

**Minutes of 1342nd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 18.8.2025**

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 Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East
Transport Department
Mr Elton C.K. Lau

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Alex H.K. Tang

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

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

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Anny P.K. Tang (a.m.)
Ms Isabel Y. Yiu (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Kenny C.H. Lau (a.m.)
Mr Jeff K.C. Ho (p.m.)

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TP/31

(TPB Paper No. 11015)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

1. The Secretary reported that the amendments incorporated in the draft Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TP/31 (the draft OZP) involved rezoning of two sites at Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road in Tai Po to facilitate public and private housing developments (Items A1 and A2) under the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS). The public housing development of the LSPS would be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). Kam Luk Investment Company Limited, which was a subsidiary of Nan Fung Group, was the project proponent of the proposed LSPS development. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Maurice K.W. Loo - being a member of the HKHA;
(as Director of Lands)

Mr Bond C.P. Chow - being a representative of the Director of Home
(as Chief Engineer (Works), Affairs who was a member of the Strategic
Home Affairs Department) Planning Committee and the Subsidised Housing
Committee of HKHA;

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan - being a member of HKHA and its Strategic
Planning Committee, and the chairperson of its
Audit Sub-Committee and Tender Committee;

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the LSPS Panel of Advisors;

- Mr Ryan M.K. Ip - being the vice-president cum co-head of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from Nan Fung Group; and
- Mr Daniel K. S. Lau] co-owning with spouse a property in Tai Po.
Dr Venus Y. H. Lun]

2. Member noted that Messrs Maurice K.W. Loo, Bond C.P. Chow and Timothy K.W. Ma and Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan would not attend/had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the properties of Mr Daniel K. S. Lau and Dr Venus Y.H. Lun had no direct view of the amendment item sites, and Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had no involvement in the project(s) under the sponsorship of Nan Fung Group, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. 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.

4. The following government representatives (including the consultants of the proponent of the proposed LSPS development (Consultants)), representers and/or their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Development Bureau (DEVB)

Mr Mann M.H. Chow - Head/Land Sharing Office (H of LSO)

- Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan - Senior Town Planner/Land Sharing Office (STP/LSO)
- Mr Steven S.F. Har - Senior Engineer/Land Sharing Office (SE/LSO)
- Mr Kanic C.K. Kwok - Town Planner/Land Sharing Office (TP/LSO)

Planning Department (PlanD)

- Mr Rico W.K. Tsang - District Planning Officer/Shah Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN)
- Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong - Senior Town Planner/Shah Tin, Tai Po and North (STP/STN)
- Mr Kevin K.W. Lau - STP/STN
- Ms Charlotte T.W. Wun - Town Planner/Shah Tin, Tai Po and North (TP/STN)

Consultants

Mr Jason Kwong

Ms Carmen Cheng

Mr Gary Tsui

Mr David Fok

Mr Faith Lai

Dr Calvin Chiu

Mr Vincent Lai

Mr Oscar So

Ms Kitty Yuen

Representers and Representers' Representatives

R12 – Tai Po Rural Committee (大埔鄉事委員會)

- Mr Cheung Yuk Man Lucas] Representer's Representatives
- Mr Chan Cheung Yau]

R13 – Ting Kok Road Community Concern Group (汀角路民生關注組)

- Mr Lau Chee Sing - Representer's Representative

R14 – The Incorporated Owners of Casa Marina I

R556 – 鄧國坤

Mr Tang Kwok Kwan - Representor and Representor's Representative

Mr Tso Wai Yuen - Representor's Representative

R18 – 林奕權

Mr Lam Yick Kuen - Representor

R20 – 胡綽謙

Mr Wu Cheuk Him - Representor

Ms Kwai Lok Lok - Representor's Representative

R27 – Cheung Yat Fung Alfred

Mr Cheung Yat Fung Alfred - Representor

R28 – 蕭錦綉

Ms Siu Kam Sau - Representor

R120 – 張建賢

Mr Cheung Kin Yin - Representor

R365 – 梁玉紅

Ms Leung Yuk Hung Vickie - Representor

R397 – 伍小茹

Ms Ng Siu Yu Iris - Representor

R411 – Chu Wai Lim (朱威廉)

Mr Chu Wai Lim - Representor

R956 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representor

5. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that the representatives of PlanD would be invited to brief Members on the representations at this session of the meeting. The representers and/or their representatives would 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 representers and/or their representatives 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 and/or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives (including the Consultants), the representers and/or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives (including the Consultants), the representers and/or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After the hearing of all the oral submissions from the representers and/or their representatives, 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.

6. The Chairperson then invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the representations.

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong, STP/STN, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendments on the draft OZP, major grounds/views/proposals of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11015 (the Paper). The amendment items on the OZP included:

- (a) Item A1 – rezoning of a site at the junction of Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road (Item A1 site) from “Green Belt” (“GB”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A) 11” (“R(A)11”) subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 65,522m² and a maximum building height (BH) of 83mPD;
- (b) Item A2 – rezoning of a site at Ting Kok Road to the north of Fortune Garden (Item A2 site) from “GB” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(A)12” subject to a maximum GFA of 23,000m² and a maximum BH of 80mPD;

- (c) Item B – rezoning of a site to the north of Shek Kwu Lung from “Open Space” to “Government, Institution or Community (3)” (“G/IC(3)”) subject to a maximum BH of 2 storeys and a maximum number of niches for columbarium of 763;
- (d) Item C1 – rezoning of two parcels of land adjoining Items A1 and A2 along Ting Kok Road from areas shown as ‘Road’ to “GB”;
- (e) Item C2 – rezoning of a strip of land to the east of Item A2 along Ting Kok Road from “GB” to an area shown as ‘Road’;
- (f) Item C3 – rezoning of two parcels of land to the north of Fortune Garden along Ting Kok Road from “Residential (Group C) 1” (“R(C)1”) to areas shown as ‘Road’; and
- (g) Item C4 – rezoning of a parcel of land to the north of Fortune Garden along Ting Kok Road from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(C)1”.

8. 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.

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

9. The Chairperson then invited the representers and/or their representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R12 – Tai Po Rural Committee (大埔鄉事委員會)

10. Messrs Cheung Yuk Man Lucas and Chan Cheung Yau made the following main points:

- (a) strong objection to the proposed public housing development was raised. The development with more than 80m high in close proximity to burial grounds and graves would adversely affect their feng shui and was considered

inappropriate;

- (b) Ting Kok Road was the only major road in Plover Cove serving over 20 villages and was already under severe congestion during peak hours and weekends. The congestion problem was even worsened after the openings of Tsz Shan Monastery and Tai Po Lung Mei Beach. Additional traffic generated by the proposed LSPS development would further exacerbate the situation on Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road. There was no comprehensive or detailed plan to mitigate the worsen traffic congestion;
- (c) the supporting facilities around Lo Fai Road were inadequate to meet the needs of the growing population. Despite Item A1 site would allocate 1,000m² GFA for retail use, the existing community facilities including schools, services for the elderly and wet markets were heavily reliant on those in Tai Po Market or Tai Po town centre. The situation would be worsened and the quality of life would deteriorate;
- (d) the existing public transport services (including minibus and bus) along Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road were already saturated and unable to meet the current demand. Coupled with the recently completed developments in the area, the proposed LSPS development would exacerbate the burden on the already insufficient public transport system; and
- (e) the area around Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road was characterised by low-rise, low-density developments and a rural/green environment. The proposed high-rise, high-density development would destroy the original landscape, create a wall effect, impede air circulation and make the environment more congested, which would be unfair to the existing villagers and local residents who had been living there for decades.

R13 – Ting Kok Road Community Concern Group (汀角路民生關注組)

11. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Lau Chee Sing made the following main points:

- (a) as an engineer, the proposed ingress/egress at Lo Fai Road for Item A1 site was considered a design error that would cause significant safety hazards. Located on a long, steep slope (i.e. 10% gradient) at about 50m from the signalised junction with Ting Kok Road, the ingress to Item A1 site would require vehicles to drive along the uphill direction of Lo Fai Road and turn right to cross the downhill lane. Spaces reserved for queuing were limited, which would obstruct the traffic flows in both directions along Lo Fai Road and lead to queue-back to Ting Kok Road, creating a dangerous situation prone to accidents. The proposed ingress point should be relocated from Lo Fai Road to Ting Kok Road, with a separate exit point could be provided at Lo Fai Road to alleviate these concerns;
- (b) the proposed ingress/egress at Ting Kok Road for Item A2 site was less severe but also considered inappropriate. Vehicles queuing to enter Item A2 site would also lead to queue back onto Ting Kok Road. There was land available within Item A2 site to create an additional lane to manage left-turning traffic and improve the situation; and
- (c) approving the proposed LSPS development would create an adverse and irreversible environmental impact, contravene the public interest, and conflict with the Board's statutory role to promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community.

R14 – The Incorporated Owners of Casa Marina I

R556 – 鄧國坤

12. With the aid of a visualiser, Messrs Tang Kwok Kwan and Tso Wai Yuen made the following main points:

- (a) they had been living in the area for over 20 years and had grave concerns about traffic arrangement at Item A1 site. The traffic on Lo Fai Road, a narrow lane serving around 1,300 existing households, was already heavy. The proposed LSPS development would double the number of residents

relying on this road, making the road unable to handle the increased traffic. Despite the Transport Department (TD)'s acceptance of the proposal, residents considered that based on their experiences, the traffic congestion would worsen and impede access to the nearby fire station, creating a significant safety hazard;

- (b) the high-rise, high-density character of the proposed buildings at Items A1 and A2 sites would contradict the established low-density, suburban setting of the area, altering the visual character and tranquil ambiance of the approach to Tai Mei Tuk via Ting Kok Road, a popular recreational spot for Hong Kong people, and have significant impact on the quality of life for local residents;
- (c) the credibility of the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) Report was questionable as only one day traffic survey in 2023 was conducted. The road conditions had changed since then, rendering the TIA's findings unrepresentative of the current situation;
- (d) regarding the LSPS, the rationale for separating the development into two sites (i.e. Items A1 and A2 sites) was questionable. The provision of additional vegetated government land to the private developer, which was not well-connected to the main roads, lacked justification and unfairly benefited the developer by allowing more private units; and
- (e) none of the valid concerns/comments raised in about 900 opposing representations appeared to have been genuinely considered or accepted by the Board. It was unreasonable that none of the numerous concerns raised was considered worthy of being addressed or mitigated.

R18 – 林奕權

13. Mr Lam Yick Kuen made the following main points:

- (a) he was the chairman of the Tai Po Rural Committee and a member of the Tai Po District Council (TPDC); and

- (b) the proposed LSPS development had been discussed extensively in TPDC, where majority of the members and the community held opposing views. Item A1 site was considered unsuitable for high-density residential development. Based on frequent contact with residents, there were severe traffic congestions at Ting Kok Road, exacerbated by recent developments, causing long delays and overcrowded public transport. While supportive of providing public housing, the site selection was questionable. The Board should maintain the original planning intention for low-density development in the area. Concerns were raised about the perceived collusion for benefits due to the land exchange nature of the LSPS and the urgency of using rural land when urban sites were still available. Besides, inconvenience caused by the lack of schools and the high-density development in the area would destroy the environment and community.

R20 – 胡緯謙

14. Mr Wu Cheuk Him made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of the Tai Po North Area Committee, a member of TPDC and the vice-chairman of the Social Welfare, Housing and Development Planning Committee of TPDC. In his role, he would be responsible for future residents' quality of life and sense of happiness;
- (b) there was strong concern about the suitability of Item A1 site for public housing development and whether there were sufficient supporting facilities in the vicinity to meet the daily needs of future residents;
- (c) with reference to the retail floor space in Fu Tip Estate, the proposed 1,000m² non-domestic GFA for retail facilities at Item A1 site was grossly insufficient. Such GFA could only accommodate a restaurant with a supermarket or a restaurant with about 10 retail shops, which were considered insufficient to serve the diverse daily needs of more than 3,000 future residents. The nearest shopping mall in Fu Shin Estate was over a 30-minute walk away; and

- (d) there was no kindergarten nearby, forcing parents to cross Ting Kok Road daily to access transportation. There were concerns about the implementation of the proposed new bus and minibus routes, given the current difficulties encountered by operators in hiring drivers. Future residents would face a dilemma between a life of profound inconvenience or forfeiting the housing allocation and waiting another 5 years. The proposed social welfare facilities (i.e. elderly centre) to be shared with other residents in Tai Po District might not meet the needs of this community as many young people had moved in. Therefore, Item A1 site was considered unsuitable for housing development and should not be supported, as it would result in a poor quality of life for its residents.

R27 – Cheung Yat Fung Alfred

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Cheung Yat Fung Alfred made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Forest Hill and a retired member of 香港工業學會 with some knowledge of traffic engineering. The 900 opposing representations represented more than a thousand people, as some signatories represented entire housing estates;
- (b) Lo Fai Road was a winding road with a gradient of 1:10. After leaving the left bend in the downhill direction, there would be about 50m sight distance to the proposed ingress/egress of Item A1 site. For a double-deck bus fully loaded with passengers travelling at 50 km/hour under wet conditions, it would require about 49m to come to a complete stop in front of the ingress/egress, leaving virtually no margin for error. The design posed extremely high risk, which was unacceptable. Furthermore, Lo Fai Road was recognised as a long steep downhill roads in TD's presentation to the Legislative Council Panel on Transport in 2008 on "Enhancement of the Safety of Long Downhill Roads". Placing an access point there would contravene the intent of the traffic safety review; and

- (c) TD should not dismiss local knowledge and accept the TIA while casually adopting the Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM) principles without a detailed study of the actual site conditions. Although Lo Fai Road might be considered a minor road compared with Ting Kok Road, its traffic flow was very busy and rather congested during peak hours. Recklessly providing a vehicular access at such a location would pose a high safety risk. The Board should not accept the current proposal and should secure a safe redesign.

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui left the meeting at this point.]

R28 – 蕭錦綉

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Siu Kam Sau made the following main points:

- (a) she referred to a government press release by DEVB on 19.12.2023, which stated that while the LSPS applications obtained in-principle endorsement, the applicants would conduct detailed technical assessments to ascertain that the proposed LSPS development would not entail any unacceptable impacts in terms of traffic, environment, infrastructure, etc.;
- (b) Lo Fai Road was the sole connection for multiple low-density residential estates and the Education University of Hong Kong (EdUHK) in the uphill, which already experienced heavy daily traffic. The addition of the ingress/egress for Item A1 site would lead to severe congestion and safety risk on this road, particularly for downward-moving heavy vehicles. Any accident would paralyse the road, trapping residents and blocking access for emergency vehicles;
- (c) the proposed public housing development on a hillside would involve felling a number of trees and extensive slope levelling for the construction of five approximately 20-storey buildings. This would impose serious impacts on the local environment and ecology, and be visually incompatible with the

surrounding low-density buildings. Given the current trend of extreme weather conditions (i.e. typhoons and black rainstorms), there were grave concerns about an increased risk of landslides associated with this development;

- (d) the existing traffic volume on Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road was extremely heavy, especially during peak hours and weekends, due to both local traffic and tourists heading to Tai Mei Tuk. The proposed LSPS development would exacerbate the traffic situation, potentially leading to severe consequences in the event of an accident; and
- (e) although the proposed LSPS development would provide 1,200 public housing units and 500 private housing units, it would impose negative impacts on the residents of housing estates along Lo Fai Road, teachers, staff and students at EdUHK, as well as the livelihoods of 25,000 residents in the Plover Cove area. Whether the project proponent could ascertain that the proposed LSPS development would not entail any unacceptable impacts in terms of traffic, environment, infrastructure, etc. as required by the Government's criteria for the scheme was questionable.

R120 – 張建賢

17. Mr Cheung Kin Yin made the following main points:

- (a) he was the vice-chairman of the Ting Kok Village Committee Executive Committee in Tai Po (大埔汀角村村公所執委會副主席) and the Committee had received numerous opposing views on the proposed LSPS development;
- (b) the area lacked community and supporting facilities (e.g. supermarkets and schools), which forced residents to travel to Tai Po town centre daily, creating significant traffic demand. However, the public transport services along Ting Kok Road were severely inadequate, with commuters often unable to board overcrowded vehicles after a waiting time of 45 minutes or more just

to reach Tai Po Market Station. This led to public frustration and greatly deteriorated the quality of life. The proposed LSPS development, which would bring additional population, was expected to exacerbate these already critical traffic and transport issues and further disrupt the daily lives of local residents; and

- (c) the proposed improvement works on eight junctions along Ting Kok Road were unlikely to resolve the traffic congestion issues effectively. The proposed LSPS development would significantly increase right-turn traffic from Ting Kok Road into Lo Fai Road, consequently causing a bottleneck and reducing the westbound flow of Ting Kok Road towards Kowloon from a double-lane to a single-lane configuration as vehicles queued to turn. This would lead to increased vehicle weaving and cutting-in manoeuvres along the road, potentially creating hazardous driving conditions. If these issues remained unaddressed, it was highly likely that public dissatisfaction would escalate in the future.

R365 – 梁玉紅

18. Ms Leung Yuk Hung Vickie made the following main points:

- (a) she had resided in Richwood Park since 1995 and witnessed the development of the neighbourhood in Lo Fai Road over the past 30 years;
- (b) it was doubtful whether Item A1 site was suitable for public housing development as there was a complete lack of retail and supporting facilities in the surrounding areas. It would be irresponsible to let the grassroots residents live there, leaving other government departments to handle future welfare problems;
- (c) Lo Fai Road was a long and steep downhill road, identified as one of the 29 dangerous roads in Hong Kong. While the upper part of the road was equipped with speed camera and road markings, the inherent danger of the steep road could not be eliminated by simply adding an extra lane or a yellow

box at the proposed Item A1 site ingress. The risk would be higher during construction due to frequent use by heavy vehicles. The TIA failed to assess the impact of the steep road on traffic safety;

- (d) it took her over 20 minutes to drive from Richwood Park to Yuen Shin Road during the peak commuting hour in the morning of the day, despite it not being a school day. The severe congestion was exacerbated by numerous concrete mixer trucks serving a nearby concrete batching plant. With the slow traffic flow, commuters travelling by public transport would take even longer due to waiting and boarding difficulties;
- (e) there were doubts about the validity of the TIA, which was based on a traffic survey conducted for only four hours on a single day (i.e. from 07:30 to 09:30 and from 17:00 to 19:00 on 6.3.2023 (Monday)). Without considering special events or conditions such as heavy rain or traffic accidents, the TIA was considered neither reasonable nor scientific;
- (f) the feasibility of the proposed widening of Ting Kok Road was questionable as there were industrial estates, village houses, green belt and cycle tracks on both sides of the road. Relying solely on traffic light adjustments without road widening would not resolve the existing and future traffic problems along Ting Kok Road;
- (g) there was only a short distance between Tai Po East Fire Station and Lo Fai Road. It happened that traffic congestion on Lo Fai Road might affect fire engines departing from the fire station, a risk that was not taken into account in the TIA; and
- (h) the proposed public housing development at Item A1 site would jeopardise the safety and quality of life of both existing and future residents, and the resulting problems would ultimately be passed to government departments for solution in the future. The Board should give serious reconsideration to the LSPS project.

R397 – 伍小茹

19. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Ng Siu Yu Iris made the following main points:
- (a) she had been a resident of Lo Fai Road for over 20 years. Owing to inadequate public transport services in the past, she had to learn to drive in order to take her children to school;
 - (b) congestion was common on Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road where traffic accidents, roadworks and pipe bursts frequently disrupted traffic. These delays often caused residents to be late for work or school. Her grown-up children had eventually chosen to move out of the area solely to avoid the persistent traffic jams;
 - (c) she showed a footage of her driving on Lo Fai Road, a route characterised by its narrow and hilly terrain, as well as potential hazards posed by fallen trees and broken branches blocking the road, a recurring problem exacerbated by extreme weather conditions;
 - (d) a severe traffic accident involving four cars and a construction vehicle once occurred on Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road, which left her stranded from 5 p.m. until 10 p.m. before she was able to return home; and
 - (e) the presence of EdUHK had already induced additional traffic that the roads could barely handle. Introducing a public housing development at Item A1 site without first providing sufficient public transport and supporting facilities would create immense difficulties for the residents to go to work or school, leading to grievances and complaints in the future.

R411 – Chu Wai Lim (朱威廉)

20. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Chu Wai Lim made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Richwood Park for nearly 30 years and had over 40 years of driving experience;
- (b) among a total of 957 representations related to Items A1 and A2, only 6 (0.6%) were supportive and 951 (99.4%) were adverse. In other words, a clear majority of representers opposed Items A1 and A2;
- (c) the rationale for selecting Item A1 site, which was a sloping site covered with dense vegetation within the “GB” zone, was questionable. Casa Marina I was located above the slope. The proposed LSPS development at Item A1 site would not only remove thousands of trees through extensive slope works but also destabilise the area, affecting the safety of Casa Marina I, especially during extreme weather conditions;
- (d) Lo Fai Road was a long, steep and dangerous downhill road. As the sharp bend made forward visibility impossible, extra caution had to be exercised. The proposed ingress/egress at Item A1 site would increase the risk posed by the steepness of Lo Fai Road. The suggestion to mitigate the risk by providing separate ingress and egress at Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road was supported, so as to prevent vehicles from entering and exiting simultaneously at the same hazardous spot; and
- (e) congestion was common at Lo Fai Road during the peak hours from 7 a.m. to 10 a.m., particularly due to frequent shuttle buses from existing estates that operated on tight schedules (i.e. had to reach Tai Po Market Station within 15 minutes). The proposed ingress/egress at Item A1 site would increase the travelling time and cause inconvenience to the residents of the estates uphill, as well as staff and students of EdUHK.

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

21. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative, the representers and/or their representatives in this session had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representers, their

representatives and/or the government representatives (including the Consultants) to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct question to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Traffic and Transport Aspects

22. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that Lo Fai Road was busy as shown in the photos by some representers, what the maximum traffic queue length on the southbound lane of Lo Fai Road under existing traffic condition was;
- (b) in conducting the TIA, whether the practice of conducting traffic surveys at only two selected time intervals was an established method which could accurately reflect the existing traffic conditions;
- (c) given that Item A1 site was located on a slope, whether the proposed design of the ingress/egress was safe, and whether it could cause tailbacks onto Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road. Concrete figures, such as the estimated number of cars entering and exiting the site during peak hours, and the number of cars that could be accommodated within the site's internal holding area and external road space without causing blockages onto Lo Fai Road, should be provided;
- (d) whether the representers' proposal of locating the ingress at Ting Kok Road and egress at Lo Fai Road was feasible, given that there was a long frontage of Item A1 site along Ting Kok Road; there would be no need for crossing the opposite traffic lane of Lo Fai Road to enter the site; and the emergency access to the site would be enhanced;
- (e) whether widening of Ting Kok Road was feasible;
- (f) whether the enhancements of public transport services recommended in the TIA, such as the provision of an additional bus/minibus routes travelling along Ting

Kok Road would be implemented before the completion of the development, to alleviate existing traffic problems;

- (g) whether there would be any improvement in the pedestrian crossing across Lo Fai Road and whether it would be safe with sufficient crossing time, especially for the future residents to cross Ting Kok Road to the bus stop during the morning peaks; and
- (h) whether there would be any difficulties in increasing the frequency of green minibus (GMB) services, particularly as the average occupancy rate of route no. 26A had reached 100% during peak hours.

23. In response, Mr Gary Tsui, the Consultant, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) the queue at Lo Fai Road as shown in the representers' photos was primarily caused by the existing traffic light signal cycle and would largely dissipate once the traffic light turned green. About 170 private car parking spaces would be provided at Item A1 site but these private cars would not enter or leave the site simultaneously. Taking into account the additional traffic arising from the proposed LSPS development, the TIA results showed that the traffic capacity at the junction of Ting Kok Road/Lo Fai Road would operate within the design requirements, which was acceptable from traffic point of view;
- (b) a manual classified traffic survey was conducted at the affected key junctions in the vicinity of the proposed residential developments from 07:30 to 09:30 and from 17:00 to 19:00 on 6.3.2023, which was a sunny typical weekday with no special events. Similar traffic counts were also carried out on a Saturday/Sunday. By comparing the data collected, the traffic during peak periods on a normal weekday was more critical than during holidays, and was therefore reflected in the TIA as the baseline assessment. To alleviate the congested situation along Ting Kok Road in the area, road improvement measures including reconfiguration of control methods at junctions, widening of road sections for provision of additional lanes and conversion of staggered

crossing into straight crossing were proposed along Ting Kok Road and Yuen Shin Road covering a total of eight junctions. Franchised bus and GMB services were currently operating on Ting Kok Road in the vicinity of Items A1 and A2 sites. To review the existing utilisation, a public transport utilisation survey was also conducted on 6.3.2023 at the bus stop on Ting Kok Road westbound near Fortune Garden during the AM peak period and on Ting Kok Road near its junction with Lo Fai Road during the PM peak period. To cater for the potential demand for public transport services arising from the proposed LSPS development, the TIA recommended enhancing the frequency of existing bus and GMB routes as well as providing an additional bus route travelling along Ting Kok Road, subject to further review by relevant government bureau/departments (B/Ds) and service providers;

- (c) the design and location of the proposed ingress/egress at Item A1 site would meet the safety standards and comply with the requirements of TD's TPDM including sightline and traffic capacity requirements. Despite its close proximity to the junction of Ting Kok Road/Lo Fai Road, the TIA results indicated that traffic queuing at Lo Fai Road was not anticipated. The gradient of Lo Fai Road at the proposed ingress/egress at Item A1 site was less steep than the upper part of the road. To further enhance the safety along Lo Fai Road southbound downhill towards Ting Kok Road, warning traffic signs and road markings in advance of the bending section were proposed to be installed to remind the motorists of the location of the proposed ingress/egress. The peak hours for traffic at Lo Fai Road northbound were different from those at Lo Fai Road southbound. Besides, as the site would not provide educational facilities, the retail and welfare facilities to be provided at the site were not anticipated to attract many vehicles to the site during peak hours. According to the TIA, the forecasted traffic generation for exiting the site during the morning peak would not lead to congestion. An exclusive right-turn lane at Lo Fai Road northbound that could accommodate four cars and a yellow box at Lo Fai Road southbound were proposed to reduce traffic conflict at the ingress/egress. Based on the current design, the entrance gate would be offset into Item A1 site from Lo Fai Road by 60m to accommodate five to six cars, and thus, combined with the external lane capacity, would allow a total of approximately 10 cars to

queue without causing blockages. Unlike offices or shopping centres, future residents with automated access would proceed to their parking spaces directly without delay, hence, queues were not expected forming. In addition, there would be traffic lights regulating the vehicles turning from Ting Kok Road into Lo Fai Road. It was therefore unlikely that vehicles would queue back from the ingress/egress to Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road;

- (d) according to TPDM design requirements, it was preferable to locate vehicular access on a minor road to minimise adverse traffic impact. The speed limit of Lo Fai Road was restricted to 50 km/h, which was lower than the 70 km/h on Ting Kok Road. As the traffic flow on Lo Fai Road was less than that on Ting Kok Road, the ingress/egress for Item A1 site was proposed to be located at Lo Fai Road. This arrangement eliminated the need for detours for traffic coming from Ting Kok Road in either the eastbound or westbound direction. Furthermore, locating the ingress point on Ting Kok Road could potentially conflict with an existing bus stop. It might cause more disruption to through traffic on Ting Kok Road as the ingress point would be relatively close to the junction with Lo Fai Road. Slowing down abruptly to turn into the site after passing the traffic lights at high speed could pose a safety risk. Besides, westbound vehicles on Ting Kok Road would need to take a long detour through Lo Fai Road and then turn back onto Ting Kok Road eastbound to access the ingress, which would increase traffic flow on Lo Fai Road. While the current design was the optimal solution based on the TIA, the ingress/egress design might still be reviewed and refined during the detailed design stage;
- (e) the proposed widening of certain sections of Ting Kok Road would only involve adjacent government land to enhance the road capacity and alleviate traffic congestion. The proposed widening works would not affect any private land and only land under short term tenancies might be involved;
- (f) enhancing the frequency of existing bus and GMB routes as well as providing an additional bus route travelling along Ting Kok Road were proposals recommended in the TIA. Traffic conditions were expected to evolve over time, and the proposed LSPS development at Items A1 and A2 sites were

anticipated to be completed in 2033. The details of how and when to implement the proposals would be subject to a review of the actual traffic condition and public transport utilisation nearer the time of occupation of the proposed LSPS development;

- (g) in designing the junction improvements, the existing staggered pedestrian crossing across Lo Fai Road was proposed to be converted into straight crossing. It would be regulated by traffic lights to allow sufficient time for the pedestrians to walk across the road directly and safely. The current at-grade crossing at Ting Kok Road would remain and continue to be controlled by the traffic lights. The standard width of the crossing would allow a pedestrian flow at a rate of 2,000 to 3,000 per hour, which was considered sufficient to accommodate the increased population from the proposed LSPS development; and
- (h) the average occupancy rate of various bus and GMB routes was generated from the public transport utilisation survey conducted. Taking into account the prospective developments, the TIA had recommended improvement measures to meet the needs of both current and future residents.

24. Mr Elton C.K. Lau, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East (CTE/NTE), TD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, supplemented that the proposed LSPS development would inevitably generate impact on the nearby traffic and the TIA conducted by the project proponent had assessed the ensuing impact and proposed mitigation measures. The traffic survey methodology adopted met the requirement of conducting the survey on a weekday with normal traffic conditions, which was in line with other TIAs and acceptable to TD. For developments in rural areas, some consultants would also provide survey data collected on holidays with tourist/visitor traffic for identifying the peak traffic flow. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures as recommended in the TIA, no insurmountable traffic problem was anticipated from the proposed LSPS development and the junction capacity would improve by 2036. Widening of the entire Ting Kok Road was considered difficult and impractical as its overall capacity was, in effect, constrained by the junctions. Six junctions along Ting Kok Road up to Yuen Shin Road were proposed to be widened. The TIA results indicated that the traffic conditions of Ting Kok Road would improve upon completion of the junction improvement works. The gradient of Lo Fai Road at the proposed ingress/egress of

Item A1 site was about 7%, which was less than 10% at the upper part of the road. The proposed arrangement of the ingress/egress complied with the requirements in TPDM. With additional road signs and markings, drivers would be alerted to the proposed ingress/egress and would drive at a slower speed. In general, it was preferable to locate vehicular access on a minor road to minimise adverse traffic impact. As the traffic flow was less and the traffic speed was slower at Lo Fai Road, it would be easier for vehicles to leave Item A1 site and turn into the public road. On the contrary, locating the ingress/egress on Ting Kok Road which carried higher traffic speed and conflicted with bus stop, might create greater impacts on traffic flow and make access to and from the site more difficult. Compared with the whole Tai Po District which had a population of about 320,000, the proposed LSPS development with a population of about 5,000 would not exert much pressure on public transport. As recommended in the TIA, the frequency of some existing bus and GMB routes could be increased, e.g. every 6 minutes for bus route no. 75K, to accommodate the future population growth. It was difficult to predetermine the provision of public transport services such as addition of a new bus route for the proposed LSPS development at this juncture. Subject to the traffic condition after occupation of the proposed LSPS development, necessary adjustments would be made based on the actual demand of the future residents over time. It was not uncommon for the average occupancy rate to reach 100% when there was a queue waiting for GMB during peak hours. Whether there was room for increasing frequency would be subject to the availability of GMB drivers and the number of GMBs that could be deployed by the service provider during peak hours. It was expected that the service provider would resolve the issue should there be a great and consistent demand for the GMB service. TD would continue to monitor the traffic condition in the area and ensure sufficient provision of public transport to serve the local community. The comments and proposals of the representers would be further considered in the detailed design of the proposed LSPS development.

25. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) in view of the severe and long-standing traffic/transport issues as claimed by the representers, whether some immediate improvement measures could be implemented even before completion of the proposed LSPS development, such as increasing the frequency of GMB services during peak hours; and

- (b) noting that the reserve capacities of the junctions of Tai Po Tai Wo Road/Yuen Shin Road, Ting Kok Road/Dai Fat Street and Ting Kok Road/Fung Yuen Road were already below 15%, whether the proposed road improvement works would be carried out by the LSPS Applicant as a condition of the development and whether the Government would carry out the junction improvement works independently, without the implementation of the LSPS project.

26. In response, Mr Elton C.K. Lau, CTE/NTE, TD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) public transport mainly relied on franchised buses due to their larger passenger carrying capacity. GMBs usually operated as supplementary public transport services, particularly in areas where franchised bus services were not viable or access by other transport modes was limited. The TIA conducted had recommended adding a new circular bus route to cater for the increase in population, which would, in practice, reduce the traffic flow on the road. The majority of public transport passengers in the area travelled to Tai Po Market Station and the area around Tai Po Tai Wo Road. TD would monitor the traffic condition as well as the public transport passenger demand and destination patterns. He would relay Members' suggestion to his colleagues and examine whether there was scope to increase the frequency of GMB services during peak hours; and
- (b) a reserve capacity of 15% for a junction was considered acceptable in the TIA, which meant that the queue was not long and could dissolve upon the change of traffic lights. For some junctions with sufficient queuing area, a reserve capacity over 0% would still be considered tolerable as the cycle time could be increased (e.g. from 90 seconds to 120 seconds) to achieve higher traffic throughput. TD would constantly monitor the junction performance and initiate improvement works when necessary. Apart from resource availability, the timing of improvement works would hinge on their impact on the local road network as too many simultaneous roadworks would paralyse the traffic. Road improvement works should better be carried out together with large-scale development in the area. This would not only resolve the current problems but

also meet the future needs, thereby minimising repeated roadworks/traffic lane closures on the local road network.

27. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H of LSO, DEVB supplemented that the LSPS aimed to unleash the development potential of private lots outside specified environmentally sensitive areas and not covered by the Government's planning efforts in order to boost both public and private housing supply. Through such a public-private partnership, the infrastructure in the area could be upgraded at the same time. The proposed road improvement works would be implemented by the LSPS Applicant before completion of the proposed LSPS development tentatively in 2033. Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, added that the road improvement works at the eight junctions along Ting Kok Road were proposed in view of the proposed LSPS development. Given the resource constraints and other considerations, such works might not be implemented as soon as the proposed timeframe without the proposed LSPS development. In other words, the LSPS proposal would bring forward enhancement to the local road network, which would be beneficial to the local communities.

28. A Member suggested that the layout of the proposed LSPS development at Item A1 site could be modified to accommodate a small-scale GMB terminus to enhance the access to the proposed retail and social welfare facilities in the site. Moreover, a footbridge with lifts across Ting Kok Road could be provided to enhance pedestrian safety. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H of LSO, DEVB, explained that the current design at Item A1 site was indicative, with a view to demonstrating the feasibility of the proposed LSPS development under the LSPS framework. The LSPS Applicant would be responsible for site formation of Item A1 site, which would then be handed over to HKHA for public housing development. Upon the completion of statutory planning procedures, HKHA would initiate the detailed design of the development which might involve modification of the block layout and the ingress/egress arrangement. Members' and the representers' comments and suggestions on the layout and ingress/egress of the public housing development would be taken into account in the detailed design stage.

29. A Member asked whether the operation of Tai Po East Fire Station was affected by the traffic congestion along Ting Kok Road. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the Fire Services Department had been

consulted and had not raised any objection or concerns regarding interface with the frontage area of Tai Po East Fire Station. The fire station was located about 240m from Item A1 site and about 900m from Item A2 site. Adverse impact on the operation of Tai Po East Fire Station arising from the proposed LSPS development was not anticipated.

30. In response to another Member's enquiry, Mr Tang Kwok Kwan (R556), with the aid of a visualiser, said that Tai Po East Fire Station was close to the junction of Ting Kok Road/Lo Fai Road. There were incidents that the traffic congestion along Ting Kok Road lasted for five to six hours and caused tailback into Tai Po Industrial Estate (Tai Po INNOPARK). Lo Fai Road was a traffic black spot. He was concerned that the proposed design of the Ting Kok Road/Lo Fai Road junction would cause traffic tailback to Ting Kok Road during congestion. This would affect the fire engines leaving the fire station in the direction of Tai Mei Tuk. Mr Gary Tsui, the Consultant, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that there was siren to alert the drivers to yield the way when the fire engines were leaving the fire station. In the event of a traffic blockage on the eastbound carriageway of Ting Kok Road, fire engines responding to emergencies could use the westbound lane to travel eastwards towards Tai Mei Tuk.

31. After hearing all the comments and concerns of the representers, a Member enquired whether B/Ds would take into account such comments and make improvements to the proposal accordingly. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD acknowledged that the traffic and transport issues, particularly the proposed ingress/egress for the public housing development at Item A1 site, were major concerns raised by the representers. He emphasised that the current design was preliminary and intended to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed LSPS development. The local concerns would be conveyed to HKHA which might explore possible improvements during the detailed design stage. The same Member remarked that the representers had expressed their concerns and shared insights from a local perspective. B/Ds should seriously consider their comments and strive to create a better living environment for both existing and future residents in the neighbourhood.

32. Given that the current design was only a preliminary layout and that HKHA would determine the final design at a later stage, a Member asked how the representers' comments and suggestions would be considered during the detailed design stage. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD said that HKHA would consult local stakeholders, including

the district council, on the detailed design of the proposed public housing development at Item A1 site. Local residents would have the opportunity to express their comments on the detailed design. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H of LSO, DEVB supplemented that LSO would oversee the progress of the LSPS project. While the current design for the road access was safe and feasible according to the TIA, LSO would liaise with HKHA on the traffic arrangement at Item A1 Site during the detailed design stage.

Provision of Retail/Supporting Facilities

33. Noting some representers claimed that the retail space reserved at Item A1 site could provide only a supermarket and an eating place, a Member enquired whether the provision of a non-domestic GFA of 1,000m² for retail facilities was sufficient to meet the needs of the residents. Mr Jason Kwong, the Consultant, replied that the provision of 1,000m² GFA for retail facilities was required by the Government. Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, supplemented that with reference to desktop research on public housing estates with about 1,000 to 4,000 units, the ratio of retail GFA to population for Item A1 site was at a median level. It was lower than two public housing developments at Tseung Kwan O but higher than Wo Tin Estate at Tuen Mun and the public housing developments at Wang Chau Phase 1 and Tung Chung Area 46. The level of provision of retail facilities was in line with the prevailing standards and was considered sufficient.

34. A Member followed up and enquired whether other public housing estates quoted in the desktop research had any supporting facilities in the vicinity and whether the proposed LSPS development at Item A1 site could provide more retail facilities to meet local needs, as some representers reflected that the supporting facilities in the neighbourhood of Lo Fai Road was inadequate. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that similar to Item A1 site, the public housing sites quoted in the desktop research were generally away from the town centre. The retail facilities therein were to serve the basic daily needs of the residents. There were currently seven wet markets in Tai Po District, which were patronised by residents living nearby and farther away, such as Pak Shek Kok. Besides, there were various bus and GMB routes serving between Ting Kok Road and the wet markets. It was considered that the existing wet markets could meet the needs of the residents in the district. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H of LSO, DEVB supplemented that such requirement was worked out with HKHA after taking into account factors such as the scale of

the proposed LSPS development, provision of nearby shopping centres and retail facilities, as well as the viability and appropriateness of the relevant facilities from both operational and financial perspectives. The retail provision of 1,000m² GFA was identified as the optimal solution. Increasing the retail floor space could lead to long-term vacancies and higher parking demands, which would, in turn, adversely affect traffic flow and the design of the nearby junction.

35. A Member enquired what type of welfare facilities would be provided at Item A1 site and whether the provision of social welfare facilities in Tai Po District was adequate. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the types of facilities to be provided at the public housing site were subject to discussion by relevant B/Ds during the detailed design stage. As there were shortfalls in the provision of child care centre, community care services facilities, residential care homes for the elderly (RCHE), day rehabilitation services and residential care services in Tai Po District to meet the long term demand, HKHA would be alerted to take into account the shortage of these social welfare facilities when considering the types of facilities to be provided in the public housing development at Item A1 site.

Development Intensity and Layout

36. Noting that, as claimed by some representers, the proposed high-rise, high-density development was incompatible with the existing rural low-density setting and would alter the unique local character of the area, two Members enquired about the development density of the public housing and private housing developments in Tai Po, and whether the density of the proposed LSPS development was compatible with the surroundings in terms of building height (BH) and visual impact. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) the plot ratio (PR) of other public housing development in the “R(A)2” zone in Tai Po including Ming Nga Court, Ting Nga Court and Wang Fuk Court was around 3.8. The PRs of private housing development in the “R(A)3” and “R(A)9” zones in Tai Po were 5.15 and 6 respectively. A relatively large-scale residential development at Ma Wo Road in the “R(A)10” zone had a PR of 6.8. Similar to the scale of other public housing developments in the “R(A)2” zone,

the PR of the public housing at Item A1 site was proposed at 3.18, which was considered optimal taking into account the infrastructural and environmental capacity and the given minimum requirement under LSPS that not less than 50,000m² increased domestic GFA should be offered in the proposal;

- (b) the existing residential clusters in the area consisted of six residential developments zoned “R(B)” and “R(C)” uphill to the north and Fortune Garden across Ting Kok Road to the south. Situated along Ting Kok Road at the fringe of Tai Po New Town with a cluster of low-rise residential developments and village houses in the proximity, the proposed public housing development at Item A1 site with a site area of about 2 ha was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas from land use planning perspective;
- (c) the BHs of the residential developments nearby including Casa Marina and Forest Hill ranged between 76mPD and 113mPD. BH restrictions (BHRs) of the residential developments at Items A1 and A2 sites were 83mPD and 80mPD respectively so that the uphill low-rise residential developments to the north would not be blocked as far as practicable. As shown in the sectional plans of the current design, the maximum BHs of the proposed LSPS development at Items A1 and A2 sites would be at a level lower than the lowest floor of Casa Marina I and Tycoon Place respectively. The proposed BHs generally respected the existing BH profile descending from inland area in the north to the waterfront in the south; and
- (d) technical assessments had been conducted, which concluded that there were no insurmountable technical problems identified for the proposed developments at Items A1 and A2 sites.

37. In response to a Member’s follow-up question, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD confirmed that the standards adopted in the technical assessments were the same as those adopted in other planning applications. All the technical assessment reports were vetted by relevant B/Ds, which had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed LSPS development.

38. A Member enquired whether the BH of the proposed LSPS development could be increased during the detailed design stage if supported by planning gain. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD said that there was provision for minor relaxation of the BHRs for Items A1 and A2 sites through submitting a section16 planning application to the Board for approval, and each application would be considered on its individual merits.

39. A Member enquired whether there was room to set back the housing blocks at Item A1 site from Ting Kok Road to alleviate the visual and traffic noise impacts. Mr Jason Kwong and Dr Calvin Chiu, the Consultants, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, replied that HKHA would refine the layout at the detailed design stage. An Environmental Assessment had been conducted for the proposed design. In general, noise-sensitive building should be located away from the noise source such as Ting Kok Road as much as possible. Nevertheless, the site was constrained by the slope to the north. Appropriate building separation should be provided to avoid wall effect. By setting back the buildings from Ting Kok Road for 5m and implementing noise migration measures such as installing acoustic windows, the proposed design would be able to mitigate the traffic noise impact and comply with the relevant design standards.

LSPS Mechanism

40. Noting that some representers considered that the LSPS' policy support was leveraged by private developer for making profits; and that the proposed LSPS project involving fragmented plots of land was a non-in-situ land exchange in nature, a Member asked for an elaboration of the LSPS mechanism. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H of LSO, DEVB, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) each LSPS project should meet the minimum requirements on housing gain i.e.
 - (i) capable of delivering an increased domestic GFA of not less than 50,000m² and at least 1,000 additional housing units (assuming an average flat size of 50m²); and
 - (ii) not less than 70% of the increased domestic GFA should be set aside for public housing development;
- (b) taking a privately owned lot currently capable of delivering a maximum domestic GFA of 20,000m² as an example, if approval was granted, the

maximum domestic GFA attainable by the private lot could increase to 80,000m², resulting in an additional domestic GFA of 60,000m². Assuming an average flat size of 50m², the project could bring about an additional 1,200 housing units. Under the requirement that at least 70% of the increased domestic GFA be allocated to public housing, the Government would receive 42,000m² (about 840 units). The developer-lot owner would retain its original domestic GFA (20,000m²) and gain 30% of the increased domestic GFA (18,000m²), resulting in a total of 38,000m² for private housing development;

- (c) the private land within Item A1 site would eventually become government land through land exchange. In order to increase housing supply and better utilise government land, the adjacent government land had been examined to be incorporated as part of Item A1 site to form a larger site with a better layout of the proposed public housing development. In calculating the housing mix under LSPS (i.e. 70:30 ratio), the domestic GFA generated from the inclusion of additional government land in Item A1 site for enlarged public housing development was not included;
- (d) in accordance with the established land administrative procedure, government land that was not capable of reasonable separate alienation or development would be amalgamated with the adjacent private land through land exchange. For Item A2 site, the government land incorporated into the private development for future land exchange would be charged with full land premium under the prevailing mechanism; and
- (e) there was no restriction under the LSPS whether the sites involved were separated. However, it was noted that both Items A1 and A2 sites were located within the same “GB” zone on the OZP. Since they were not too far away, the proposed LSPS development therein generated similar impacts in terms of traffic, visual and drainage, etc. as reflected in the technical assessments. The proposed LSPS development at Items A1 and A2 sites duly met the requirements as stipulated under the LSPS. Under such circumstances, the LSPS application was supported by the LSPS Panel of Advisors and endorsed in-principle by the Steering Committee on Land and Housing Supply under the

delegated authority from the Chief Executive-in-Council.

Burial Ground

41. Noting some representers' concerns on the proximity of Item A2 site to the burial ground and its potential impacts on feng shui, a Member enquired whether the LSPS Applicant could engage with the local villagers and refine the design of the proposed LSPS development to mitigate the impact on the burial ground. Enhancement to access to the burial ground might also be considered. In response, Mr Jason Kwong, the Consultant, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that while Item A2 site did not encroach upon any permitted burial ground, a survey had been carried out to ensure that the construction would be carried out safely without affecting any graves/urns. The permitted burial ground was accessible through an existing footpath from Ting Kok Road which would not be affected by the works in Item A2 site. At the detailed design stage, considerations would be given to alleviating the impacts on the graves/urns and the future residents.

42. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the presentation and Q&A session for the morning session of the hearing was completed. She thanked the representers, their representatives and the government representatives (including the Consultants) for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting after the afternoon session of the hearing was completed and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The representers, their representatives and the government representatives (including the Consultants) left the meeting at this point.

43. The Chairperson said that the meeting would be adjourned for lunch break.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:30 p.m.]

[Mr Ryan M.K. Ip left the meeting during lunch break.]

44. The meeting was resumed at 2:00 p.m.

45. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the afternoon session:

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 Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Alex H.K. Tang

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)
Transport Department
Mr Elton C.K. Lau

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

[Messrs Stephen L.H. Liu, Daniel K.W. Chung and Derrick S.M. Yip joined the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

46. The following government representatives (including the Consultants), the representers and/or their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

DEVB

Mr Mann M.H. Chow	-	H of LSO
Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan	-	STP/LSO
Mr Steven S.F. Har	-	SE/LSO
Mr Kanic C.K. Kwok	-	TP/LSO

PlanD

Mr Rico W.K. Tsang	-	DPO/STN
Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong	-	STP/STN
Mr Kevin K.W. Lau	-	STP/STN
Ms Charlotte T.W. Wun	-	TP/STN

Consultants

Mr Jason Kwong
Ms Carmen Cheng
Mr Gary Tsui

Mr David Fok

Mr Faith Lai

Dr Calvin Chiu

Mr Vincent Lai

Mr Oscar So

Ms Kitty Yuen

Representers and their Representatives

R548 – Lo Sheung Yan

Mr Lo Sheung Yan - Representer

R549 – Lee Tat Ying Gwendoline

Ms Lee Tat Ying Gwendoline - Representer

R592 – Cheung Wing Kong

Mr Cheung Wing Kong - Representer

Ms Lui Yan Yvonne - Representer's Representative

R645 – Lee Kwok On

Mr Lee Kwok On - Representer

R676 – Han Yvonne Ming Yee

Ms Han Yvonne Ming Yee - Representer

R678 – Lo Chi Tak Lewis

Mr Lo Chi Tak Lewis - Representer

R744 – 黃家儒

Mr Wong Ka Yu - Representer

Mr Wong Tang Kin Kennedy - Representer's Representative

R772 – 林宗開

Mr Lam Chung Hoi - Representor

R956 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representor

47. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representors and/or their representatives to elaborate on their representations:

R592 – Cheung Wing Kong

48. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lui Yan Yvonne made the following main points:

- (a) she provided a brief overview of the Lo Fai Road community, which comprised six low-density private residential estates. Each estate was characterised by 4-storey buildings and a greening ratio of 35%. The area faced challenges, including limited public transport options and a shortage of supporting facilities, apart from EdUHK and a nearby primary school. The junction of Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road served as a critical intersection, with Tai Po East Fire Station situated nearby to provide essential services to the residents of Tai Po and the wider district;
- (b) she doubted if the proposed LSPS development had genuinely delivered balanced benefits. Under the proposal, the LSPS Applicant would acquire 1.32 ha of government land, including a portion of Ting Kok Road, but only allocate 30% of their land (0.6 ha out of 1.87 ha) for public housing development, which was far below the Government's requirement of 70%. A more comprehensive analysis from both the LSPS Applicant and the Government should be provided to justify the scheme;
- (c) she questioned the credibility of the TIA, noting that the analysis was based solely on a one-day traffic survey, unlike the standard 5-day period typically used in other TIAs. Moreover, the survey conducted in 2023 failed to take

into account the recently completed developments in the vicinity and the increased number of teachers and students at EdUHK;

- (d) Ting Kok Road had experienced numerous traffic accidents, while Lo Fai Road was a long, steep downhill road. The proposed ingress/egress at Lo Fai Road for Item A1 site was considered inappropriate as it would disrupt traffic flows in both directions along Lo Fai Road, potentially causing queues to tail back to Ting Kok Road. This disruption might also hinder the timely provision of emergency services by Tai Po East Fire Station. The proposed yellow box junction design at Lo Fai Road southbound was insufficient. To address those issues, it was suggested that the ingress point be relocated from Lo Fai Road to Ting Kok Road, thereby eliminating the need for vehicles to cross lanes to access the site. Furthermore, she recommended enhancing traffic improvement works for Ting Kok Road/Fung Yuen to increase the traffic capacity by up to 15%;
- (e) the presence of burial grounds and graves adjacent to the sites could cause discomfort for future residents. To address the issue, she suggested imposing a 10m setback from the burial grounds as a buffer, ensuring the graves remained undisturbed and visually concealed; and
- (f) there was insufficient provision of social welfare facilities in the area, particularly RCHE and mental health services. She proposed that the public housing site (Item A1 site) should include more facilities in addition to retail provisions. She also suggested reducing the BH and incorporating green rooftops to enhance the aesthetic appeal.

R548 – Lo Sheung Yan

49. Mr Lo Sheung Yan made the following main points:

- (a) he acknowledged the Government's initiative to pursue public housing development to address the acute housing needs of the grassroots population; and

- (b) in view of the proximity of Item A1 site to EdUHK and Hong Kong's overarching aspiration to position itself as an international education hub, he suggested that it would be worthwhile to explore the possibility of developing the site into a student hostel for EdUHK. Such development would address the traffic concerns raised by other representers, as the hostel would be located close to the university. Furthermore, it would help ease pressure on the rental market by providing purpose-built student accommodation.

R676 – Han Yvonne Ming Yee

50. Ms Han Yvonne Ming Yee made the following main points:

- (a) she was an associate professor at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University and had been a resident of Casa Marina for 22 years; and
- (b) as a scientist, she questioned the rationale for selecting Items A1 and A2 sites, particularly in light of the concerns raised by other representers and the availability of alternative sites with better accessibility and supporting facilities. The major issue was the traffic situation in Tai Po, where Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road already experienced congestion during peak hours. She cited a specific incident where a water pipe had burst near Tai Po East Fire Station at the junction of Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road, which highlighted the limitations of the road infrastructure in accommodating additional population. She emphasised that increased traffic would worsen current congestion and pose serious safety risks, especially given the proximity of the fire station. She urged the Government to provide a clear and comprehensive response to address those critical concerns.

R678 – Lo Chi Tak Lewis

51. Mr Lo Chi Tak Lewis made the following main points:

- (a) he had been a resident of the Lo Fai Road neighbourhood for two decades;

- (b) the existing road infrastructure in the area was inadequate to cater for the projected high traffic volume resulting from the proposed LSPS development as the original planning intention of the area was for low-density developments. Concerns had been raised about the suitability of introducing such a development in a low-density area, as it contradicted the established planning objectives for the area; and
- (c) Tai Po Lung Mei Beach, a popular tourist attraction, would generate significant traffic during weekends. The weekend traffic conditions, which were not adequately addressed in the TIA, should be carefully considered when making decision on the proposed development.

R744 – Wong Ka Yu

52. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Messrs Wong Ka Yu and Wong Tang King Kennedy made the following main points:

- (a) the LSPS, launched in 2020, was established to address both the challenges of high property prices and insufficient land supply at the time. The primary objectives were to complement government-led planning of private land for a specific public purpose, and to facilitate the resumption of private land, particularly brownfield sites, for developments. Nevertheless, by 2025, property prices in Hong Kong had declined, resulting in stagnation in the land sales market. The Government's continued efforts in developing public housing, including light public housing, had achieved positive outcomes, notably increasing public housing supply and reducing waiting time. Given the substantial changes in the overall development since the scheme was first launched, there were concerns about the effectiveness and applicability of the LSPS in the present context;
- (b) LSPS aimed to foster confidence and safeguard public interest through a transparent mechanism. All relevant statutory procedures as well as the existing public participation under those processes would continue to apply. Nevertheless, as revealed in the Paper, out of over 900 representations

received, only a few individuals expressing support, while the majority (over 99%), including members of the district council and rural committee, raised objection. It was questionable why PlanD recommended that the OZP should not be amended to address those representations, particularly in light of the substantial public concerns and objection;

- (c) the LSPS Applicant proposed to convert the sites for residential use. Nevertheless, the final report of Application No. LSPS/001 did not provide a clear explanation as to why such an amendment was considered necessary. Apart from technical assessments for rezoning, such as compensation required for the removal of thousands of trees, there was no evidence of other feasibility studies or alternative schemes being considered. The lack of comprehensive analysis and justification made the conclusion difficult to accept and raised concerns about the robustness of the decision-making process;
- (d) the proposed increase in BHRs within the area would set an undesirable precedent. Currently, developments to the north of Ha Hang Village were characterised by low-density developments, primarily two to four storeys in height. Nevertheless, the amendments would allow for high-rise, high-density developments, which were incompatible with the existing environment and would lead to further encroachment of high-rise buildings onto the “GB” along Ting Kok Road. This would undermine the principles outlined in the TPB Guidelines for Application for Development within “GB” Zone under Section 16 (s.16) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) (TPB PG-No. 10). In particular, the Guidelines stipulated that residential developments within “GB” zone should maintain a PR of 0.4 (paragraph 2b of the Guidelines) and that any proposed development should demonstrate its necessity and unavailability of alternative sites (paragraph 2e of the Guidelines). In view of the surrounding environment, the Board had a statutory duty to safeguard trees and “GB” areas, ensuring that any development should comply with the principles as set out in TPB PG-No. 10;
- (e) traffic congestion on Ting Kok Road had been a significant concern for

residents. The proposed LSPS development only involved minor improvements to a few junctions, which were unlikely to effectively address the ongoing traffic issues on Ting Kok Road. Moreover, the suggestion to introduce a new bus route and increase the frequency of existing bus routes from 15-30 minutes to 6 minutes throughout the day, while aimed at enhancing public transport accessibility, could inadvertently exacerbate congestion in the area. Those measures might lead to an increased number of buses on the road, further overburdening the already limited capacity of Ting Kok Road; and

- (f) the LSPS Applicant failed to outline how essential community facilities, such as education, social welfare and medical facilities, and emergency services, would be adequately provided to accommodate the additional population generated by the proposed LSPS development.

R956 – Mary Mulvihill

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

Items A1 and A2

- (a) she objected to both Items A1 and A2. Despite the Policy Address announced on 25.10.2023 explicitly stating that there were no plans for further large-scale development in “GB” areas, except for recreational and tourism purposes, the LSPS application was endorsed by the Steering Committee on Land and Housing Supply on 6.12.2023. The proposed residential developments at the urban fringe, which were characterised by dense vegetation, would significantly alter the landscape character. Furthermore, the development intensity could be further increased by up to 30% through an application for minor relaxation. That trend had already been observed in private developments, raising concerns about the cumulative impact on the ecological and aesthetic integrity of the area;
- (b) the public housing site was situated at a considerable distance from the town

centre and was located on a cut slope, rendering it isolated from essential supporting facilities and potentially vulnerable to damage following heavy rainfall. With priority given to young families, hundreds of school-aged children were expected to reside in the area. It was imperative that primary schools should be provided within a safe and accessible walking distance from home to ensure the well-being and convenience of residents;

- (c) HKHA had implemented measures to monitor tenant eligibility, resulting in the recovery of 9,000 public housing units over three years. That initiative had significantly reduced the demand for public housing, making the proposed LSPS development of small and isolated sites unnecessary;
- (d) other representers had already raised the issue of traffic congestion in detail. She concurred with their concerns and further emphasised that increasing the frequency of buses, while intended to improve public transport accessibility, would likely exacerbate congestion rather than alleviate it;
- (e) she expressed concern at the absence of green groups at the meeting and noted with surprise the participation of district council and rural committee members, who were typically regarded as Government supporters but openly opposed the subject amendments. The unexpected opposition highlighted the contentious nature of the proposal;

Item B

- (f) according to the submission of a section 12A application No. Y/TP/36, the niches were placed in two separate buildings. Of those, 2,744 niches in one building were to be sealed off. While the response in the Paper stated that an increase in the number of niches in the future would require a s.16 application, she considered that the amendment item should not be approved if those niches remained in place;

Items C1 to C4

- (g) Items C1 to C3 were housekeeping in nature but Item C4 would result in a narrower road alignment near the proposed golf course development;

Amendments to the Notes (d) to (f)

- (h) the incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1 of the Notes for the “V” zone would deprive the public of the opportunity to comment on the location and design of those facilities;
- (i) the planning intention of the “V” zone was to provide housing and the incorporation of ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ under Column 2 of the Notes for the “V” zone would be exploited for commercial operations; and
- (j) she strongly objected to the revision to the Remarks of the Notes for “SSSI” zone, which exempted filling of land or 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 relinquishing its monitoring role over such developments, resulting in devastating impact on land and natural resources.

54. As the presentations of the representers and/or their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the representers, their representatives and/or the government representatives (including the Consultants) 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.

LSPS Mechanism

55. Noting that a representer (R592) questioned whether the LSPS Applicant's contributions in the LSPS Development Scheme complied with the requirements set out in the LSPS guidance notes, two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the respective land contributions made by the LSPS Applicant and the Government; and
- (b) whether the LSPS Applicant would be responsible for the site formation works and the landscaping of the public housing development (Item A1 site).

56. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H of LSO, DEVB, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following points:

- (a) according to the application, about 14,500m² of private land would be allocated for public housing development at Item A1 site, while about 4,300m² of private land would be allocated for private housing development at Item A2 site. With such site areas, the domestic GFA of about 53,700m² was designated for public housing development, while about 23,000m² would be allocated for private housing development. This resulted in a public-private housing mix of about 70:30. The inclusion of about 3,797m² additional government land at Item A1 site primarily aimed to optimise the development layout with the provision of more public housing units. With the additional domestic GFA of about 10,855m² generated from the Government land at Item A1 site, the mix would be further adjusted to about 74:26. The proposed LSPS development aligned with the policy objective of LSPS, which sought to unleash the development potential of private lots with a view to increasing both public and private housing supply. The proposal did not constitute an abuse, considering that the LSPS Applicant would be required to surrender their private land principally for public housing development, while the remaining private land could be retained for private housing development; and

- (b) the cost of site formation for public housing as well as the construction of infrastructure and utilities in support of the proposed LSPS development would be borne by the LSPS Applicant, subject to premium assessment.

57. A Member followed up by enquiring about the planning gain of the proposed LSPS development. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD said that according to the Long Term Housing Strategy Annual Progress Report 2024, the Government had set a housing supply target at 440,000 units to meet the housing demand over the next 10 years. The proposed LSPS development would help accelerate land supply to meet housing demand, particularly for public housing. Besides, the LSPS Applicant would undertake the proposed road improvement works as recommended in the TIA.

“GB” Zone (Items A1 and A2)

58. A Member enquired whether the proposed LSPS development at Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road would set an undesirable precedent for future developments within the “GB” zone. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD clarified that TPB PG-No. 10 only applied to planning applications submitted under s.16 of the Ordinance. The rezoning of two sites from “GB” and the area shown as ‘Road’ for residential use was undertaken through OZP amendment under section 5 of the Ordinance. All proposed OZP amendments were considered on a case-by-case basis, supported by relevant technical assessments, and would only proceed if there were no insurmountable technical issues and if relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) had no objection or no adverse comment. The subject LSPS development would not set an undesirable precedent or encourage similar developments in the “GB” areas, as each case would be assessed based on its individual merits and technical feasibility.

Traffic and Transport Aspects (Items A1 and A2)

59. Noting that many representers raised concerns on traffic and transport issues, two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the TIA was updated to reflect the latest circumstances, such as expansion of EdUHK; and

- (b) the detailed findings of the TIA.

60. In response, Mr Gary Tsui, the Consultant, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) the LSPS Applicant conducted a detailed TIA, with a design year of 2036, three years after the completion of the proposed LSPS development. The TIA had thoroughly considered current traffic conditions, taking into account the planned and committed developments in the vicinity up to 2036, and carry out traffic forecasts for both the construction phase and upon population intake. Appropriate traffic mitigation measures were also formulated to ensure that the additional traffic generated by the proposed LSPS development would not cause adverse traffic impacts on the road networks within the district. The TIA concluded that the proposed LSPS development was acceptable from traffic perspective; and
- (b) traffic counts were collected during weekday peaks and weekends. With the implementation of the proposed road improvement works at the eight road junctions, including reconfiguration of control methods at junctions, the provision of additional traffic lanes, and conversion of staggered pedestrian crossing into straight pedestrian crossing, the congestion at the eight junctions was expected to be alleviated. The road improvement works would enhance the reserve capacity of the junctions, enabling them to accommodate more traffic.

61. A Member followed up by asking whether area designated as 'Road' was used for housing development and whether the amendments would result in a narrower road alignment on Ting Kok Road, as raised by a representer (R592). In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, clarified that the land within the areas shown as 'Road' under the previous OZP was not part of Ting Kok Road. The amendments were intended to reflect the as-built road alignment of Ting Kok Road. The road widening works along Ting Kok Road (section between Tai Po INNOPARK and Shuen Wan Chan Uk) were already completed in 2005, and no further widening was proposed at this juncture. Mr Elton C.K. Lau, Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East) (CTE(NTE)), TD confirmed that

there was no plan to widen the concerned section of Ting Kok Road further.

62. Regarding the proposed road improvement works, Ms Mary Mulvihill, R956 alleged that the Government was exerting pressure on the community on the premises that TD would not proceed with the road improvement works unless the proposed LSPS development was approved. She noted that some of the eight junctions were located far from Item A1 and A2 sites, and expressed the view that such improvement works should not be contingent upon the proposed LSPS development.

[Post-meeting note: In the morning session of the meeting, some Members had already raised similar questions and enquired whether the Government would carry out the junction improvement works independently, without the implementation of the LSPS project. For TD's response, please refer to paragraph 26(b) above.]

BH Profile (Items A1 and A2)

63. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the justifications for the proposed BHRs; and
- (b) whether the proposed BHRs could accommodate GFA exemptions for sustainable building design or green features, as well as modern construction methods such as Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) method.

64. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) to meet the minimum requirements for housing gain, the LSPS Applicant was required to deliver an increased domestic GFA of not less than 50,000m², resulting in a medium to high-density residential development. The proposed BHs of 83mPD and 80mPD for Items A1 and A2 sites respectively generally respected the existing BH profile, which descended from inland areas in the north to the waterfront in the south. Both sites were situated on a downhill area and embedded within the hillslopes. They were lower than the

uphill low-rise residential developments to the north. In particular, Item A1 development would be lower than Casa Marina I (95-108mPD) while Item A2 development would be lower than Tycoon Place (83-92mPD); and

- (b) the proposed BHR of 83mPD for the public housing development at Item A1 site was determined with consideration of sustainable building measures and the potential adoption of MiC method, which allowed for GFA exemptions.

Environmental, Ecological and Landscape Aspects (Items A1 and A2)

65. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the findings of the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA);
- (b) whether a 6-month ecological survey was sufficient; and
- (c) whether any rare species were found.

66. In response, Mr Oscar So, the Consultant, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) a comprehensive ecological survey with a 6-month duration between 2023 and 2024, covering both dry and wet seasons, was conducted by the LSPS Applicant. This arrangement allowed for recording of a majority of species found in Hong Kong. It primarily identified habitats within rural plantations, woody shrubland and woodlands. According to the EcoIA, Item A1 and A2 sites were not recognised as sites of conservation importance or habitats of conservation interest, with records of low abundance of wildlife and low overall ecological values; and
- (b) no very rare species and Old and Valuable Tree were found, but *Aquilaria sinensis* (土沉香), *Fortunella hindsii* (山橘) and *Ailanthus fordii* (福氏臭椿(常綠臭椿)) were identified in the vegetation survey and were considered species

of concern. Those plants were recommended to be retained or transplanted in-situ where possible. In addition, some Indian Forest Skink (*Sphenomorphus indicus*) (銅蜓蜥), a type of reptile, was identified in Items A1 and A2 sites. Considering that their habitat did not depend on Items A1 and A2 sites, and with implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, potential ecological impacts could be mitigated to an acceptable level.

67. In response to the follow-up questions from the same Member regarding the details of the tree compensation plan and whether there were any eco-friendly measures, Ms Kitty Yuen, the Consultant, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) the LSPS Applicant had maximised the tree compensation area. Suitable slopes were identified for whip tree planting, and 19 heavy standard compensatory trees were proposed to be planted, mainly around the periphery of the roundabout and along Ting Kok Road; and
- (b) the tree compensation ratio for both Items A1 and A2 sites was initially about 0.56:1 in terms of quantity due to site constraints and insufficient tree spacing for sustainable tree growth. Subject to further review, the ratio was expected to improve, potentially reaching up to 0.65:1 for Item A1 site.

68. Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD supplemented that according to relevant guidance notes, the private housing development at Item A2 site should meet a tree compensation ratio of not less than 1:1 in terms of quantity, as far as practicable. The LSPS Applicant should comply with the requirement unless full justification was provided. Relevant B/Ds would act as gatekeepers to ensure compliance. Moreover, the greenery coverage for the proposed LSPS development would be provided in accordance with the prevailing requirements.

69. Mr Jason Kwong, the Consultant, supplemented that regarding the eco-friendly measures, the LSPS Applicant was committed to complying with the requirements of relevant B/Ds as well as other related legislation in respect of environmental protection during both the construction and operation phases.

70. A Member enquired whether new technologies had been explored to improve the tree compensation ratio. In response, Ms Kitty Yuen, the Consultant, said that various planting methods had been considered. However, owing to the steepness of Items A1 and A2 sites, limited suitable areas were identified. Whip trees would be planted on the slopes with a gradient of less than 30 degrees, while heavy standard compensatory trees would be planted mainly around the periphery of the roundabout and along Ting Kok Road. Areas with a gradient of greater than 30 degrees were considered unsuitable for tree planting.

71. Noting that the tree compensation ratio could not be improved due to site constraints, the same Member and another Member asked whether off-site tree compensation and land exchange for tree compensation had been considered. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD said that the LSPS Applicant and their consultants had explored the possibility of off-site tree compensation, but no suitable site was identified. Rooftop or vertical greenery options would be further explored during the detailed design stage.

72. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H of LSO, DEVB supplemented that land exchange for tree compensation was not within the scope of the LSPS framework and was not an available option.

Provision of Retail/Supporting Facilities (Items A1 and A2)

73. Noting that a representer (R592) expressed concerns regarding the necessity of GIC facilities in the area, a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the shortfall of GIC facilities in the area; and
- (b) the planned GIC facilities at the public housing development site (Item A1 site).

74. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, there was a shortfall of various facilities in Tai Po District, including hospital beds, police stations, child care centres, community care services facilities, RCHE, etc. Those facilities would be carefully planned and reviewed by relevant B/Ds,

such as HKHA, from time to time; and

- (b) an area equivalent to about 5% of the total attainable domestic GFA of the public housing development at Item A1 site would be set aside for the provision of social welfare facilities. As the types of GIC facilities to be provided at the public housing development would be subject to review during the detailed design stage, such provision had not been finalised at this juncture.

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi left the meeting temporarily during the Q&A session.]

75. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. She thanked the representers, their representatives and the government representatives (including the Consultants) for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The representers, their representatives and the government representatives (including the Consultants) left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

76. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

Items A1 and A2 Sites

77. A Member expressed views on the suitability of rezoning "GB" sites for housing development, emphasising the factors to be considered, such as addressing existing ecological issues and balancing the loss of natural habitats, including woodlands, with appropriate compensation and mitigation measures. Concerns were raised about the potential rezoning of the remaining "GB" areas between the Items A1 and A2 sites for housing development, given their similar geographical background and the possible precedent effects. Moreover, in view of the concerns about insufficient community facilities in the area, further exploration of reserving more spaces for retail developments was suggested.

78. In response, the Chairperson made the following main points:

Green Belt and Ecological Aspects

- (a) the rezoning amendments recently considered by the Board included new development areas (NDAs), which also involved rezoning of “GB” areas. Before the land supply in NDAs came on stream in large quantity, rezoning individual suitable “GB” sites for alternative uses had served as a relatively expedient solution to boost housing and land supply. Nevertheless, ecology and tree compensation concerns remained essential considerations when assessing the rezoning of suitable “GB” sites for housing development;
- (b) a one-year ecological survey was normally required for a full environmental impact assessment (EIA). For evaluation of the “GB” area, a 6-month ecological survey was typically conducted. The ecological value of Items A1 and A2 sites did not appear to be significant. While the vegetation seemed relatively dense on the plan, on-site inspections revealed that the slope predominantly consisted of sparsely distributed and relatively newly planted trees, rather than valuable or mature vegetation;
- (c) adhering to the implementation of compensatory tree planting of a ratio of not less than 1:1 in terms of number of trees for developments within the subject “GB” areas could be challenging, particularly given the extensive site clearance that would be required; and

Provision of Retail/Supporting Facilities

- (d) concerns regarding the insufficiency of community and supporting facilities were acknowledged. There was flexibility within the OZP provisions to accommodate additional floor spaces for such purposes. While HKHA might have practical considerations regarding the optimal allocation of space, LSO could discuss with HKHA to explore the potential of providing further retail and supporting facilities, where appropriate.

79. Upon the invitation of the Chairperson, Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning, made the following points:

“GB” Review and Site Condition

- (a) the “GB” review was one of the Government’s multi-pronged approaches to identify suitable sites for housing developments. The review was conducted in three phases. Phase 1 focused on areas that had already been disturbed or contained minimal vegetation. Phases 2 and 3 targeted urban/New Town fringe areas and/or sites with some tree cover but low ecological value, particularly those with existing infrastructure and transport support. Throughout the process, numerous “GB” sites were rezoned. Examples include rezoning of “GB” areas at To Yuen Tung in Tai Po South, the junction of Wong Chuk Yeung Street and Kwei Tei San Chuen Road in Fo Tan, and near Tai Tau Leng in Sheung Shui for public housing development;
- (b) Items A1 and A2 sites were located approximately 4 to 5 km from Tai Po town centre and were accessible via Ting Kok Road, with supporting facilities in place;

Environmental, Ecological and Landscape Aspects

- (c) the ecological survey conducted for Item A1 site revealed that the trees on-site were young, indicating that Item A1 site was largely composed of secondary woodland and plantation. The findings further confirmed that the area, primarily consisting of woodland, had low ecological value. A 6-month ecological survey, covering both wet and dry seasons, was undertaken. The approach was considered acceptable and consistent with other similar cases, unless a full EIA was specifically required. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department considered the survey acceptable;
- (d) on tree preservation, according to the relevant guidance notes, the project proponent was required, as far as practical, to implement compensatory tree planting at a ratio of not less than 1:1 in terms of the number of trees removed.

Proposal deviating from the said requirement should be supported by full justifications and an alternative proposal in quantity and quality, including off-site compensation and other greening solutions such as enhanced landscaping and greenery provisions. Given that more than half of the site area would be allocated for housing development, implementing compensatory tree planting on-site at a ratio of not less than 1:1 was infeasible. To address the shortfall, the LSPS Applicant had proposed compensatory planting on the adjacent slope; and

- (e) the possibility of integrating additional trees and greenery within the public housing development would be explored through planning briefs with HKHA to address the shortfall in compensation during the detailed design stage.

80. The vast majority of Members supported the amendments to the draft OZP and agreed that the proposed LSPS development should proceed. Members had the following views and suggestions on Items A1 and A2:

Site History and “GB” Zone

- (a) the concerned area might have ecological value about 50 years ago. Nevertheless, during the 1970s and 1980s, part of the area was converted into a borrow area for fill material, resulting in the removal of much of the original forest cover. Subsequently, parts of that area were occupied by temporary housing for resettled fishing families, who were later relocated to other areas in Tai Po. As a result, the current tree cover primarily consisted of young secondary or planted trees dating back only a few decades. This historical context explained why the ecological value of Items A1 and A2 sites was lower compared to some other “GB” areas. When compared with previous rezoning cases in Tsing Yi and Tseung Kwan O, where “GB” areas featured notable rivers or wildlife, the current sites in Tai Po did not possess such unique ecological characteristics;
- (b) while trees in “GB” areas played a vital role in mitigating extreme weather conditions by absorbing and slowing stormwater to reduce flooding risks, the

rezoning of “GB” areas with low ecological value under the LSPS framework could be supported. Such an approach would facilitate the acceleration of land supply, addressing the pressing housing demand in the short-to-medium term;

- (c) the subject rezoning should not be regarded as setting a precedent for general development in “GB” areas. The Board would continue to scrutinise each case on its individual merits, ensuring that only a relatively small proportion of this zoning with low ecological value would be rezoned for development, while those higher-value areas would remain protected. This approach stroke a proper balance between addressing development needs and preserving natural habitat and the environment;

Traffic and Transport Aspects

- (d) even though Lo Fai Road was not overly congested, Ting Kok Road served as a major road where traffic volumes had risen significantly due to local tourism and housing developments. Strategic or macro-level planning for improvement works, such as widening some sections or constructing bypasses, should be planned. Proactive measures were essential to prevent further deterioration and to ensure sustainable traffic management in the area;
- (e) according to the LSPS Development Scheme, the proposed ingress/egress for Item A1 site was situated at Lo Fai Road. Noting the representers’ suggestion to explore the possibility of locating the ingress at Ting Kok Road and egress at Lo Fai Road, it was considered prudent for the LSPS Applicant to assess the feasibility and traffic benefits of this alternative option in consultation with TD. The assessment should thoroughly consider factors such as road capacity, traffic safety, and proximity to the adjacent fire station to ensure an optimal and safe traffic management solution;
- (f) the proposed junction improvement works should ideally be completed before or at least simultaneously with the population intake of the development to avoid severe disruption during construction and to ensure smooth traffic flow and accessibility for residents from the outset;

- (g) the current public transport services provision could not meet the current local demand, with GMB services frequently cited by the representers as unreliable or inadequate. Despite reported high occupancy rates, it was anticipated that the operations might be fragmented with small number of operators due to workforce shortage. TD should further review the current situation and explore measures to address those concerns, as improvement of such service could alleviate residents' worries without having to wait for the completion of new road infrastructure;
- (h) the provision of visitors' parking at Item A1 site should be carefully considered, as visitors such as relatives, carers or service providers would likely to arrive by car. Without adequate visitors' parking facilities, they might resort to roadside parking near the fire station or adjacent villages, which posed safety risks and was undesirable;

Environmental, Ecological and Landscape Aspects

- (i) Items A1 and A2 sites were integral components of the broader natural environment, particularly the remaining "GB" areas. It was equally important to recognise that biodiversity encompassed not only trees but also fauna and habitats. The concept of a 'biographical island' should be explored, highlighting that ecological impacts should not be assessed in isolation for a single site but rather across the entire ecological network;
- (j) although the ecological survey concluded that the ecological value of Items A1 and A2 sites was low, characterised by predominantly younger and regularly planted secondary trees, mitigation measures remained necessary to minimise any potential ecological impacts and ensure sustainable development. While a 1:1 tree compensation ratio could not be achieved on-site due to site constraints, opportunities should be sought to plant additional trees in the surrounding areas or off-site locations to enhance ecological connectivity and resilience, where appropriate;

- (k) the LSPS Applicant and HKHA should explore opportunities during the detailed design stage to incorporate ecologically friendly design features, such as bird-friendly glass to reduce collisions, non-reflective façades, and nature-centric architecture to enhance the ecological compatibility of the project while promoting sustainable urban design;

Provision of Retail/Supporting Facilities

- (l) while some Members suggested increasing the GFA for retail facilities, such as accommodating food outlets or daily convenience stores, other Members considered the provision of a non-domestic GFA of 1,000m² sufficient to meet daily needs. Excessive retail space could lead to vacant shops if demand was lacking, particularly under the current economic conditions. Furthermore, several Members emphasised that introducing large-scale retail facilities, either on-site or elsewhere nearby, would be challenging without adequate visitors' parking and could exacerbate traffic congestion; and
- (m) Members generally agreed that HKHA should review the proposed retail GFA of 1,000 m² allocated at the public housing site (Item A1 site). Adjustment should be made based on actual demand during the later stages of development to ensure optimal utilisation of space and alignment with community needs.

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi rejoined the meeting during deliberation.]

Conclusion

81. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the amendments on the draft OZP, and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations. All grounds of the representations had been addressed through the department responses as detailed in the Paper, as well as the presentations and responses made by the government representatives (including the Consultants) at the meeting.

82. Noting Members' views and concerns, the Chairperson summarised the major views and recommended the following comments be conveyed to the LSPS Applicant or relevant B/Ds for consideration and follow-up as appropriate:

- (a) Items A1 and A2 sites were assessed by the EcoIA as having low ecological value, making them suitable for housing development, which was in line with the general principles adopted in the "GB" review. Rezoning Items A1 and A2 sites for residential purposes would not set a precedent for future developments across the "GB" area, as the majority of the remaining "GB" areas in the vicinity were under government ownership. Any potential rezoning of the "GB" area in the future could only be initiated by the Government if necessary and subject to technical assessments;
- (b) the LSPS Applicant and/or HKHA should explore opportunities to incorporate environmentally friendly building designs into the residential developments, where feasible, taking into account the site constraints, despite Items A1 and A2 sites being assessed as having low ecological value. This included implementing measures to mitigate bird collisions through bird-friendly designs and maximising greening efforts;
- (c) the LSPS Applicant was requested to conduct a review, within a reasonable period of about 3 months, to reassess the ingress/egress point for Item A1 site by evaluating two options, including (i) the originally proposed ingress/egress at Lo Fai Road, and (ii) an alternative option suggested by the representers with the ingress at Ting Kok Road and egress at Lo Fai Road, to determine the preferred solution. The impact on Tai Po East Fire Station should also be considered in the review. TD should be consulted during the process. Upon completion, LSO should further liaise with the relevant stakeholders;
- (d) the LSPS Applicant should explore the feasibility of expediting the implementation of the proposed road improvement works for the eight junctions before population intake to bring early traffic improvement to the area. If considered appropriate, relevant lease conditions might be imposed during the land exchange or lease modification process;

- (e) it would be more appropriate to defer to HKHA to determine the retail floor space and visitors' parking arrangements during the detailed design stage. Flexibility had been incorporated under the OZP regarding retail provision;
- (f) recommendations for enhancing pedestrian connectivity and provision of public transport facilities at Item A1 site, including the provision of pedestrian footbridges, as well as the construction of a public transport interchange and minibus stops, would be conveyed to HKHA for consideration; and
- (g) regarding the long-term traffic issues concerning Ting Kok Road and public transport arrangements in the area, such as GMB services, TD was requested to explore measures to improve the traffic conditions along Ting Kok Road and enhance public transport services, including service frequency.

83. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1 to R6** on Items A1 and A2, and **R7** on Item B, and decided not to uphold R8 to R958 and considered that the draft Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“Items A1 and A2

- (a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase land and housing supply in the short-to-medium term, and Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS) is one of the initiatives. It is considered appropriate to rezone Item A1 and A2 sites to take forward the endorsed LSPS development. The relevant amendments to the OZP have been submitted for the Board's agreement and subsequently exhibited for public inspection under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). All relevant statutory and administrative public consultation procedures have been duly followed;
- (b) the proposed residential developments at Item A1 and A2 sites along Ting Kok Road at the fringe of Tai Po New Town are considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas from land use planning perspective. The proposed LSPS

development with a maximum BH of 83mPD generally respects the existing BH profile descending from inland area in the north to the waterfront in the south;

- (c) relevant technical assessments have been conducted by the LSPS Applicant to demonstrate that there is no insurmountable technical problem identified and the relevant government B/Ds have no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed LSPS development;
- (d) the existing and planned provisions of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities are generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in Tai Po District in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and concerned B/Ds' assessments. The provisions of GIC facilities will be closely monitored by the relevant B/Ds;

Item B

- (e) the rezoning is to take forward the decision of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee of the Board on the agreed section 12A application No. Y/TP/36 for regularising the existing religious institution and columbarium uses. The applicant had submitted a detailed development proposal supported by technical assessments. Future operations of the columbarium would be subject to the licencing requirements under the Private Columbaria Ordinance. The rezoning of Item B is considered appropriate;

Items C3 and C4

- (f) the rezoning is to reflect the as-built road alignment of Ting Kok Road section adjoining/in proximity to Item A1 and A2 sites and to the north of Fortune Garden. The rezoning of Items C3 and C4 is considered appropriate;

Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (g) 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 "Village Type Development" 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 established procedures and/or require planning permission from the Board; and

- (h) the incorporation of the exemption clause that filling of land or excavation of land related to public works co-ordinated or implemented by the Government are exempted from the requirement for planning application in the "Sites of Special Scientific Interest ("SSSI") zone 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 "SSSI" zone would not be undermined."

84. 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 Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

85. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:50 p.m.