

**Minutes of 1335th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 3.4.2025**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Engineer/Traffic Survey and Support
Transport Department
Mr W.H. Poon

Chief Engineer (Works)
Home Affairs Department
Mr Bond C.P. Chow

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Dr C.M. Cheng

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Professor B.S. Tang

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Anny P.K. Tang

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Thomas C.S. Yeung

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1334th Meeting held on 21.3.2025

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1334th meeting held on 21.3.2025 would be sent to Members in due course. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting note: The minutes were sent to Members on 23.4.2025 and were confirmed on 25.4.2025 without amendment.]

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[This item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan

2. The Secretary reported that on 17.3.2025, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as S/YL-NSW/10) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the OZP was notified in the Gazette on 28.3.2025.

(ii) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plan

3. The Secretary reported that on 26.2.2025, the Secretary for Development referred the approved Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H5/31 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1A)(a)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the OZP was notified in the Gazette on 3.4.2025.

(iii) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations on Draft Outline Zoning Plan

4. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations in respect of the draft Tsim Sha Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K1/29. She briefly introduced that on 17.1.2025, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, seven valid representations were received. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the representations was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the full Board) collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for May 2025.

5. The Board agreed to the hearing arrangement in paragraph 4 above.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/38

(TPB Paper No. 11002)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

6. The Secretary reported that the amendments incorporated in the draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (the draft OZP) involved rezoning of a site at the junction of Wing Shun Street and Texaco Road (Item A Site) for private residential development; and rezoning of another site at the junction of Ma Tau Pa Road and Texaco Road (Item B Site) to facilitate the redevelopment of the existing industrial buildings for commercial development. A feasibility study (the Study) was conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development

Department (CEDD) to ascertain the technical feasibility of the proposed private residential development at Item A Site. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan;
- Professor Simon K.L. Wong - his company owning a property in Tsuen Wan; and
- Mr Daniel K.W. Chung - being a former Director of CEDD.

7. Members noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the property owned by Professor Simon K.L. Wong's company had no direct view of the two amendment sites and Mr Daniel K.W. Chung had no involvement in the Study, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

8. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

9. The following government representatives (including the consultants) and representers were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

- Mr Derek P.K. Tse - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)
- Mr Michael K.K. Cheung - Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon

Mr Jacky K.C. Kong - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK)

CEDD

Mr Carl K.S. Ng - Senior Engineer

Atkins China Limited

Mr Louis N.K. Lau]
Mr Alex P.Y. Sung] Consultants
Ms Vivian W.Y. Chan]
Ms Joe M.W. Fung]

Representers

R12 – Wan Chung Leung

Mr Wan Chung Leung - Representer

R36 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

10. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that representatives of PlanD would be invited to brief Members on the representations. The representers would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representer two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representers had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives and/or the representers. After the Q&A session, the government representatives and the representers would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) would then deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Professor Simon K.L. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

11. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Jacky K.C. Kong, TP/TWK, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendment items on the draft OZP, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11002 (the Paper). The amendment items included:

- (a) Item A – rezoning of a site at the junction of Wing Shun Street and Texaco Road from “Government, Institution or Community (9)” (“G/IC(9)”) to “Residential (Group A) 22” (“R(A)22”) subject to a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 6, a maximum non-domestic PR of 0.2 and a maximum building height (BH) of 150mPD, with provision of a public vehicle park (PVP) and government, institution and community (GIC) facilities ; and
- (b) Item B – rezoning of a site at the junction of Ma Tau Pa Road and Texaco Road from “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) to “Commercial (7)” (“C(7)”) subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 52,513m² and a maximum BH of 150mPD.

12. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the Plan and to tally with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.

13. The Chairperson then invited the representers to elaborate on their representations.

R12 – Wan Chung Leung

14. Mr Wan Chung Leung made the following main points:

- (a) the road and infrastructure capacity and community facilities planned in the area were not designed to accommodate the additional population generated from the proposed development at Item A Site;

- (b) the traffic on Texaco Road, Wing Shun Street and Ma Tau Pa Road was already saturated during peak hours. Traffic congestion always occurred on Texaco Road due to on-street double parking in front of the Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area, boarding and alighting of passengers at the bus stop, and frequent utility maintenance works. The situation was further aggravated during the Chung Yeung and Qing Ming festivals when some temporary road closure measures were imposed to facilitate ancestor worship at the Tsuen Wan Chinese Permanent Cemetery;
- (c) the Environmental Impact Assessment conducted for the widening of Tsuen Wan Road, in particular on the traffic noise aspect, did not take into account the proposed development at Item A Site, and hence the assessment should no longer be valid;
- (d) the proposed development would further exacerbate the wall effect which would significantly affect air ventilation in the area; and
- (e) during the development of Tsuen Wan South, a footbridge connecting to Tsuen Wan Town Centre was proposed and incorporated into the lease of some developments. Nevertheless, the footbridge had not been constructed and might already be deleted from the original plan. Similarly, the community facilities to be specified in the lease for Item A Site might ultimately not be delivered.

R36 – Mary Mulvihill

15. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

Item A

- (a) according to a recent news report, Alibaba Group Holding Chairman expressed concerns about the potential oversupply of AI data centres, and Hong Kong was currently facing a scenario of oversupply of housing which might take about 10 years to clear the backlog;

- (b) the residential child care centre for children with special needs within the proposed development would be situated adjacent to the proposed noise barrier to mitigate the noise of Tsuen Wan Road. It was undesirable as it would impede natural light and ventilation;
- (c) “G/IC” zones were designated to meet the present and future needs of the community, and also served as breathing space. While the Government aimed to identify more sites for land sale to increase revenue, this should not override the importance of ensuring a healthy living environment, especially in light of climate change and the possible outbreak of another infectious disease like COVID. The elimination of standalone GIC sites had created a situation in which it was almost impossible to accommodate emergencies that required isolation. Openable windows were an essential element of a healthy environment. The impacts on air quality and ventilation were underestimated by concluding that the proposed development would not induce or be subject to significant adverse impacts and that mitigation measures would be provided at a later stage;
- (d) there were currently insufficient GIC facilities and open space in Tsuen Wan district. A large portion of land in Tsuen Wan Park had been utilised for drainage works, which resulted in the loss of a community garden. Item A Site should be developed for community use;

Item B

- (e) the increase in BH could be pursued through section 16 application with the submission of master layout plan (MLP) under the original “CDA(1)” zone to better address future needs and circumstances;
- (f) the OZP amendment was presented as an administrative measure, however, it eliminated the need for any technical assessment to evaluate the potential impacts of the increase in BH. The proposed plot ratio (PR) of 7 was relatively low, and future application for an increase in PR was expected;

Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (g) the incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1 for “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone would deprive the public’s right to comment on the location and design of those facilities; and
- (h) the planning intention of the “V” zone was to provide housing and the incorporation of ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ under Column 2 for the “V” zone would be exploited for commercial operations.

16. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative and the representers had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representers and/or the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Land Use Zonings

17. Two Members enquired about the planning history of the representation sites and the rationale for the “CDA” Review. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) Item A Site and its adjacent area zoned “G/IC(9)” were reclaimed land previously reserved for GIC use, and had once been earmarked for an electricity substation. As the use was no longer required, to better utilise the government land which was not designated for particular use, Item A Site was, after review, rezoned to “R(A)22” for private residential development to expedite housing land supply in the short to medium term; and
- (b) regarding Item B Site, three sites currently zoned “C” under various sub-zones to the east together with Item B Site originally formed a larger “CDA(1)” zone.

Following the completion of their respective developments as approved by the Board under the previous “CDA” zoning, the three sites were subsequently rezoned to “C(2)”, “C(3)” and “C(4)”. Item B Site, which was a private lot without any redevelopment proposal, was kept as “CDA(1)”. According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 17A for Designation of “CDA” Zones and Monitoring the Progress of “CDA” Development, a review of the “CDA” zone by the Board would be required after its designation for 3 years. Taking into account that Item B Site was under single ownership, had no approved MLP for 26 years and the changes in planning circumstances including the completion of its surrounding redevelopment projects, the Metro Planning Committee of the Board agreed in 2023 to rezone Item B Site to other appropriate zoning to streamline redevelopment process in the future. As the previous “CDA(1)” zone was intended for commercial development without provision for residential use in order to address the industrial and residential interface issues in the area, Item B Site was rezoned to “C(7)” subject to the same maximum GFA (i.e. 52,513m²) as the previous “CDA(1)” zone with an increase in maximum BH from 100mPD to 150mPD to provide design flexibility without compromising the BH profile of the area. As the relevant government departments had confirmed its technical feasibility under the current “C(7)” zone, the landowner would no longer be required to submit planning application and conduct technical assessments for the intended commercial development, which would streamline the planning process in redeveloping the site.

18. Noting that the remaining area of the “G/IC(9)” zone was mainly kept as a temporary carpark and was partly covered by Tsuen Wan Road flyover, a Member enquired about the possibility of extending Item A Site to include the area so as to form a larger development site to enhance the design flexibility and management efficiency under a single landowner. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that for better land use planning, adequate buffer distance between residential developments and major road, i.e. Tsuen Wan Road under the subject case, should be provided. In response to the Member’s further enquiry on the future development of the remaining “G/IC(9)” site, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that the site could be used for some low-rise developments given its site constraints imposed by the flyover. The

“G/IC(9)” area had once been considered for installation of a dry weather flow interceptor by the Drainage Services Department (DSD) to improve the water quality and mitigate the odour problem of Tsuen Wan Bay, which was subsequently proposed at Tsuen Wan Park, taking into account the locals’ views. The Government would keep reviewing the suitable use of the site.

19. A Member enquired whether Item B Site should be rezoned for residential use as Hong Kong was facing an oversupply of commercial sites. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD explained that Item B Site was a private lot and its redevelopment was subject to the initiative of the landowner. Since the planning intention of the site was all along for commercial development and there was no change in the permitted commercial GFA of the site, the concerned rezoning would not result in an increase of planned commercial floor space in the area. Besides, the site would serve as a buffer between the existing industrial and residential interface in the area as mentioned above and residential use on the site was not supported by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) under current circumstances.

Traffic Aspect

20. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the traffic condition of Texaco Road and the impact of Item A Site on Texaco Road, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD and Mr Alex P.Y. Sung, the consultant, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) Texaco Road was a carriageway with central divider. The traffic congestion along Texaco Road as raised by R12 was related to the industrial area on the southbound of the road opposite to Item A Site, while the ingress/egress of Item A Site was located on the northbound side, where the traffic conditions were acceptable;
- (b) according to the Preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment, the existing traffic conditions (volume/capacity ratio) of major roads, such as Texaco Road, Ma Tau Pa Road and Yeung Uk Road, were all within acceptable levels during the morning and evening peak hours. The proposed development would not result in any significant adverse impact on the surrounding road network and the improvement works of Tsuen Tsing Interchange had been taken into account in the assessment; and

- (c) the proposed development on Item A Site would provide a PVP for both private cars and light goods vehicles to meet the local demand. Meanwhile, the existing parking spaces at Item A Site would largely be absorbed by nearby carparks during the construction stage.

21. A Member noted that local traffic condition was a major concern raised by the representer (R12), and enquired about the programme of the widening works of Tsuen Wan Road. In response, Mr W.H. Poon, Chief Engineer/Traffic Survey and Support (CE/TSS), Transport Department (TD) said that the Highways Department (HyD) was conducting an investigation study on the widening of Tsuen Wan Road and associated junction improvement works, and the project implementation schedule was subject to the latest developments including policy initiative, Government's fiscal position, etc. For Tsuen Tsing Interchange, the improvement works were on going and were anticipated to be completed before the population intake of Item A Site. By that time, the capacity of Tsuen Tsing Interchange would be improved.

Environmental Aspect

22. In response to a Member's enquiry in relation to R36's comment that the location of the residential special child care centre in Item A Site next to the noise barrier was not desirable, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD and Ms Vivian W.Y. Chan, the consultant, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) relevant technical assessments, including noise and air quality aspects, had been conducted under the Study based on the indicative development scheme to ascertain the feasibility of the proposed development. While the exact location and layout of the proposed child care centre would be subject to detailed design by the future developer, relevant government departments, including the Social Welfare Department (SWD), would set out detailed design requirements, including the size, facilities and necessary mitigation measures, as well as other government requirements through the land sale document and lease conditions. Those requirements would be closely monitored at the detailed design and construction stages; and

- (b) different locations for the child care centre had been explored during the study process and the one shown in the indicative development scheme was identified as a possible option. According to the Quantitative Noise Impact Assessment under the Study, with incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures, such as acoustic windows, the noise impact on the facility was considered acceptable. Regarding air quality, Quantitative Air Quality Impact Assessment was also conducted based on the assumption of openable windows. No adverse air quality impact was anticipated with incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.

Provision of GIC Facilities and Open Space

23. A Member enquired whether the provision of open space and GIC facilities in Tsuen Wan could meet the requirements set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) the overall provision of open space in Tsuen Wan was sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population as stipulated in HKPSG. There would be a surplus of planned district and local open space of about 12.97 ha and 7.36 ha respectively in the area; and
- (b) the provision of GIC facilities within the area was generally adequate except for shortfalls in secondary school (-24 classrooms), hospital (-33 beds), divisional police station and some social welfare facilities, including community care service facilities, child care centres and residential care services. The provisions of both secondary school spaces and hospital beds were assessed on a wider district and hospital cluster respectively, and could be addressed by the provisions in the adjoining areas. As for the deficits in some elderly and child care services/facilities, SWD adopted a wider spatial context/cluster in assessing the provision of such facilities. Those facilities should be carefully planned/reviewed by relevant government bureaux/departments, and premises-based GIC facilities could be incorporated in future development/redevelopment in the wider district when opportunities

arose. Opportunity had also been taken to provide appropriate social welfare facilities for the elderly and children within the proposed development in Item A Site as requested by SWD.

24. The same Member asked the representer (R36) about the suitability of Tsuen Wan Park, located opposite Item A Site, as an emergency space in the event of necessity; and her views on the housing need, given the long waiting list for public housing and the ongoing demand for private housing. In response, Ms Mary Mulvihill (R36) made the following points:

- (a) during the course of the COVID-19 pandemic, the need for open spaces became crucial for residents in densely populated, high-rise districts, who sought to exercise and enjoy fresh air. To use the open spaces as emergency facilities, such as erection of isolation tents, would deprive the community of these essential recreational areas. Nevertheless, the community had not been sufficiently prepared for natural disasters, such as earthquakes and tsunamis. It was therefore crucial to maintain certain spaces for swift conversion into emergency facilities if needed; and
- (b) while Hong Kong was currently facing an adequate supply of residential properties, Item A Site was intended for private residential development, which could help generate revenue for the Government to address financial situation, rather than public housing.

Others

25. In view of some information provided by the representers during the above discussion, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following clarifications:

Construction Sites to the Northwest of Item A Site

- (a) the site previously occupied by a temporary community garden was located outside Tsuen Wan Park and zoned “G/IC” subject to a BH restriction of 3 storeys. It was being developed into a 3-storey government joint-user

complex with a community hall, a neighbourhood elderly centre and a 100-place child care centre to meet the community needs;

- (b) another works site next to the complex was being developed into a dry weather flow interceptor proposed by DSD to improve the water quality and odour problem in Tsuen Wan Bay. The drainage facility had previously been considered to be located in the “G/IC(9)” site underneath Tsuen Wan Road flyover near City Point as mentioned above. Taking into account the locals’ views, the facility was being developed at the periphery of Tsuen Wan Park (an area zoned “Open Space”) after obtaining planning permission from the Metro Planning Committee of the Board; and

Footbridge Proposal

- (c) in order to enhance the footbridge network, HyD was conducting a study on extending the existing footbridge network in Tsuen Wan to Tsuen Wan Park via Item A Site and City Point. As required under the lease of City Point, a footbridge connection point had been reserved at City Point to facilitate the footbridge proposal.

26. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board’s decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers and the government representatives (including the consultants) for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

27. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

Item A

28. Members generally supported the amendment. A Member considered that it would be a waste of resource to leave GIC sites vacant for decades. Another Member acknowledged

the concerns raised by the representers regarding the noise impact on Item A Site, but pointed out that with the mitigation measures in place, all residential units would comply with the road traffic noise criterion. Regarding the proposed location for the social welfare facilities, a Member remarked that the provision of social welfare facilities would be subject to approval by relevant government departments including SWD and the Fire Services Department, which would ensure their proper locations and compliance with relevant statutory requirements. Mr Gary C.W. Tam, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), EPD added that contemporary acoustic windows were designed to maintain ventilation, and thus achieving noise reduction and airflow was not a conflicting goal. The future developer would be required under the lease to conduct Noise Impact Assessment for relevant government departments' consideration.

29. A Member noted that the noise level of Tsuen Wan Road would be improved after the road widening works as noise mitigation measures would be implemented. Mr W.H. Poon, CE/TSS, TD supplemented that the widening of Tsuen Wan Road and the associated junction improvement works were authorised in 2023. The approved Environmental Impact Assessment report for the project had recommended adopting various mitigation measures, including noise barriers.

30. In response to two Members' questions related to the remaining portion of the "G/IC(9)" site, Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning, made the following main points:

- (a) relevant considerations and requirements had been taken into account when delineating the boundaries of the "R(A)22" and "G/IC(9)" zones so as to optimise the development potential of the respective sites while addressing the site constraints. For instance, residential development should be set back at least 20m from major roads to mitigate potential air impacts;
- (b) the remaining "G/IC(9)" zone could accommodate a wide range of uses, and there were some good examples in Energized Kowloon East of utilising the unused spaces underneath the flyover for public enjoyment; and
- (c) PlanD would assess the long-term use of the remaining "G/IC(9)" site after the termination of the temporary car park at the site.

31. Mr W.H. Poon, CE/TSS, TD supplemented that the remaining portion of the “G/IC(9)” site would be used as works area for the Tsuen Wan Road Widening in the medium term.

Item B

32. Members generally supported the amendment. A Member remarked that while the landowner currently had no intention to redevelop Item B Site, the rezoning would facilitate its future redevelopment. Another Member concurred and said that the rezoning of Item A and Site B Sites would enable early development/redevelopment at the sites, which would provide incentive for completing the footbridge network.

Conclusion

33. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the OZP amendments, and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations. All grounds of the representations had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

34. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive view of **R1** on Item A and decided not to uphold R2 to R39 and agreed that the draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“Item A

- (a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to make available sufficient supply of housing land progressively to meet the acute demand for housing, including carrying out various land use reviews on an on-going basis. Item A Site is located at the southern part of Tsuen Wan with residential, government, institution and community (GIC) and open space uses in the area and separated from Tsuen Wan East Industrial Area by Texaco Road. Technical assessments covering various aspects such as traffic, environmental, air ventilation, landscape and visual also confirm that

there is no insurmountable technical problem in developing Item A Site for private residential use. It is considered appropriate to rezone Item A Site for private residential use subject to the current plot ratio and building height (BH) restrictions (**R2 to R28, R30 to R36, R38 and R39**);

- (b) the provision of GIC facilities is generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population in the Tsuen Wan area in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, except for secondary school, hospital beds, community care services facilities, child care centres and residential care services. The private residential development would also provide social welfare facilities to meet the needs of residents in the area as appropriate. The provision of GIC facilities will be closely monitored by relevant government bureaux/departments. Besides, there are adequate planned provisions of district open space and local open space in the planning area to cater for the planned population (**R2, R4, R9, R11 to R13, R22 to R26, R28, R30, R35, R36, R38 and R39**);

Item B

- (c) the rezoning under Item B is to take forward the decision of the Metro Planning Committee of the Board in the Review of Sites Designated “Comprehensive Development Area” on Statutory Plans in the Metro Area for the Years 2021/2023. Item B Site is rezoned from “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) to “Commercial (7)” (“C(7)”) to facilitate redevelopment of the existing industrial buildings for commercial uses. The “C(7)” zone is intended primarily for commercial developments, which aligns with the planning intention of the previous “CDA(1)” zone. The current gross floor area restriction is the same as that of the previous “CDA(1)” zone and the BH restriction is compatible with the surrounding developments (**R36**); and

Amendments to the Notes for “Village Type Development” (“V”) Zone

- (d) the incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1 and ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “V” zone is in line with the latest Master Schedule of Notes promulgated by the Board. The provision of these facilities will follow the relevant established government procedures and/or require planning permission from the Board (R36).”

35. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

Sai Kung and Islands District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Ho Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-HC/12

(TPB Paper No. 11003)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

36. The Secretary reported that the amendments incorporated in the draft Ho Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (the draft OZP) were mainly to take forward three section 12A (s.12A) applications agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) and to reflect the as-built government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, road alignment of the completed Hiram’s Highway Improvement Stage 1 project and local road improvement works, as well as the land use review of relevant areas. A representation was submitted by The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited

(Towngas) (R2), a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD).

The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho - having current business dealings with HLD; and
- Mr Ryan M.K. Ip - being the vice-president and executive director of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from Henderson Group.

37. Members noted that Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had no involvement in the project(s) under the sponsorship of Henderson Group, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

38. The following government representatives, representer and representer's representative were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

- Mr Walter W.N. Kwong - District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands
- Ms Tammy S.N. Kong - Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs)
- Mr Jackin H.Y. Yip - Assistant Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands
- Ms Sally S.Y. Chan - Town Planning Graduate/Sai Kung and Islands

Representer and Representer's Representative

R1 – Mary Mulvihill

- Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

R2 – The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited

Mr Cheng Wa

- Representer's Representative

39. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that representatives of PlanD would be invited to brief Members on the representations. The representer and representer's representative would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representer and representer's representative two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representer and representer's representative had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, the representer and/or representer's representative. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representer and representer's representative would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

40. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Tammy S.N. Kong, STP/SKIs, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendment items on the draft OZP, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11003 (the Paper). The amendment items included:

- (a) Item A – rezoning of a site in Wang Che from “Conservation Area” (“CA”) to “Village Type Development” (“V”);
- (b) Item B – rezoning of a site comprising two land parcels at Ho Chung North Road from “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”), “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group C) 3”; and addition of a symbol for linking up the two land parcels;
- (c) Item C – rezoning of a site at Wo Mei Hung Min Road from “Green Belt”

(“GB”) to “Residential (Group C) 4” and designation of the land in the middle as non-building area;

- (d) Item D – rezoning of a site at Ho Chung Road from “R(E)” and “GB” to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”);
- (e) Item E – rezoning of a site occupied by Ho Chung Lowland Raw Water Pumping Station from “Agriculture” to “G/IC”;
- (f) Item F – rezoning of a site at the junction of Hiram’s Highway and Luk Mei Tsuen Road from “GB” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(E)”;
- (g) Item G1 – rezoning of a site to the north of Ho Chung North Road from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(D)”;
- (h) Item G2 – rezoning of a site at the junction of Ho Chung Road and Ho Chung North Road from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(E)” ;
- (i) Item G3 – rezoning of four sites separately at the junction of Ho Chung North Road and Ho Chung Road, Ho Chung Village and Mok Tse Che from areas shown as ‘Road’ to “V”;
- (j) Item G4 – rezoning of two sites separately at Ho Chung River and to the southeast of Nam Pin Wai from areas shown as ‘Road’ to “GB”;
- (k) Item G5 – rezoning of a site to the southeast of Nam Pin Wai from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group C) 1”; and
- (l) Item H – rezoning of four sections of Hiram’s Highway, Luk Mei Tsuen Road and Ho Chung North Road from “V”, “GB” and “R(E)” to areas shown as ‘Road’.

41. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the Plan and to tally with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.

42. The Chairperson then invited the representer and representer's representative to elaborate on their representations.

R2 – The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited

43. Mr Cheng Wa made the following main points:

- (a) since the proposed developments at Items C, D and F sites were in close vicinity to the high-pressure pipeline at Hiram's Highway, the project proponents were required to conduct Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) to evaluate the potential risk based on the forecasted ultimate population and determine the necessary mitigation measures if required;
- (b) according to PlanD's presentation at the meeting, the project proponent of Item C site had conducted a QRA, a copy of which should be provided to Towngas for record; and
- (c) the project proponents should consult and closely liaise with Towngas during the detailed design and construction stages.

R1 – Mary Mulvihill

44. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

Item A

- (a) half of the site was on government land (GL). There was sufficient land available within the "V" zone of Kai Ham (including Wang Che) to meet the outstanding Small House demand and the 10-year Small House demand forecast;
- (b) the site was located within the water gathering ground and the efficiency of sewage disposal through the proposed underground holding tank at the

discretion of the land owner was not reliable;

- (c) as the site was located close to the slope within the “CA” zone, slope stabilisation works were required for the proposed development, which would adversely affect the trees both within and outside the site. A detailed tree survey report was required to assess the impact on the existing landscape. The cumulative impact on trees was difficult to justify for a development of one single dwelling;

Item B

- (d) the public passage on GL should be excluded from the site;
- (e) she objected to the building height (BH) of the proposed development. The parking facilities should be provided underground and the BH should be kept the same as the surrounding village houses to retain the rural landscape and reduce visual impact;
- (f) half of the site area was used for internal access, which was considered an inefficient use of land and would greatly reduce the greening coverage. The response that a greenery coverage of 20% would be provided on the site did not address the issue;
- (g) the Tree Survey Report for the s.12A application, including the number of existing trees and planting design, was questionable;
- (h) continuous approval of residential developments in an area without public sewerage system should be questioned;

Item C

- (i) the rezoning of Item C site would eliminate the current “GB” buffer from Hiram’s Highway. There were expectations that Sai Kung should continue to maintain its rural character;

- (j) given that sufficient land had been identified for housing and there were many vacant residential units in Ho Chung, the proposed development involving felling of a substantial number of trees was not well justified;
- (k) the BH of the proposed development should be capped at the same height as the village houses in the surroundings;
- (l) the opportunity for the public to comment on the s.12A application had been deprived after the Town Planning Ordinance was amended;

Item D

- (m) she objected to the rezoning of a large piece of vegetated land to “G/IC” as further development of the temple could be achieved on the existing vacant land;

Item E

- (n) it was more suitable to rezone Item E site, which was currently a river bank, to “Open Space” to provide recreational space for villagers and address the shortfall in recreational and community facilities. There was no indication as to why the presence of the pumping station would prohibit its use as open space. Based on the “single site, multiple uses” principle, other facilities could be accommodated at the rear of the pumping station;

Item F

- (o) a wide strip of land along the road should be retained as “GB” so that a tree line could be planted as a buffer and a more pleasant outlook could be achieved;

Item G4

- (p) she supported this amendment;

Items G1 to G3 and G5

- (q) it was questionable why Item G5 site, which was adjacent to Item G4 site with the same character, was not treated in the same way (i.e. by rezoning to “GB”);
- (r) the sites should be more suitable to be zoned as “GB” to serve as tree-planted buffer between the residences and the roads, which would create a more pleasant streetscape, improve living conditions and help absorb vehicle pollutants;

Other Aspects

- (s) the proposed development in Items A to F and other rezoning projects in the area would place a strain on the community facilities. There were significant deficits in many community services in the district, and provision of open space and GIC facilities in the district should not be assessed based on a wider district perspective, which was far away from Ho Chung. Such assessment was misleading and there was no attempt in the OZP to encourage the development of GIC facilities suitable for the district;

Amendments to Notes (d) to (f)

- (t) the incorporating ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1 for “V” zone would deprive the public’s right to comment on the location and design of those facilities;
- (u) the planning intention of “V” zone was to provide housing and the incorporation of ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ under Column 2 for “V” zone would be exploited for commercial operations; and
- (v) with the revision to the Remarks of the Notes for “CA”, “Coastal Protection Area” and “Site of Special Scientific Interest” zones to exempt filling of land/pond and excavation of land pertaining to public works co-ordinated or

implemented by Government, and maintenance or repair works from the requirement of planning permission, the Board was effectively relinquishing its monitoring role of those developments, resulting in devastating impact on land and natural resources.

45. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, the representer and the representer's representative had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representer, the representer's representative and/or the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

46. Members had no questions to raise. The Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representer, the representer's representative and the government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

47. The Chairperson invited views from Members. Noting that the amendments incorporated in the OZP were mainly to take forward three s.12A applications agreed by the RNTPC and to reflect the as-built GIC facilities, road alignment of the completed Hiram's Highway Improvement Stage 1 project and local road improvement works, as well as the land use review of relevant areas, Members generally supported the OZP amendments, and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations. All grounds of the representations had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentations made by the government representatives at the meeting.

48. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive view of **R1 (part)** on Item G4 and views of **R1 (part)** on Item H and **R2** on Items C, D and F, and decided not to uphold R1 (part) and agreed that the draft Ho Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- “(a) Items A to C are to take forward the decisions of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee on three agreed section 12A applications for proposed residential developments. The technical assessments undertaken by the applicants have demonstrated that the development proposals are technically feasible and will not cause significant adverse impacts on the surroundings, while concerned government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed developments at the sites. The zonings and relevant development restrictions for these items on the Notes of the OZP are considered appropriate;
- (b) the “Government, Institution or Community” zonings are appropriate for the sites under Items D and E to reflect the existing site conditions and allow compatible uses complementary to Che Kung Temple. Relevant B/Ds have no objection to or no adverse comment on the rezonings;
- (c) the sites under Items F, G1 to G3 and G5 were the original ‘Road’ reserves or leftover area which are not required for road use after completion of the road works. It is considered appropriate to rezone them as “Residential (Group C) 1”, “Residential (Group D)”, “Residential (Group E)” and “Village Type Development” (“V”) zonings to rationalise the zoning boundary and better utilise land resources;
- (d) the existing and planned provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in Sai Kung District is generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population while there is surplus in the existing and planned provision of open space in Sai Kung District. The provision of GIC facilities and open space will be closely monitored by the relevant B/Ds;
- (e) the incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1 and ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “V” zone is in line with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN) promulgated by the Board. The provision of these facilities will follow the relevant government procedures and/or require planning permission from the Board;

- (f) the incorporation of the exemption clause that filling of land/pond or excavation of land related to public works co-ordinated or implemented by the Government is exempted from the requirement for planning application in the “Conservation Area” (“CA”), “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) and “Sites of Special Scientific Interest (“SSSI”) zones is in line with the latest MSN promulgated by the Board and will streamline the planning application process. The exemption clause is only applicable to public works and minor works in which no major adverse impacts are anticipated. Statutory control over the developments in the “CA”, “CPA” and “SSSI” zones would not be undermined; and
- (g) the opportunity for the public to make comment on rezoning proposal has not been deprived as the public can submit the representation in the statutory plan-making process. The established practices for both statutory and administrative public consultation for statutory plan have also been duly followed.”

49. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

50. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:00 noon.