

**Minutes of 1270<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 22.6.2022**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr C.H. Hau

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West  
Transport Department  
Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Regional Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Victor W.T. Yeung

Director of Lands  
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Franklin Yu

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr W.C. Lui

1. The meeting was resumed at 4:20 p.m. on 22.6.2022.

### **Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1270<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 16.5.2022, 17.5.2022 and 23.5.2022

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The draft minutes of the 1270<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 16.5.2022, 17.5.2022 and 23.5.2022 were confirmed without amendments.

[Mr Andrew C.W. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

### **Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

### **Agenda Item 2**

[Closed Meeting]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TY/31

(TPB Paper No. 10827)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

### **Deliberation Session**

3. The Secretary reported that Members' declaration of interests was reported at the hearing sessions and recorded in the relevant minutes of the meeting held on 16.5.2022, 17.5.2022 and 23.5.2022. No further declaration of interests had been received from Members since then. Members noted that Messrs Andrew C.W. Lai, Paul Y.K. Au and Franklin Yu and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong, who had declared direct interests on the item, had left the meeting or had not been invited to join the meeting. For those Members who had no direct interests or involvement in the proposed public housing development and/or the submissions of the representers/commenters, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

4. The Chairperson said that hearing sessions for the consideration of representations and comments on representations (comments) on the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY/31 (the OZP) were held on 16.5.2022, 17.5.2022 and 23.5.2022 and the minutes of the hearing sessions, which were issued to Members on 16.6.2022, were confirmed under Agenda Item 1. Today's meeting was to proceed with the deliberation of the representations and comments on the OZP. The Chairperson then invited the Secretary to briefly recapitulate the major concerns made by the representers and commenters in their written and oral submissions and the responses of relevant government departments.

5. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, the Secretary recapitulated the following major points covered in the hearing sessions:

- (a) the amendment to the OZP, i.e. Amendment Item A, involved rezoning a site of about 2.73 hectares (ha) at Tsing Yi Road West (TYRW), Tsing Yi (the Site) from "Green Belt" ("GB") to "Residential (Group A)5" ("R(A)5") for public housing development (the proposed development) with building height (BH) restrictions of 220mPD and maximum plot ratio of 6.7;
- (b) during the exhibition periods, 5,277 representations and 1,627 comments were received, which predominantly opposed the amendments;

#### Development Programme and Cost Effectiveness

##### *Representations/Comments*

- (c) the proposed development was not cost-effective and could not address the imminent housing demand given the long construction time and high cost involved, such as the site formation works, and there would be impacts on the local communities during the long construction period;

##### *Responses from Government Departments*

- (d) the cost aspect was not under the purview of the Town Planning Board (the

Board) and should be considered by the Government/the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA);

- (e) the proposed development could help meet the long-term housing demand;
- (f) the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and the Housing Department (HD) would closely co-ordinate the site works required in order to rationalise the overall construction time and cost;
- (g) mitigation measures in accordance with relevant statutory requirements for pollution/noise/dust control, temporary construction traffic management, good site practice etc., would be implemented to minimise the nuisance generated by the proposed development to the surroundings during construction period;

#### Availability of Other Sites

#### *Representations/Comments*

- (h) there were other possible alternative sites available in Tsing Yi or other parts of the territory, and other land supply options should be pursued instead of developing the Site;

#### *Responses from Government Departments*

- (i) the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to address the acute housing demand. Despite the availability of other options or alternative sites, the Site was considered suitable for housing development as substantiated by the technical assessments under the Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) conducted by CEDD;

## GB review and Development Intensity

### *Representations/Comments*

- (j) the amendment was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone or criteria of the GB review. Besides, the proposed development was excessive in development intensity and the PR and BH should be lowered;

### *Responses from Government Departments*

- (k) the Site had met the site selection criteria of the second stage of the GB review in that the Site was at the fringe of the existing built-up areas and, though being vegetated the conservation value of which was relatively low;
- (l) the Site was technically feasible for housing development without insurmountable technical problem as substantiated by the technical assessments under the EFS;
- (m) the proposed development intensity was considered appropriate and was not incompatible with the surrounding medium to high-density residential developments;
- (n) lowering the development intensity, including BH, would result in loss of housing units. As requested by Members during the hearing sessions, based on the notional scheme (i.e. BH of 220mPD with 3,800 units), it was estimated that if the BH was reduced to 200mPD and 190mPD, there would be loss of about 550 and 990 units respectively;

## Traffic and Transport

### *Representations/Comments*

- (o) the methodology and assumptions adopted in the Preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (PTTIA) under the EFS were not reliable;

- (p) the proposed development would cause adverse impacts on the traffic capacity of the road network in the area, especially along TYRW and its junction with Ching Hong Road (CHR);
- (q) the proposed construction of 1.9 km sewerage pipes underneath CHR would induce traffic congestion;
- (r) there was road safety concern due to the proposed ingress/egress of the Site at the sloping TYRW;
- (s) the additional population brought by the proposed development would intensify the demand for and increase the burden of the public transport services, which were considered inadequate;

*Responses from Government Departments*

- (t) the PTTIA was conducted based on the latest traffic model developed by the Transport Department (TD), and had taken into account all new and planned developments (e.g. TD Vehicle Examination Complex). The traffic surveys for PTTIA were undertaken during reasonable time;
- (u) according to the findings of the PTTIA, significant adverse traffic impacts due to the proposed development were not anticipated. For instance, reserved capacities of 28% and 17% at the junctions of TYRW/CHR and TYRW/Liu To Road would be maintained even with the proposed development in place;
- (v) CEDD was currently exploring a shorter alternative route along CHR and Chung Mei Road for the proposed sewerage pipes with a view to minimising the traffic impact on CHR;
- (w) the design of the proposed vehicular ingress/egress, right-turn pocket at TYRW and sightline requirement complied with the prevailing standards;



- (x) a public transport interchange (PTI) was proposed at the Site and the capacity of the public transport services including the railway line capacity would be able to cater for the additional population brought by the proposed development. TD would closely monitor the situation and timely strengthen the public services when needed;

Ecology, Stream Diversion and Tsing Yi Nature Trails

*Representations/Comments*

- (y) there was insufficient information in the ecological survey and the ecological value of the Site was underestimated;
- (z) the proposed development would involve felling of more than 1,200 trees which was considered excessive, and there was no adequate compensation for the loss of trees;
- (aa) the existing stream (about 600m) within the “GB” zone would be affected. The proposed stream diversion would result in an engineered/channelized watercourse and cause irreversible ecological impact on the existing habitat for species;
- (bb) the integrity and quality of the Tsing Yi Nature Trails (the Nature Trails) would be affected;

*Responses from Government Departments*

- (cc) the assessment on ecological impacts under the Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PEA) of the EFS was conducted making reference to the Technical Memorandum on the Environmental Impact Assessment Process. According to the PEA, the ecological value of the secondary woodland at the Site, in which the vegetation had been cleared by human activities and subsequently regenerated over a period of time, was low to moderate. Besides, the existing woodland surrounding the Site could provide alternative

habitats for the species identified in the area;

- (dd) in respect of tree felling, mitigation measures were proposed including transplanting of selected species (i.e. four *Aquilaria sinensis* (土沉香)) and compensatory tree planting (about 300) within and in proximity to the Site. Further compensatory planting would be considered as far as possible (e.g. along roadside);
- (ee) for stream diversion, sensitive design (such as incorporation of ecological elements like rock pools, riffles, and features for maintaining ecological connectivity and facilitating variation in water flow) would be adopted for the diverted watercourse to allow regeneration of habitats for aquatic flora/fauna. Those directly affected species of conservation importance (e.g. *Cryptopotamon anacoluthon* (鰓刺溪蟹) and *Nanhaipotamon hongkongense* (香港南海溪蟹)) would also be suitably translocated;
- (ff) only a small section (about 250m) of the Nature Trails which passed through the Site would be affected and a new section of hiking trail from TYRW would be re-provisioned to the west of the Site along the diverted stream. According to CEDD's clarification after the hearing sessions, the new section of hiking trail should be about 450m instead of 600m in length as provided by them at the hearing meeting on 17.5.2022 (paragraph 19(h) of the Minutes of 1270<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 17.5.2022 refers);

### Hazard Assessment

#### *Representations/Comments*

- (gg) no residential development should be allowed within the 1 km consultation zone (CZ) of the potentially hazardous installation (PHI) of oil depot;
- (hh) there was insufficient information provided to justify the findings of the Hazard Assessment (HA) under the EFS in support of the proposed

development;

*Responses from Government Departments*

- (ii) the CZ did not prohibit development. The HA, which had been undertaken according to the prevailing standards and guidelines for development within the CZ in Hong Kong, was endorsed by the Coordinating Committee on Land-use Planning and Control relating to Potentially Hazardous Installations (CCPHI);
- (jj) according to the HA, the potential individual and societal risks associated with the proposed development were very low and acceptable to the relevant government departments, and administrative measures (such as carrying out safety drills by the contractor during the construction period and preparation of the evacuation plan by the future property management company) were proposed to further minimise the risk;

Visual and Air Ventilation

*Representations/Comments*

- (kk) the proposed development with a bulky podium and BH exceeding the adjoining mountain peak at 214mPD was undesirable. In particular, adverse visual impact, daylight impact and “wall effect” would be induced on Mount Haven in close proximity, and there was no assessment on the visual impact from any vantage point at Mount Haven;
- (ll) the proposed development would cause adverse air ventilation impacts on the surroundings;

*Responses from Government Departments*

- (mm) the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) concluded that the proposed development would unavoidably result in changes in visual character of the

area, but yet it could be perceived as an extension of the surrounding medium to high-rise residential clusters. Visual mitigation measures including stepped height podium, building separations/setbacks and amenity planting/landscape treatment, were proposed for the proposed development;

- (nn) according to the established framework for undertaking VIA, only public vantage points would be selected for assessment. No vantage point would be selected within private developments including Mount Haven. The distance between the block of the proposed development and the block of Mount Haven was about 120m and such separation was considered adequate;
- (oo) concerning air ventilation impact, according to the Air Ventilation Assessment by Expert Evaluation (AVA-EE) under the EFS, the proposed development would not cause adverse impacts on the nearby residential clusters to its east as the prevailing winds came from the eastern quarter while the Site was located in the downstream area. For the prevailing winds from the southern quarter, the proposed development might cause some impacts on air ventilation on the residential developments to the north of the Site and mitigation measures (e.g. building separations/setbacks and podium garden of 4m-headroom) were proposed;

#### Provision of Open Space and Government, Institution or Community Facilities

##### *Representations/Comments*

- (pp) there was insufficient provision of open space and Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities in Tsing Yi;

##### *Responses from Government Departments*

- (qq) the existing and planned provision of open space and GIC facilities were generally adequate except for residential care homes for the elderly, community care services facilities and child care centres. Notwithstanding that, social welfare facilities (e.g. facilities for the elderly, child care and

rehabilitation) and local open spaces would be provided at the Site;

### Local Consultation

#### *Representations/Comments*

- (rr) there was a lack of local consultation for the proposed development and the Government did not provide sufficient information in supporting the OZP amendment to the District Council and the local community; and

#### *Responses from Government Departments*

- (ss) statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public had been duly followed. Before submitting the OZP amendments to the Board for consideration, relevant Government departments had consulted the District Council. The public views related to the OZP amendment had been incorporated into the MPC Paper No. 5/21 (the MPC Paper) for the consideration by the Metro Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 11.6.2011, and the MPC Paper was available for public access on the Board's website. After the OZP was exhibited for public inspection, relevant Government departments had given a briefing to the residents of Mount Haven regarding the proposed development, the amendments to the OZP, and major findings of the technical assessments undertaken in support of the amendments.

6. The Chairperson suggested Members to make reference to the TPB Paper No. 10827 (the Paper) and the confirmed minutes of the meeting held on 16.5.2022, 17.5.2022 and 23.5.2022 in deliberating the representations and comments. In response to Members' questions as to whether some of the issues raised by the representers/commenters would be regarded as relevant factors to be taken into account by the Board, the Chairperson shared her views as follows:

- (a) regarding the concerns on technical difficulties of implementation, it should be noted that these were normally implementation issues for the relevant

Government departments. For the case in question, those departments had advised that no insurmountable problems were anticipated for the proposed development in terms of technical constraints;

- (b) the Board should not bother itself with the subject of construction cost. There were different mechanisms, in general, under the Government, the HKHA as well as Legislative Council to manage the use of public money for public housing developments;
- (c) construction time was normally not a consideration of the Board, but the nuisances induced by the lengthy construction period of the proposed development and whether there would be adequate mitigation measures could be a relevant factor to be considered by the Board when contemplating suitable land uses for the area;
- (d) Members were not encouraged to put too much emphasis on the point regarding availability of alternative sites (including the housing supply from the Lantua Tomorrow Vision/Northern Metropolis Development in the long term for public housing development). This was because a multi-pronged approach had been adopted by the Government to address the acute housing demand and every single site identified counted. As announced in the 2021 Policy Address, about 400,000 to 500,000 housing units would be provided in the medium to long-term, and the proposed development had contributed to this estimated supply; and
- (e) the development parameters (e.g. the restrictions on BH and PR) of the proposed development and the corresponding amendments were matters to be considered by the Board. In respect of detailed design aspects (e.g. disposition of the block layout, podium/façade design), Members' views would be recorded and referred to HD in the formulation of the Planning Brief (PB) for the proposed development, and HD would take into account the views in the detailed design stage.

7. Members generally supported or had no objection to Amendment Item A, and

agreed with the Government departments' responses to the representers/commenters' views. Their major views were summarised as follows:

Meeting Acute Housing Demand

- (a) the multi-pronged approach to increase housing land supply to provide a better living quality for the people in need in the society was supported and the proposed development at the Site would contribute to meeting the acute housing demand. It was also noted that the alternative sites proposed by the representers/commenters were not suitable for housing development or had already been planned for other uses;

Cost-effectiveness

- (b) it was the responsibility of the Government and the HKHA to control and manage the development cost of housing projects including the proposed development at the Site;

Nuisance during Construction Period

- (c) the construction period for the proposed development was relatively long as compared with other housing development in general. Notwithstanding, it was noted that CEDD and HD would closely coordinate the proposed development with a view to optimising the construction period as far as possible. Nuisances to the local community during the construction period would be addressed by the implementation of proper mitigation measures;

Ecological Consideration

- (d) while the existing natural conditions of the Site (including woodland and stream) were recognized in general, there was no strong justification to support that the Site was not suitable for housing development due to ecological consideration;

- (e) Tsing Yi was essentially a hilly terrain covered by vegetation, and the Site only occupied a small portion of the whole “GB” zone;
- (f) the affected sections of the existing stream were not easily accessible by the public and the scale of stream diversion was not substantial. Significant impact on the public enjoyment of the stream environment after diversion, which was considered by most of the representers/commenters an important leisure activity for the local residents and the public, was not anticipated. The nearby TYRW Park, which had a larger area with similar leisure environment with stream that public could easily access, could be an alternative spot for enjoyment;
- (g) translocation of valuable aquatic species would be carried out before commencement of construction works at the Site;

#### Traffic, Transport and Road Safety

- (h) according to the PTTIA, the existing traffic capacity would be able to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed development. The existing traffic congestion and road safety issues would be monitored by relevant Government departments, and the ingress/egress design of the Site and local improvement works would be refined and confirmed in the detailed design stage;
- (i) the increase in population due to the proposed development might offer an opportunity to introduce more public transport services to the area which would benefit the local communities especially for the low income family;

#### BH, Visual Impact and Air Ventilation

- (j) the development parameters for the proposed development, as stipulated on the OZP, were considered appropriate and not incompatible with the surroundings. It was generally agreed that the proposed development was an extension of the surrounding high-rise residential developments. It was also



noted that the ridgeline in Tsing Yi was not high, and hence, any new high-rise developments thereat might breach the ridgeline;

- (k) the concerns on BH of the proposed development and the building separations (about 120m) between Mount Haven and the Site, and the proposed mitigation measures in respect of building design were noted. HD would enhance the design with appropriate mitigation measures such as setback, façade design/retreatment, podium design in the detailed design stage to further minimise visual and air ventilation impacts;
- (l) taking into account the compact city environment in Hong Kong, views from private developments would not be guaranteed. Instead, public views should be protected as far as possible and visual assessment would take into account public viewpoints;
- (m) making reference to the Ma On Shan OZP amendments in 2021 in which a proposed public housing site was located in close proximity to a local village, the building separation of the proposed development from Mount Haven, which was much wider, was considered appropriate; and
- (n) lowering the BH of the proposed development would reduce the production of housing units (e.g. reducing 20m/30m to 200mPD/190mPD would induce loss of 550/990 units respectively) and thus affect the contribution in meeting the acute housing demand.

8. Regarding the visual and air ventilation aspects, Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, supplemented that after the approval of the OZP, there would be subsequent tasks for the relevant departments to follow up including formulation of PB to set out the detailed development requirements for the proposed development, such as conducting a quantitative air ventilation assessment and further enhancing the building design in order to address the air ventilation, visual and landscape concerns raised by the representers/commenters and Members. This would serve as guidance for HD in the detailed design of the proposed development. HD would consult the District Council on the development scheme before further proceeding with the implementation.

### Stream Diversion and Tree Compensation

9. A Member, as gathered from some green groups based on their past experiences, said that some compensation plans and mitigation measures for Government projects were not carried out properly by the contractors in the implementation stage. For instance, the contractors of the North East New Territories development project used construction waste as land filling materials for farmlands of agricultural rehabilitation offered to the affected farmers by the Government. Occurrence of such kind of incidence was one of the reasons why the public was doubtful on compensation proposals put forth by the Government. However, similar mitigation measures and arrangements were still being adopted in the Government projects. On stream diversion, the Government should consider formulating suitable guidelines on the design principles and general practices so as to secure a consistent approach and quality outcome. For example, diversion of streams should be carried out before commencement of the filling of concerned streams or construction works at the site; “U-channel” design should not be adopted as it would become a “trap” endangering the aquatic species; natural substrates or materials or substrates from the existing stream, rather than construction waste, should be used for construction of stream banks and streambed of the diverted stream; vegetation should be provided along the diverted stream which would benefit the regeneration of stream habitat and the ecological value; and no vertical wall or stream bank should be applied, etc. A Member shared that there were good examples of river revitalisation in Tung Chung West and Yuen Long South in which good design elements for habitat generation had been adopted and the watercourses were transformed into scenic recreation areas for public enjoyment.

10. On tree compensation proposals, the same Member who shared green groups’ concerns also said that the Government focused only on the number of individual trees to be compensated rather than the quality of compensation in the form of tree cluster like a woodland. For the proposed development at the Site, more than 1,000 trees would be felled and only 300 trees could be compensated and the compensated trees could only be planted individually on the podium platform or roadside given the limited space available within the Site and nearby areas. Such piecemeal approach would significantly reduce the function of a woodland currently providing fresh air, absorbing carbon dioxide, and providing habitats for species etc. for the area. Besides, felling of a mature tree would usually be compensated with a younger

tree. Hence, the public including the representers/commenters could hardly trust that the tree compensation proposed by the Government was adequate and effective. Noting that there would be no suitable area in Tsing Yi for tree compensation, the Member suggested that the relevant Government departments might consider identifying some slope areas in different districts as tree banks for compensatory planting for projects which could not achieve full on-site tree compensation. There was about 45% of undeveloped land in Hong Kong which was not vegetated and hence, there should be adequate slope areas for establishment of tree banks for tree compensation for future development projects, especially those housing developments under the GB review. The establishment of tree banks would bring positive effects on capturing of carbon and rainwater, hence facilitating the sustainable development of Hong Kong.

11. With regard to tree compensation, the Chairperson acknowledged that there was currently no holistic or centralised mechanism for tree compensation arrangement for housing sites identified under the GB review, and areas for tree compensation were identified by individual project proponents. Similarly, there were no promulgated guidelines on stream diversion/reprovisioning of stream. She would task the Development Bureau (DEVB) to follow up on the two issues, involving the Environment Bureau (ENB) as appropriate.

12. Members also had the following views and suggestions:

- (a) the relevant Government departments should address properly and promptly the nuisances caused to the local community during the construction period of the proposed development;
- (b) measures should be explored to reduce the extent of land filling. A minimum filling approach should be adopted in order to minimise the podium size and height. Considerations should also be given to optimising the location of the new facilities, e.g. PTI, which could also help reduce the scale of the proposed development;
- (c) there should be a seamless reprovisioning of the affected Nature Trails so that the local community and general public could continue to enjoy hiking at the Nature Trails;

- (d) the entire stream in the vicinity of the Site and the diverted stream course should be treated as an integral feature and efforts should be made to enhance the ecological habitat of not only the diverted stream but the entire stream and the surroundings. Reprovisioning of affected sections of the Nature Trails together with the entire stream enhancement could enhance the regeneration of ecological habitat and at the same time create a quality recreation space for public enjoyment; and
- (e) more information on the potential risk of the proposed development being located within the CZ of a PHI should be provided to the future residents to facilitate their understanding on the issue and the proposed mitigation measures.

[Post-meeting Note: a Member, who was unable to attend the meeting, had provided his comments in writing before the meeting. In view of the need to address the acute housing demand, in particular public housing, the Member supported Amendment Item A. Given that stream diversion involved in the development might result in negative impact on the ecosystem, the Member suggested that the Government should provide sufficient resources to facilitate such diversion works and the impact on habitat along the stream be kept to a minimum.]

13. As Members had no further views, the Chairperson summarised the major points as follows:

- (a) Members generally agreed to or had no objection to the OZP amendments;
- (b) Members' detailed comments on the proposed development, including the extent of land filling and built form (e.g. podium height, stepped height and permeability) would be addressed in the detailed design stage;
- (c) the construction period would be optimised and if a relatively long period was required, nuisance caused to the local community should be minimised through proper mitigations;

- (d) there were inevitably some controversies over the proposed development in respect of the disturbances to the existing natural environment of the “GB” zone. The Government would take the opportunity to uplift the environment of the stream course and the Nature Trails and to regenerate the habitats with a view to allowing better enjoyment by the public;
- (e) regarding local community’s concerns on transport and traffic issues, the Government would take the opportunity to enhance the road capacity and public transport services, something much wanted by the local community. Road improvement works should commence as early as possible; and
- (f) on tree compensation and stream diversion for the proposed development and other upcoming development sites under the GB review, DEVB and ENB would co-ordinate to work out appropriate guidelines or arrangements with a view to ensuring the provision of compensatory and mitigation measures in a consistent manner. DEVB would follow up.

14. After deliberation, the Board noted the views of R1 to R88, R2992 to R2995, R3001 to 3005, R3007 to R3010, R3076, R3077, R3079, R3081, R4155 and R5261 to R5276. The Board decided not to uphold R89 to R2991, R2996 to R3000, R3006, R3011 to R3075, R3078, R3080, R3082 to R4154, R4156 to R5260 and R5277 and considered that the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- “(a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase housing land supply, including carrying out various land use reviews on an on-going basis. The “Green Belt” site proposed for public housing development is located at the fringe of the existing built-up areas in Tsing Yi and is in close proximity to existing roads. Taking into account that there is no insurmountable technical problem identified for the proposed public housing development, it is considered suitable for rezoning the representation site to “Residential (Group A) 5” on the subject Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for increasing the housing land supply;

- (b) an Engineering Feasibility Study comprising technical assessments on the traffic and transport, environmental, ecology, landscape, geotechnical, drainage, sewerage, visual and air ventilation aspects, etc., have been conducted which confirmed that there is no insurmountable technical problem in developing the representation site for public housing development, with supporting government institution or community facilities;
- (c) the development intensity and building height of the proposed development are considered appropriate taking into consideration the planning context of the area and the findings of the relevant technical assessments;
- (d) the overall provision of government, institution or community facilities and open space is generally sufficient to serve the population in Tsing Yi. As for the elderly services and facilities and child care centres, the Social Welfare Department will consider their provision in the planning and development process as appropriate, with a view to meeting the demand as long-term goal; and
- (e) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the zoning amendment have been duly followed. The views received were duly considered and responded by concerned Government bureaux/departments. The exhibition of the OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance.”

15. The Board also agreed that the draft Tsing Yi OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

**Agenda Item 3**

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting] [The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

16. The Board noted that Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn, the Chairperson, who had served the Board as a Member/Chairperson for about 10 years, was attending the meeting of the Town Planning Board for the last time before taking up the appointment as the Secretary for Development. On behalf of all Members, the Secretary congratulated Ms Linn on the appointment and extended a vote of thanks for her valuable contributions to the operation of the Board.

17. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 6:10 p.m.