

**Minutes of 1345th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held at 10:00 a.m. on 12.9.2025**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong)
Mr Horace W. Hong

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

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

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

In Attendance

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

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

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Katherine H.Y. Wong

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1342nd (18.8.2025), 1343rd (22.8.2025) and 1344th (29.8.2025) Meetings

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The Secretary reported that subsequent to circulation of the draft minutes of the 1344th meeting to Members, an amendment to paragraph 62 incorporating a Member's comment as shown on the screen was proposed. Members agreed that the minutes of the 1344th meeting held on 29.8.2025 were confirmed with incorporation of the said amendment.

2. The draft minutes of the 1342nd meeting held on 18.8.2025 and the 1343th meeting held on 22.8.2025 would be sent to Members in due course. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting note: The draft minutes of the 1342nd meeting and the 1343rd meeting were sent to Members on 25.9.2025 and were confirmed by circulation on 26.9.2025 without amendment.]

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans

3. The Secretary reported that on 2.9.2025, the Secretary for Development referred the approved Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K7/24, the approved Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP No. S/K15/27 and the approved Shek Kong OZP No. S/YL-SK/9 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1A)(a)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 12.9.2025.

(ii) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representation on Draft Outline Zoning Plan

4. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representation in respect of the draft Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K5/40 (the draft OZP). The Secretary briefly introduced that on 13.6.2025, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, one valid representation was received. The hearing of the representation was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the full Board). To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to the representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representation by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for October 2025.

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

(iii) New Judicial Review Received

Judicial Review Application (HCAL 1722/2025) Lodged against a Decision of the Hong Kong Settlers Housing Corporation Limited on Rehousing Arrangement and a Decision of the Town Planning Board on s.16 Application No. A/K4/67

6. The Secretary reported that the judicial review (JR) application was lodged by Ms Ma Mei Mei (the JR Applicant) on 1.8.2025 against the decision of the Hong Kong Settlers Housing Corporation Limited (HKSHCL) (1st Putative Respondent) on rehousing arrangement and the decision of the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) (2nd Putative Respondent) on a section 16 (s.16) application No. A/K4/67 (the 2016 Application) on 24.6.2016 for not making the advisory clause on "proper rehousing of the occupants of Tai Hang Sai Estate (THSE)" as an approval condition in granting permission to HKSHCL for proposed comprehensive redevelopment of THSE in Shek Kip Mei and minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) restrictions. The five grounds of the JR application were set out in the JR Applicant's Form 86, which was circulated to Members on 9.9.2025. All five grounds focused on the decision of HKSHCL on rehousing arrangement and none of them was related to the Board, which included:

- (a) Ground 1: HKSHCL had been acting ultra vires in disqualifying the approved occupants;
- (b) Ground 2: HKSHCL had been breaching public policy, its aim of establishment, governmental strategy in redevelopment of the urban areas and the directive of the Chief Executive;
- (c) Ground 3: Wednesbury unreasonableness – HKSHCL had not taken into consideration its public functions of assisting the Hong Kong Government in public housing policy or the resettlement policy in the old days of the Colony, and failed to consider its original aims of establishment;
- (d) Ground 4: Breach of substantive legitimate expectation – the JR Applicant and other tenants were approved settlers of Kwong Man Village and were allotted a flat in the THSE redeveloped from Kwong Man Village. The policy speech of the Chief Executive had clearly indicated that the redevelopment of THSE was allowed on the condition of proper rehousing of all residents; and
- (e) Ground 5: Procedural impropriety – HKSHCL did not give reasons for disqualifying some of the residents' right of rehousing back to the future redeveloped THSE, did not explain the source of their power to do so and did not give reasons why the residents of THSE were treated differently from the other residents of the public housing estate even though they were all approved settlers from their outset.

7. The Secretary drew Members' attention that the approved scheme of the 2016 Application was not implemented, and with an extension of time for commencement, its planning permission lapsed on 25.6.2024. Separately, on 10.12.2021, a s.16 application No. A/K4/76 (the 2021 Application) jointly submitted by HKSHCL and Urban Renewal Authority for proposed comprehensive redevelopment of THSE and minor relaxation of PR, BH and non-building area restrictions was approved by MPC, with the validity of the planning permission until 10.12.2025. The approved scheme of the 2021 Application was being implemented, with building plans approved in 2024/2025.

8. The Secretary also reported that the Court had not yet granted leave to the JR

Application.

9. Members noted the above and agreed that the Secretary would represent the Board in all matters relating to the JR application in the usual manner.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H9/21

(TPB Paper No. 11019)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

10. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the two representers inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than the one who was present, the other representer had not indicated to attend and made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in the absence of the other representer.

11. The following government representatives and the representer were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Janet K.K. Cheung	-	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)
Mr Elton H.T. Chung	-	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)

Ms Gloria Y. L. Sze - Town Planner/Hong Kong

Representer

R2 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

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

13. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations.

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendments on the draft Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H9/21 (the draft OZP), major grounds/views of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11019 (the Paper). The amendment items on the draft OZP included:

- (a) Item A – rezoning of a site at the Former Sau Kei Wan Market (SKWM) Building and SKWM Building Sitting-out Area from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group A) 7” (“R(A)7”) subject to a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 8 for Class A site, 9 for Class B site and 10 for Class C site, or a maximum non-domestic PR of 15, and a maximum building height (BH) of 120mPD; and

- (b) Item B – rezoning of a site occupied by the Kam Wah Street Rest Garden from “G/IC” to “Open Space” (“O”).

15. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the Plan.

16. One of the representations was also concerned about the minor adjustment of zoning boundaries of three pieces of land to the immediate south of the proposed public housing development at A Kung Ngam Village.

17. The Chairperson then invited the representer to elaborate on her representation.

R2 – Mary Mulvihill

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

- (a) she supported Item B but expressed strong objection to Item A;
- (b) the proposed development under Item A deprived the community of much needed facilities. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), there was an urgent need for additional government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in the district. Compared with the GIC table of Shau Kei Wan (SKW) provided at the TPB meeting on 19.1.2024, there had been a deterioration in the provision of a number of facilities. The deficit in child care centres had increased dramatically from 3% to 47%. Similarly, the shortfall in community care services had increased from 7% to 45%. The number of beds in residential care homes for the elderly (RCHE) had also shown a significant increase in deficit, from -230 to -300. In addition, there were ongoing deficits in day rehabilitation and residential care services and no provision for pre-school rehabilitation services;
- (c) the Social Welfare Department (SWD) had emphasised its long-term goal of providing district-wide services while disregarding the provision of essential

services;

- (d) the GIC table indicated that there was one sports centre provided in SKW and there was no shortfall provision in sports centre. Nevertheless, given the provision standard of one sports centre for every 50,000 to 65,000 persons in HKPSG, the overall planned population of about 127,700 in SKW required the provision of two sports centres based on the higher end of the requirement;
- (e) the third and roof floors of the Former SKWM Building were in active use by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department for table tennis facilities and a children's playground, which would be removed. The proposal was contrary to the Government's pledge to promote sports. There was no playground near Item A Site;
- (f) the proposed BH restriction of 120mPD at Item A Site presented a significant contrast to the existing developments in the district, which were generally around 100mPD or lower. The proposed development would result in adverse air ventilation and visual impacts. The visual impact of the proposed development was overwhelming, especially when viewed from the SKW Tram Terminus and Shing Wong Temple. The proposed development would also remove the relief provided by the current low-rise building at the Site from the wall effect created by Ming Wa Dai Ha redevelopment and other private developments in the vicinity;
- (g) Item A Site was not suitable for residential development due to interface issues with Shing Wong Temple. It should be developed as a GIC complex as GIC services typically operated during designated hours of the day;
- (h) the minor boundary adjustments were not mentioned in the Schedule of Amendments to the OZP, and the public might not be aware of such changes and therefore not be able to make comments. It would also set an undesirable precedent and encourage development to encroach onto the "Green Belt" ("GB") zone, thereby providing an excuse for developers to extend their development without going through the planning process; and

- (i) the draft OZP should be rejected as the urgent need for the provision of community services should be a priority. In light of the current housing market situation with an oversupply of units and declining prices, there was no need to provide additional housing sites. Recent reports, including one from Jones Lang LaSalle, highlighted a surplus in housing supply. Creating additional housing in the market would put considerable pressure on developers of all scales.

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

20. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) with the rezoning of GIC site for residential use under Item A, whether there was any reprovisioning of the GIC site elsewhere in the district, whether there was a systematic tracking mechanism in place to monitor such reprovisioning, and how competing factors were balanced in determining the use of GIC sites;
- (b) noting that there was a significant shortfall of social welfare facilities in SKW, the distribution of existing and planned GIC facilities in SKW;
- (c) whether the proposed development at Item A Site would incorporate social welfare facilities or merely provide a public open space; and
- (d) the general considerations and procedures for the allocation of GIC facilities.

21. With aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) the Government had been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase housing land supply on an on-going basis. Item A Site was identified as having potential for private residential development due to its prime location which was well served by public transport and infrastructure. The proposed residential development was considered compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood, which predominantly comprised medium- to high-rise residential buildings. According to the record in 2017, the vacancy rate at SKWM was relatively high at about 44%, and the facility was subsequently closed in 2018 due to its low occupancy rate and patronage. Prior to the proposal of rezoning Item A Site for residential development, the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department had confirmed that there was no need to reprovide the public market. Kam Wah Street Wet Market in the vicinity was well established and popular in meeting local needs. Besides, relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) also confirmed that there was no need to reserve the site for other GIC uses, which could be accommodated in other premises;
- (b) SKW was a well-developed urban area supported by various community facilities and infrastructure. Planned GIC facilities would also be provided in the area through several developments, such as the Ming Wah Dai Ha redevelopment, the planned public housing developments at A Kung Ngam Village and Shan Pin Terrace, and the redevelopment of Salvation Army Shau Kei Wan Community Day Rehabilitation Service Centre. These examples illustrated how the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to increase the provision of social welfare and community services by (i) reserving premises within new public and private housing developments; (ii) systematically implementing a policy requiring equivalent to 5% of the domestic gross floor area (GFA) to be allocated for social welfare facilities in new public housing developments; and (iii) relaxing BH restriction to facilitate the redevelopment of social welfare buildings for expansion of facilities. PlanD would continue to liaise with relevant B/Ds to facilitate the provision of GIC facilities in future development/redevelopment when opportunities arose;
- (c) the Government would consider the feasibility of incorporating appropriate public facilities within Item A Site, taking into account the relatively small size

of the site (about 1,490m²) and the potential impact on the future development; and

- (d) regarding the allocation of GIC facilities, relevant B/Ds would be consulted to determine the suitable facilities to be provided at specific locations, taking into account factors such as location suitability, demand and supply in the area, service priorities, funding availability and resource allocation.

22. Ms Mary Mulvihill (R2) supplemented that according to a recent announcement by the Secretary for Housing, to accelerate construction of future public housing projects, consideration might be given to scaling down the community facilities. As a result, some planned community facilities within public housing developments might not be materialised.

23. 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 representer and the government representatives 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 representer and the government representatives left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

24. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

25. Members generally supported the amendments on the draft OZP and considered that Item A Site was suitable for residential development as the existing market was underutilised and redundant. The table tennis facilities currently provided were intended for temporary use, making good use of the vacant space. In view of the relatively small size of Item A Site, some Members suggested that the provision of GIC facilities at the site might not be feasible or beneficial. No government departments had committed to taking up the site for other GIC uses. The overall GIC provision was considered a long-term issue requiring resolution, for which Item A Site was not a suitable means to address the broader problems. A Member opined that elderly centres should be provided in suitable locations with a proper environment and sufficient space, rather than on a small site in a dense urban area surrounded

by buildings, where operational efficiency would be low. Another Member observed that as the prevailing easterly wind was already blocked by the hillside and Ming Wah Dai Ha redevelopment, the proposed development would unlikely affect the local wind environment.

26. Noting the concern and demand for GIC facilities from the public, some Members made the following general observations and suggestions:

- (a) while acknowledging the pressing need for housing, the lack of ancillary community facilities would reduce overall liveability. In view of the ageing population in the territory, there was an urgent need for elderly facilities, and more resources should be allocated for such facilities;
- (b) relying solely on public housing projects to provide spaces for social welfare facilities might not be adequate. Private developments should also be required to contribute to such provision as social service investment was a collective societal responsibility;
- (c) there appeared to be no systematic way of tracking where equivalent GIC facilities would be reprovisioned to offset the losses, which made it difficult to convince the public. More information on the provision of GIC facilities, in particular on the planned social welfare facilities and completion time of these facilities, should be provided in the future. Relevant government departments, including SWD, should provide accurate and district-specific data. The presentation of the GIC table could be reviewed, for example, to differentiate between committed and expected provisions, as appropriate, in order to provide a comprehensive picture of future supply; and
- (d) the Government should explore adopting a “City Information Modelling” system, which would provide comprehensive data on urban infrastructure and track the provision of facilities across the territory. AI could also be used to gain a better understanding of urban development patterns and future needs, which could enhance effectiveness in managing and planning developments.

27. Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning, said that planning was a dynamic process. The

provision of GIC facilities was not determined solely by the number of GIC sites on statutory plans. The Government had pursued various initiatives to increase GIC provision across the territory through three key approaches. Firstly, PlanD had regularly carried out reviews of existing GIC sites with a view to better utilising these sites, and some underutilised and low-density GIC sites had been intensified to facilitate comprehensive redevelopment, often incorporating GIC facilities within these new developments. The Board had also approved various applications from non-governmental organisations for minor relaxation of BH restrictions for GIC sites, so as to allow them to redevelop and expand their facilities' capacity. Secondly, PlanD had been actively increasing the provision of GIC sites. Substantial new sites had been reserved for GIC uses in new development areas. In urban areas, PlanD collaborated with the Urban Renewal Authority on comprehensive redevelopment projects, such as those in Cheung Sha Wan and Kowloon City, where GIC complexes were developed to serve district needs. Thirdly, the approach to GIC provision had evolved in recent years. Instead of mainly relying on dedicated GIC sites or joint user complexes, there had been a strategic shift towards incorporating GIC facilities within both public and private housing developments to maximise site utilisation. The Government had implemented a policy requiring that social welfare facilities equivalent to 5% of the total domestic GFA be allocated in new public housing developments. This could be a substantial GIC space in large-scale developments. Besides, land sale sites were required to provide GIC facilities, as appropriate. For Item A Site, PlanD had conducted a thorough land use review and no B/Ds had indicated a need to reserve the site for GIC use. It was crucial to strike a balance between land utilisation and social needs, and in this case, residential development was considered to better serve the public interest.

28. Regarding the information provided in the GIC table, the Secretary said that PlanD had been actively reviewing how the information could be presented more clearly. In practice, when compiling the GIC table, PlanD had to rely on relevant B/Ds to provide their data. In cases where the development proposals were uncertain or not yet finalised, B/Ds might be reluctant to share such preliminary information, and thus it would not be included in the GIC table. As for the 5% GIC allocation in public housing developments, if the specific use(s) was/were not yet decided by SWD, those potential provisions would also not be included in the table. Furthermore, as the data only covered government or SWD funded facilities, privately operated GIC facilities were not included. Besides, the population-based provision standards for some social welfare facilities were introduced a few years ago. However, the catchment

areas adopted by SWD and PlanD in their assessments for the provision of GIC facilities were different, and some of the facilities, such as those under the Hospital Authority, were planned based not only on population-based standards but also on service-specific demand (e.g. psychiatric or maternity beds). PlanD would further liaise with relevant B/Ds to explore how the information could be improved to enhance the completeness and clarity of the GIC table.

29. As regards the Member's suggestion for Hong Kong to adopt a "City Information Modelling" system, Mr Maurice K.W. Loo, Director of Lands, shared with Members the Government's recent efforts in promoting the sharing and application of spatial data with a view to supporting Hong Kong's smart city development. In particular, the Lands Department launched the 3D Visualisation Map in early 2025, which served as an essential building block for B/Ds to develop dedicated applications to support their operation and policy analysis through utilising spatial data collected by themselves or other sources. Moreover, the Common Spatial Data Infrastructure Portal established in recent years also provided a common information platform for government departments, as well as public and private organisations, to share spatial data with a view to facilitating the development of various smart city applications. A recent example was the District Office's use of spatial data to identify catchments in Sham Shui Po for the Pilot Programme on Community Living Room.

30. The Chairperson acknowledged Members' views and suggestions regarding the provision of GIC facilities and remarked that the process from reserving a site/premises for GIC use to the actual delivery of these facilities for public use involved various parties, including planning, securing funding, design, construction and implementation. The Board's role was to optimise land use planning to meet social and economic needs. Should a shortage of land for any purpose be identified, PlanD, in collaboration with relevant B/Ds, would seek to reserve appropriate sites to address those needs. At present, the Government had adopted a proactive and pragmatic approach to reserve GIC sites in new development areas, particularly in the Northern Metropolis, where more space was available. However, the densely built-up area in urban areas such as Item A Site posed greater challenges, and the limited floor area rendered it unsuitable even for a small elderly centre. The Chairperson highlighted that the Government had been proactively addressing shortfalls in GIC facilities through various approaches, such as the allocation of equivalent to 5% of the total domestic GFA in public housing developments for provision of social welfare facilities, which constituted a substantial amount of GFA for social welfare purposes. With regard to private sector participation, the Development Bureau

might require some floor space in land sale sites, with some up to about 10% of the total domestic GFA, for social welfare facilities where appropriate. Nevertheless, given the current market situation, developers had expressed concerns about such requirements, and a balance needed to be struck taking into account emerging circumstances. To further incentivise private sector involvement, the Government had introduced an incentive scheme to encourage the provision of RCHE and Residential Care Homes for Persons with Disabilities (RCHD) in new private developments. Under the incentive scheme, eligible RCHE/RCHD premises could be exempted from land premium, and their total GFA could be exempted from the total permissible GFA of the entire project under lease. Regarding the GIC table, it should be noted that some planned provisions might not be included due to uncertainties associated with the projects. PlanD would explore ways to further improve the GIC table so as to more accurately reflect the actual situation.

31. For the minor adjustment of zoning boundaries, Members noted that the adjustments had been presented to the Metro Planning Committee of the Board when proposing amendments to the OZP. As with other OZPs, there was a provision in the covering Notes of the subject OZP to allow minor boundary adjustments. The affected “GB” area (about 99m² or 0.0185% of the total “GB” area on the extant OZP) was very small, hardly visible on the small-scale OZP and would not have any material implications for the land use zonings.

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

33. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1** on Items A and B and **R2(part)** on Item B. The Board decided not to uphold the remaining part of R2, and considered that the draft Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (the draft OZP) should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

“Item A

- (a) the Government has been carrying out various land use reviews on an on-

going basis with a view to identifying suitable sites for conversion to residential use. Considering the high-rise and high-density residential neighbourhood surrounding the site, its excellent accessibility to public transport networks and the availability of community and retail facilities in the neighbourhood, the site is considered appropriate for high-rise and high-density residential development; and

- (b) the provision of government, institution, and community (GIC) facilities is generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population in accordance with Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, except for hospital beds, a sports centre, a sports ground/sport complex, child care centres, community care services facilities, residential care homes for the elderly, day rehabilitation services and residential care services in the Eastern District Council Area. These services/facilities will be carefully planned/reviewed by relevant government bureaux/departments, and premises-based GIC facilities could be incorporated in future development/redevelopment when opportunities arise. The Government will, taking into account the relatively small size of the site and the potential impact on the future development, consider the feasibility of incorporating appropriate public facilities within the site.”

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

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/SK-HC/354

Temporary Private Garden for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 429 S.B (Part) in D.D. 244 and Adjoining Government Land, Ho Chung New Village, Sai Kung
(TPB Paper No. 11020)

Presentation and Question Sessions

35. The Town Planning Board (the Board) noted that there was one case requesting the Board to defer consideration of the review application. Details of the request for deferral were in **Annex**.

Deliberation Session

36. After deliberation, the Board decided to defer a decision on the review application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information, as recommended in the Paper.

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

37. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:10 p.m.

Minutes of 1345th Town Planning Board
(held on 12.9.2025)

Deferral Case

Request for Deferment of Review Application by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
4	A/SK-HC/354	2 nd

** Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/TPB/Agenda/1345_tpb_agenda.html for details of the planning application*