

**Minutes of 1350<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 28.11.2025**

**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 K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Logistics  
Transport and Logistics Bureau  
Mr Kenny C.M. Or (for Agenda Items 1 to 3)

Chief Engineer (Traffic Survey & Support)  
Transport Department  
Mr W.H. Poon (for Agenda Item 4)

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West)  
Transport Department  
Ms Vilian W.L. Sum (for Agenda Items 5 and 6)

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 Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Jeff K.C. Ho (a.m.)

Ms Katy C.W. Fung (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee (a.m.)

Mr Kenny C.H. Lau (p.m.)

## **Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

### Confirmation of Minutes of the 1349<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 14.11.2025

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1349<sup>th</sup> meeting were confirmed without amendment.

## **Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

### Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

#### (i) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan

2. The Secretary reported that on 28.10.2025, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Cheung Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as S/I-CC/11) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the OZP was notified in the Gazette on 7.11.2025.

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

3. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations in respect of the draft Kwun Tong (South) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K14S/27. The Secretary briefly introduced that on 12.9.2025, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, 33 valid representations were received. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the representations was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the full Board) collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer in the hearing session.

Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for January 2026.

4. The Board agreed to the hearing arrangement in paragraph 3 above.

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14N/16

(TPB Paper No. 11032)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

5. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and LWK & Partners (HK) Limited (LWK) were two of the consultants of the Study for the Smart and Green Mass Transit System in East Kowloon (SGMTS-EK or the Project) commissioned by the Railway Development Office (RDO) of Highways Department (HyD) to support the amendment item. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Dr Tony C.M. Ip - having past business dealings with Arup;

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - having current business dealings with LWK;  
and

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung - being a former Director of HyD.

6. Members noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interest of Mr Daniel K.W. Chung was considered indirect, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

## Presentation and Question Sessions

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

### ***Government Representatives***

#### Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai	- District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)
Ms Florence Y.S. Lee	- Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)
Ms Charlotte P.S. Ng	- Town Planner/Kowloon

#### RDO of HyD

Mr Vincent T.H. Chu	- Chief Engineer (CE)
Mr Sunny C.S. Chiang	- Senior Engineer (SE)
Ms Simone S.M. Chan	- Engineer

#### Arup-AIS Joint Venture

Ms Alice Chan	]
Mr S.P. Chin	]
Mr Brad Fong	] Consultants
Mr Elvis Lau	]
Mr Y.P. Chan	]

#### Ecosystems Limited

Mr Vincent Lai	- Consultant
----------------	--------------

### ***Representers***

#### R1 – Yip Sui Yu

Mr Yip Sui Yu	- Representer
---------------	---------------

#### R2 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill	- Representer
-------------------	---------------

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

9. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Florence Y.S. Lee, STP/K, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendment item on the draft Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP), the grounds/views of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11032 (the Paper). The amendments mainly involved the rezoning of a site to the east of Po Tat Estate (the Main Site) from "Green Belt" ("GB") and a site to the north of Po Lam Road (the Northern Site) from "Open Space" ("O") (the Sites) to "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Commercial/Residential Development cum Public Transport Facilities" subject to maximum total and domestic gross floor areas (GFAs) of 484,800m<sup>2</sup> (equivalent to a plot ratio (PR) of about 7.6) and 449,200m<sup>2</sup> (equivalent to a PR of about 7.04) respectively and a maximum building height (BH) of 290mPD (i.e. Item A). A notional scheme supported by various technical assessments had been drawn up to ascertain the feasibility of the proposed residential and commercial uses cum public transport facilities at the Sites (the Proposed Development).

10. 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.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting during the presentation of PlanD's representative.]

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

R1 – Yip Sui Yu

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yip Sui Yu made the following main points:

- (a) he worked in the architectural design sector. ‘Kowloon Greenway’ (九龍綠色通道) was his self-initiated project to advocate cycling as a daily mode of transport and the incorporation of cycle-friendly design in development projects. While supporting the Project and the OZP amendments, and acknowledging that provision of cycle track was always permitted under the OZP and cycle tracks had been provided/planned along key pedestrian walkways at Anderson Road Quarry (ARQ) Development, it was suggested that connectivity between the proposed Ma Yau Tong (MYT) Station and the neighbouring residential developments in the uphill areas in Tai Sheung Tok should be further enhanced by providing an ‘active mobility pathway’ (活躍出行通道). Such provision could turn the proposed MYT Station and its topside development into a high-quality and modern transit-oriented development;
- (b) there was great potential to encourage active mobility and modal interchange in the Tai Sheung Tok area which covered ARQ Development, On Tat Estate, On Tai Estate, Po Tat Estate and other residential developments. Under the Traffic and Transport Strategy Study being conducted by the Transport and Logistics Bureau (TLB), cycling was regarded as the first and last mile mode of transport for the New Development Areas. That should also apply to the Tai Sheung Tok area with a total population of about 30,000. Based on a conservative estimate that 5% of the total population would choose cycling as a daily mode of transport, over 1,000 residents would ride bicycles to/from the proposed MYT Station. With such a threshold population and in view that the terrain at On Yu Road in ARQ Development and the Sites was relatively flat, it was worth exploring the construction of an elevated, direct



and convenient walking and cycling path, like a sky corridor, linking the Tai Sheung Tok area with the proposed MYT Station. With the provision of the walking and cycling path, it would only take about 5-6 minutes to ride bicycles from ARQ Development to the proposed MYT Station;

- (c) the key features of the proposed walking and cycling path were as follows:
  - (i) the proposed elevated walking and cycling path would be about 250m in length, linking the existing pedestrian walkway and cycle track at On Yu Road in ARQ Development at the level of about 177mPD (i.e. the northern end of the walking and cycling path) with the proposed topside development at MYT Station at the level of about 168.5mPD (i.e. the southern end of the walking and cycling path). The southern end of the walking and cycling path would further connect with vertical transportation tower(s) (i.e. lift tower(s)) to bring pedestrians and cyclists from the level of about 157.5mPD to the concourse/platform of the proposed MYT Station at the level of about 135mPD and further down to Tseung Kwan O (TKO) Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange at the level of about 81.5mPD;
  - (ii) a cycling hub with bicycle parking area and ancillary facilities such as toilets and changing rooms should be provided at the southern end of the walking and cycling path to facilitate park and ride on SGMETS-EK; and
  - (iii) retail shops, activity spaces, landscaped areas, rooftop gardens and sitting areas could be provided alongside the walking and cycling path to create an interesting and vibrant sky corridor; and
- (d) consideration should be given to incorporating the requirement for the provision of pedestrian and cycling connections between the proposed MYT Station and the Tai Sheung Tok area in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP. Relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) should collaborate through lease conditions, dedicated legislative provisions or other applicable

instruments to establish a framework for future operators of SGMETS-EK, landowner and property developers to facilitate the development of the proposed walking and cycling path. Flexibility should also be allowed in the design and management of the proposed walking and cycling path to meet changing market demand.

R2 – Mary Mulvihill

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

Item A

- (a) she opposed the felling of more than 2,500 trees and turning a planned open space for property development at the Sites to provide funding support for the Project. Fiscal consideration should not be the determining factor in formulating the development plan for the Sites;
- (b) the Government was not keeping its promise not to rezone “GB” sites for development as pledged in the 2023 Policy Address;
- (c) the Northern Site, which was about 2 ha in area, was originally planned for the provision of a sizable district open space (DO) for public use. As shown in the notional scheme of the Proposed Development, only dispersed and pocket-sized open spaces were proposed in the Proposed Development to compensate for the loss of the “O” zone. Also, except children’s play area, no active recreational facilities such as tennis court, basketball court and volleyball court were proposed;
- (d) the proposed open spaces were only convenient to the residents of the topside residential development and unlikely to be enjoyed by the residents of the nearby residential developments, i.e. Po Tat Estate and ARQ Development, and the passengers of SGMETS-EK;
- (e) R1’s suggestions on providing a cycling path between the proposed MYT

Station and its neighbouring developments and providing a bicycle parking area close to the proposed MYT Station were supported;

- (f) the provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in the Proposed Development was inadequate to meet the anticipated demand according to the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). The provision of a 100-place child care centre (CCC) and two 6-classroom kindergartens in the Proposed Development demonstrated inadequate effort to address the existing shortfalls in the Kwun Tong district, particularly in residential care services, rehabilitation services and sports facilities. In view of the recent Tai Po blaze incident, the provision of community hall was important for emergency use;
- (g) having considered that the Sites were large in size and located close to the proposed MYT Station, there was great potential to provide additional GIC facilities to serve more residents. As the Sites were government land, 5% of total domestic floor area should be reserved for the provision of GIC facilities. While the provision of GIC facilities would have financial implications, the provision of social welfare and sports facilities should always be prioritised to ensure long-term benefits to the community;
- (h) it was unacceptable that about 1,600 trees would be compensated and planted off-site at Black Hill in TKO, which was far away from the Sites. It was questionable whether tree compensation would be materialised;
- (i) the notional scheme of the Proposed Development showed that some building blocks were close to each other. Drawing on lessons from the Tai Po blaze incident, sufficient building separation should be reserved for fire safety, firefighting and rescue purposes;
- (j) Drawing 14 of the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) Paper No. 6/25 (Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14N/15) indicated the location of open space in the Proposed Development. It was questioned what the dark shading on the two drawings

of Drawing 14 referred to; and

*Others*

- (k) she expressed disappointment that only two representations were received given the scale and scope of the Project. Besides, the attachments of the Paper consisted of over a thousand pages and took a very long time to download from TPB website. Public information should be reasonably accessible to facilitate the public in submitting their representations. Poor access to public information greatly affected the public consultation process.

14. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the representers had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the government representatives (including the consultants) and/or the representers. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board nor for cross-examination between parties.

*SGMTS-EK*

15. At the invitation of the Chairperson, Mr Kenny C.M. Or, Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Logistics, TLB, said that SGMTS-EK would provide a convenient, fast, smart and green mass transit system for over 300,000 residents in the uphill areas of Kwun Tong. The system would connect to the existing railway network, facilitating residents' commuting to and from different areas of Hong Kong. The Sites would accommodate the depot and a station of SGMTS-EK, and the property development rights associated with the Sites would be the major funding support for the Project. On publicity, the study team had conducted extensive public consultations on the Project, including consultation with district councils, locals and key stakeholders. The scheme for the Project had also been authorised under the Railways Ordinance (Cap. 519). Looking ahead, subject to the approval of the OZP, the Government would invite tenders for the Project in 2026, which would cover the design, construction, operation and maintenance of SGMTS-EK. The Government would continue to maintain close communications with the public and duly consider public views in the process.

### *GIC Facilities*

16. Noting from the Paper that the existing and planned provision of major GIC facilities in the Kwun Tong district was considered generally adequate to meet the anticipated demand, except for about 10 types of facilities, and only a 100-place CCC and two 6-classroom kindergartens were proposed in the Proposed Development, two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) more elaboration on the provision of GIC facilities in the district; and
- (b) whether additional GIC facilities would be proposed at the Sites at the early planning stage, given the large size and convenient location of the Sites as well as the stronger demand of the residents in the Kwun Tong district, particularly the elderly, for GIC facilities.

17. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the HKPSG, different types of GIC facilities had different population-based planning standards while the provision of GIC facilities was generally assessed on a district basis or in a wider context. In proximity to the Sites were a number of public housing developments, where different types of GIC facilities were in operation/planned. For example, to the northwest of the Sites was On Tai Estate, where a GIC block offering residential care services for the elderly and rehabilitation services for the people with special needs was already in operation. To the north of the Sites was ARQ Development. At Sites R2-4, R2-5 and R2-8 of ARQ Development, a CCC, two neighbourhood elderly centres (NECs) and community care services facilities would soon be available. A joint-user complex at ARQ Development comprising two buildings of 3-storey and 7-storey high would provide a sports centre, a community hall, a library and some welfare facilities for children, youth, the elderly and people with special needs. The joint-user complex was scheduled to commence operation in 2027. To the immediate west of the Sites was Po Tat Estate, only about

100m walking distance from the Main Site, which included kindergartens, primary schools, a mobile library, an NEC, a family service centre, etc. In a wider context, an NEC and residential care services facilities at Hiu Ming Street and a CCC, an NEC and community care services facilities at Wang Chiu Road would also soon be available upon completion of the new public housing estates thereat. In addition, there were some GIC facilities in Hing Tin Estate near TKO Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange. The above GIC facilities would serve not only residents of the public housing estates but also the wider community in the Kwun Tong district; and

- (b) since the Notes of the OZP for the “OU” annotated “Commercial/Residential Development cum Public Transport Facilities” zone had provision for exemption of floor space for GIC facilities as required by the Government, there was flexibility to accommodate additional GIC facilities before tendering the Project. As SGMETS-EK was a committed key project to improve the overall traffic conditions in East Kowloon, the eventual provision of the GIC facilities at the Proposed Development should take into account the implementation programme of the Project.

18. One of the Members followed up and asked whether the shortfalls in the provision of GIC facilities as shown in the GIC table in Annex VI of the Paper would generally be addressed by the gradual provision of those GIC facilities as mentioned in paragraph 17 (a) above. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD said that the provision of the above-mentioned GIC facilities would help address provision of GIC facilities as highlighted in the GIC table. Having said that, the Government would take into account not only the population-based planning standards and guidelines set out in the HKPSG but also the needs of the community, the overall demand for such facilities, the floor area requirements of different facilities and other relevant considerations when proposing appropriate facilities to meet the service demand arising from the population in the area. In general, the policy initiative of providing floor area of not less than 5% of the domestic GFA of public housing development for social welfare facilities could also help address the shortfalls.

*Open Space*

19. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) any requirements on the provision of public open space (POS) in the Proposed Development at the Sites;
- (b) the rationale for proposing in the notional scheme a covered and open-sided POS at a deck at the level of 120mPD underneath the proposed MYT Station-cum-depot at the Main Site which might not be easily accessible and whether at-grade open-air POS or other forms of open space was proposed in the Proposed Development;
- (c) with reference to Drawing 14 of the MPC Paper (or Drawing H-7 of the Paper), what the dark shading referred to and whether only children's play area was proposed at the open space at the level of 157.5mPD; and
- (d) noting that the Northern Site, which was originally zoned "O" for the provision of DO, was located near ARQ Development and the residents of ARQ Development might have legitimate expectation that a sizable DO would be developed at the Northern Site, details of the existing condition of the Northern Site, the rationale for rezoning the Northern Site for the Proposed Development and whether there was any DO in ARQ Development for residents' enjoyment.

20. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) to compensate for the loss of "O" zone at the Northern Site, the Notes and ES of the OZP had stipulated that open space of not less than 21,200m<sup>2</sup> should be provided for public use within the "OU" annotated "Commercial/Residential Development cum Public Transport Facilities" zone. Such requirements would also be stipulated in the tender document of SGMTS-EK and the land lease. In addition, the ES of the OZP had specified

various requirements for the provision of open space, including that majority of the open space should be uncovered, and not less than half of the open space should be provided at-grade;

- (b) to demonstrate that the open space requirements could be met, the notional scheme illustrated different forms of POS at different levels. About 17,575m<sup>2</sup> at-grade open space was proposed, which included (i) the open space along the northern boundary of the Northern Site; and (ii) the open spaces at the podium level of the proposed residential/commercial development at the Main Site. For (i), the residents of ARQ Development could access that open space via an at-grade crossing at On Yu Road and then the proposed pedestrian footbridge over Po Lam Road to the proposed MYT Station. For (ii), the open spaces could be integrated with retail frontage in a cohesive design to provide vibrant activity space. The remaining 3,625m<sup>2</sup> was proposed for a covered and open-sided open space at a deck at the level of 120mPD underneath the proposed MYT Station-cum-depot at the Main Site, which would serve both public enjoyment and commuting purposes to facilitate access from Po Tat Estate (connecting to the open space deck via a proposed pedestrian walkway) and Ma Yau Tong Village (connecting to the open space deck via a proposed opening) to the proposed MYT Station. Direct and barrier-free pedestrian connections through an integrated pedestrian network comprising walkways, footbridges, lift accesses and other practical means would be accommodated in the Proposed Development to facilitate pedestrian access within the Sites and from the surrounding developments to the POS, the proposed MYT Station and the TKO Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange;
- (c) Drawing 14 of the MPC Paper (or Drawing H-7 of the Paper) included two plans. For the left-hand plan, the orange colour illustrated the proposed location of private open space of the Proposed Development. For the right-hand plan, the green colour illustrated the proposed location of POS of the Proposed Development while the green colour with red broken lines referred to the covered and open-sided open space at a deck at the level of 120mPD underneath the proposed MYT Station-cum-depot at the Main Site. With



reference to Drawing 15 of the MPC Paper (Artist's Impression of the POS (at 157.5mPD) of the Main Site) as shown in the PowerPoint slide, the notional scheme demonstrated that POS at the level of 157.5mPD could be designed with retail shops along both sides, providing activity/event spaces, hard and soft landscaping and sitting areas for public enjoyment. The notional scheme was indicative and for illustration purpose only. Not only children's play area could be provided at the open space. Multi-purpose POS at different levels of the Proposed Development would be further explored at the detailed design stage; and

- (d) the Northern Site was about 2 ha in area and accessible via On Yu Road, which had been zoned "O" since 2009 and reserved for the provision of DO without implementation programme. It was currently a formed platform devoid of vegetation, with site levels ranging from about 175mPD to 190mPD, and used as a temporary works area. Incorporating the Northern Site into an integrated development would not only expedite the implementation of the planned open space but also enable the comprehensive design of the open space network in the locality. Besides, a 3 ha open space named Anderson Road Quarry Flood Lake Park (安達臣道石礦蓄洪湖公園) at the northern part of ARQ Development had been developed. The overall provision of open space was sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in the district.

### *Pedestrian Accessibility and Connections*

21. As regards pedestrian accessibility to the proposed MYT Station, some Members noted that there was a level difference between the podium level of the proposed residential/commercial development and the concourse/platform level of the proposed MYT Station at the Main Site and enquired how passengers could access the proposed MYT Station and whether installation of lifts and/or escalators would be considered.

22. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that as shown in the notional scheme, there was scope for installing lifts in the Proposed Development to bring people from the podium level of the proposed

residential/commercial development to the station concourse/platform. The installation of lifts and/or other practicable means for pedestrian circulation, including those through the car parking floors, would be further explored at the detailed design stage.

23. To supplement, Mr Vincent T.H. Chu, CE, RDO of HyD acknowledged that there was a significant level difference of about 22.5m between the podium level of the proposed residential/commercial development (at 157.5mPD) and the concourse/platform level of the proposed MYT Station (at 135mPD) due to the presence of the proposed SGMETS-EK depot, thus lifts would be installed to bring passengers from the proposed residential/commercial development at the Sites as well as nearby developments to the station. According to the preliminary passenger flow estimation conducted by the consultants, eight lifts would need to be installed at the Proposed Development. The area requirements for the lift towers and associated queuing/waiting areas, as well as other practicable means of access, such as staircases or escalators, would be further examined at the detailed design stage.

24. Regarding the pedestrian connection between the Northern Site and the Main Site, two Members asked whether the proposed footbridge over Po Lam Road linking the two sites was sufficient to cater for the passenger flow to/from the proposed MYT Station and/or TKO Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange. In response, Mr Vincent T.H. Chu, CE, and Mr Sunny C.S. Chiang, SE, RDO of HyD said that the proposed footbridge was more than 10m in width and was preliminarily assessed to be able to cater for the estimated passenger flow. The study team had taken into account the existing/planned population of the residential developments in the area as well as the travel needs and patterns of the residents when formulating the proposed footbridge linking the Northern Site and the Main Site. Having said that, the project proponent was required to examine the passenger flow and propose appropriate pedestrian connections to/from the proposed MYT Station and/or TKO Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange, e.g. at-grade crossing and/or additional footbridge(s) at the detailed design stage.

25. With regard to the accessibility to the proposed MYT Station, a Member asked whether the residents of ARQ Development would need to access the proposed MYT Station via the proposed footbridge over Po Lam Road and the proposed lifts within the Main Site, and whether the proposed pedestrian connections could cater for such a large pedestrian flow. In response, Mr Vincent T.H. Chu, CE, RDO of HyD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the alignment and station location of SGMETS-EK allowed for convenient access by the

residents of ARQ Development. For instance, residents living in the northern part of ARQ Development could access the proposed Sau Mau Ping Station via existing/proposed footbridges and proposed lifts. Residents living in the southern part of ARQ Development could access the proposed Po Tat Station via existing/proposed footbridges or the proposed MYT Station via the proposed footbridge over Po Lam Road and the proposed pedestrian connections (including lifts) within the Main Site, while residents living in the eastern part of Po Tat Estate could also access through the proposed footbridge linking to the proposed MYT Station. Therefore, residents of ARQ Development would have multiple route options to access SGMTS-EK and not all of them would travel to the proposed MYT Station.

26. As a related issue, another Member asked whether there was any estimation of the number of residents of ARQ Development travelling to the TKO Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange. In response, Mr Vincent T.H. Chu, CE, RDO of HyD said that it was preliminarily estimated that about 2,000 to 3,000 pedestrian trips per day would arise from residents of ARQ Development travelling to the Bus-Bus Interchange via the proposed pedestrian connections within the Proposed Development at the Sites. Since SGMTS-EK would provide convenient feeder services to the nearby railway stations, i.e. MTR Choi Hung Station and Yau Tong Station, comparatively more people were expected to choose to access the proposed MYT Station rather than the Bus-Bus Interchange via the pedestrian connections within the Proposed Development.

27. Regarding the pedestrian connection between the Northern Site and Po Tat Estate, noting that the Northern Site was located close to Po Tat Estate/the proposed Po Tat Station of SGMTS-EK, a Member asked whether consideration would be given to providing a pedestrian connection such as a footbridge linking the Northern Site with Po Tat Estate/the proposed Po Tat Station. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, explained that the significant level difference between the Northern Site and Po Tat Estate, coupled with limited space in the well-developed Po Tat Estate, would pose technical challenges for providing a footbridge linking the two areas.

28. In response to a Member's enquiry on the construction and management responsibilities of the proposed pedestrian connections at the Proposed Development, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD said that the construction and management responsibilities would be borne by the project proponent of the Proposed Development.

### *Cycling Facilities*

29. Some Members concurred with R1's suggestions on providing a cycle track connecting the Tai Sheung Tok area with the proposed MYT Station, and asked whether consideration had been given to incorporating such a cycle track and whether the requirement could be incorporated in the relevant documents, such as the ES of the OZP, to ensure that it would be duly considered by the project proponent at the detailed design stage.

30. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD said that relevant requirements on exploring the connection/extension of the existing cycling tracks from ARQ Development to the proposed MYT Station and adoption of cycle-friendly design in the Proposed Development could be stipulated in the ES of the OZP to ensure that such requirements would be duly considered by the project proponent at the detailed design stage. Given the significant level difference between On Yu Road in ARQ Development and the proposed MYT Station, it would be technically challenging to construct an elevated and straight cycling corridor in the hilly terrain as cycling path had to be designed with due consideration to gradient, curvature, width and other relevant geometric factors. Having said that, the provision of cycling track and adoption of cycle-friendly design, such as the provision of bicycle parking area, would be duly considered by the project proponent at the detailed design stage.

31. To supplement, Mr Vincent T.H. Chu, CE, RDO of HyD said that RDO had a meeting with R1 to listen to his proposal. R1's proposal would be studied in detail, with consideration given to balancing the need for and cost of constructing an elevated cycling path and encouraging bidders to incorporate in their submissions the exploration of connecting/extending the existing cycling track to the proposed MYT Station and adopting cycle-friendly design at the Proposed Development, where appropriate. Subject to the proposal of the successful tender, relevant design provisions would be stipulated through administrative means.

32. A Member asked R1 whether there were any overseas examples of constructing cycling paths at height. In response, Mr Yip Sui Yu, R1, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that there were not many examples of elevated cycling paths in hilly terrain within densely-populated areas. One example was Kuixing Building Rooftop Plaza in Chongqing

(重慶魁星樓天台廣場), where elevated cycling/walking pathways were connected to the rooftop plazas of two buildings. Having said that, there were many overseas examples of providing park-and-ride facilities near railway stations or transport hubs to facilitate the use of mass transit systems, such as those in the Netherlands and Zurich. Even in Hong Kong, public bicycle parking areas were provided near MTR Tai Wai Station and in the Mui Wo Municipal Services Building near Mui Wo Ferry Pier to facilitate park-and-ride with the train and ferry respectively. Encouraging bike travel through the incorporation of cycle-friendly design and facilities into development projects was considered a positive move towards sustainable development.

33. The Chairperson remarked that due consideration should be given to stipulating in the ES of the OZP and the tender documents for the Proposed Development that the project proponent was required to explore connection/extension of the existing cycling tracks to the proposed MYT Station and adoption of cycle-friendly design in the Proposed Development.

#### *Landscape Aspect*

34. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) further elaboration on the tree compensation proposal, noting R2's concerns regarding the loss of more than 2,500 trees and the proposed off-site tree compensation at Black Hill in TKO; and
- (b) whether there were any design measures and landscape treatment to respond to the natural slope at the Main Site.

35. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) there were approximately 2,533 existing trees at the Sites based on the tree survey conducted. Most of those trees were either exotic woodland plantations or wild growth located on slopes, and were in poor form and structure, rendering them unsuitable for transplanting. Even if successfully transplanted, the trees would have a low survival rate. As the Sites would

be developed as MYT Station-cum-depot and topside development, those 2,533 trees were proposed to be felled. In that connection, a compensatory planting proposal was prepared to achieve a 1:1 compensation ratio as far as practicable in accordance with the relevant technical circular. Apart from planting new trees at the Sites, about 1,600 new trees were proposed to be planted off-site at Black Hill. Although Black Hill was located within the TKO district, it was physically situated to the southeast of the Sites and was not far away; and

- (b) extensive excavation works would be avoided. The main building structure would be lifted from the natural slope through structural cores, minimising disturbance to the natural slope at the Main Site. Besides, POS at multi-levels would be incorporated in the Proposed Development for public enjoyment. Landscaping areas and edge plantings would also be provided at different levels of the Proposal Development to enhance landscape amenity.

#### *Air Ventilation Aspect*

36. Noting from the notional scheme of the Proposed Development that some proposed building blocks were located close to one another with narrow building separations, a Member enquired whether air ventilation had been taken into account in formulating the indicative layout. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that an Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) – Initial Study had been conducted to compare the pedestrian wind environment in the surroundings of the Sites before and after development. The notional scheme had incorporated wind enhancement features to facilitate wind penetration across the Sites, particularly under north-easterly and south-westerly winds. To align with air paths, various mitigation measures had been incorporated in the notional scheme, including a 40m-wide wind corridor running east to west across the Main Site and three 15m-wide building separations within the Sites. It was anticipated that the Proposed Development would not have significant adverse impact on the pedestrian wind environment in the surrounding areas. As stipulated in the ES of the OZP, the project proponent was required to undertake an AVA at detailed design stage to identify appropriate enhancement measures and ascertain their effectiveness. Such requirements would be stipulated in the land lease.

### *Development Restrictions*

37. In response to a Member's enquiry about any restrictions on the flat number and flat size, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the Proposed Development at the Sites was subject to maximum total and domestic GFAs of 484,800m<sup>2</sup> and 449,200m<sup>2</sup> respectively as stipulated in the Notes of the OZP and to be specified in the tender document and the land lease. There were no statutory restrictions on the number and size of flats on the OZP. To facilitate the rezoning, an average flat size of 50m<sup>2</sup> and a total of 8,984 flats in the notional scheme were assumed for conducting the relevant technical assessments.

38. 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. The Board would further deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers and the government's representatives (including the consultants) for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

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

### Deliberation Session

39. Members generally indicated support for rezoning the Sites to "OU" annotated "Commercial/Residential Development cum Public Transport Facilities" for the proposed MYT Station-cum-depot and its topside residential/commercial development under Item A. Some Members had the following views/observations/suggestions:

#### *GIC Facilities*

- (a) in view of the large size of the Sites, their convenient location atop/near the proposed MYT Station of SGMETS-EK and stronger demand from residents in the Kwun Tong district, particularly the elderly, for GIC facilities, additional GIC facilities should be considered to be provided in the Proposed

Development at the early planning stage;

- (b) detailed information on the provision of existing and planned GIC facilities in the locality and in a wider district context should be incorporated in the Paper for Members' and public information;

#### *Open Space*

- (c) to compensate for the loss of the sizable "O" zone at the Northern Site, more accessible and at-grade POS, rather than covered POS, should be provided in the Proposed Development, particularly at the Northern Site;
- (d) there was concern regarding the proposed covered and open-sided POS at the deck at the level of 120mPD underneath the proposed MYT Station-cum-depot, which constituted a covered area and was not easily accessible to the public. The proposed POS in the Proposed Development should be user-friendly and easily accessible for all ages and all walks of life, particularly the elderly residing in this old urban district;

#### *Pedestrian Accessibility and Connections*

- (e) while installation of lifts to facilitate pedestrian access to the proposed MYT Station/TKO Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange was supported, the number of lifts to be installed, provision of sufficient queueing/waiting area as well as installation of escalators as an alternative access should be duly examined at the detailed design stage, taking into account detailed analysis of pedestrian flow and travel pattern of the existing/planned population in the area. Such requirement should be incorporated in the ES of the OZP as appropriate;

#### *Cycling Facilities*

- (f) concurring with R1's suggestions on promoting cycling as a daily mode of transport and incorporating innovative and forward-thinking ideas on the design of cycle-friendly facilities in the Proposed Development;



- (g) relevant requirements on the extension/connection of the existing cycle tracks to the proposed MYT Station and the adoption of cycle-friendly design in the Proposed Development should be stipulated in the ES of the OZP, tender document and/or land lease where appropriate to ensure that the project proponent would duly consider such requirements at the detailed design stage;

#### *Air Ventilation*

- (h) according to the findings of the AVA-Initial Study, downhill wind from Tai Sheung Tok/Black Hill might create stronger airflow towards the southern corner of the Proposed Development at the Main Site, i.e. the proposed covered and open-sided open space at the deck at the level of 120mPD. Appropriate design and mitigation measures should be devised at the detailed design stage for those areas likely to experience strong wind;

#### *Building Layout*

- (i) learning from the Tai Po blaze incident, sufficient building separations should be reserved in the Proposed Development for fire safety, fire-fighting and rescue purposes; and

#### *Others*

- (j) management responsibilities of the proposed MYT Station-cum-depot and the topside residential/commercial development should be sorted out and clearly defined at the implementation stage.

40. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported or had no objection to the OZP amendments, and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representation. All grounds of the representations had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting. The Chairperson remarked that Members' views on the extension/connection of the existing cycle tracks to the proposed MYT Station and the

adoption of cycle-friendly design in the Proposed Development, the installation of lifts and/or other practical means to facilitate pedestrian accessibility to the proposed MYT Station and the TKO Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange as well as the provision of user-friendly, accessible and integrated POS in the Proposed Development would be stipulated in the ES of the OZP and the tender document as appropriate to ensure that the project proponent of the Proposed Development would duly consider such requirements at the detailed design stage.

41. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1**, and decided not to uphold **R2** and agreed that the draft Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

“ Site Selection

- (a) rezoning of Item A for comprehensive development is necessary to support the operational requirements for the Smart and Green Mass Transit System in East Kowloon (the Project) as the Main Site is the only suitable site along the alignment to accommodate essential functions of the proposed Ma Yau Tong Station-cum-depot. Together with the Northern Site, the proposed residential and commercial uses cum public transport facilities at the Sites (Proposed Development) will provide major funding support for the Project. Technical assessments conducted, covering landscape and visual, environmental including ecology, among others, have concluded that the Proposed Development is technically feasible with implementation of mitigation measures;

Open Space and Government, Institution and Community (GIC) Facilities Provision

- (b) incorporating the former “Open Space” zone at the Northern Site for an integrated development will expedite the implementation of open spaces. According to the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the OZP, the Proposed Development should include reprovisioning of open space accessible to the public which will be designed and integrated through cohesive design and convenient pedestrian connectivity; and

- (c) the existing and planned provision of major GIC facilities in the Kwun Tong District is generally adequate to meet the anticipated demand in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and concerned government bureaux/departments (B/Ds)' assessments, with some exceptions. The services/facilities in shortfalls will be carefully planned/reviewed by relevant B/Ds, and premises-based GIC facilities could be incorporated in future development/redevelopment when opportunities arise.”

42. 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.

[Post-meeting note: Paragraphs 9.6.9 and 9.6.10 of the ES of the OZP were amended to address Members' concerns/suggestions regarding provision of cycling facilities, pedestrian accessibility and connections as well as open space provision. The paragraphs were amended to read as:

“9.6.9 Open space of not less than 21,200m<sup>2</sup> consisting of uncovered and open-sided areas shall be provided within this zone for public use and majority shall be uncovered. Not less than half of these open spaces shall be provided at-grade. Adequate headroom **and connections with the surrounding areas** shall be provided for open-sided open spaces. These open spaces shall be designed and integrated with each other by ways of cohesive design and convenient pedestrian connectivity, and shall be accessible to the public.

9.6.10 The comprehensive development shall serve the uphill areas as a transport hub by providing direct connections to the proposed Ma Yau Tong Station and Tseung Kwan O Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange from the surrounding developments, including ARQ Development, DAR, Po Tat Estate, and Ma Yau Tong Village through an integrated pedestrian network including walkways, footbridges **and**, lift accesses **and other practical means as appropriate**. Subject to future operation of the Ma Yau Tong station, relevant passageways of these linkages shall be accessible by the public at all times so as to facilitate passengers to interchange to other transport modes in an efficient manner and enhance accessibility among the uphill

developments. Barrier-free pedestrian passageways at the comprehensive development, open for public use at all times, shall be provided to allow direct connections to external linkages. *As cycling tracks are provided along some of the roads in ARQ Development including On Yu Road to the immediate north of the comprehensive development, the project proponent should explore connection/extension of the cycling tracks to the future station and adoption of cycle-friendly design in the development.”*

[Messrs Kenny C.M. Or left and W.H. Poon joined the meeting at this point.]

### **Sai Kung and Islands District**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Peng Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-PC/13

(TPB Paper No. 11033)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

43. The Secretary reported that Amendment Item A was to take forward the decision of an agreed section 12A (s.12A) application No. Y/I-PC/2, and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) was one of the consultants of the application. Dr Tony C.M. Ip had declared an interest on the item for having past business dealings with Arup. Members noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

44. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), representer and representer's representative were invited to the meeting at this point:

##### ***PlanD***

Mr Walter W.N. Kwong

- District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKIs)

Ms S.H. Lau	- Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs)
Mr Gabriel T.C. Lai	- Assistant Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands

***Representer and Representer's Representative***

**R1 – Peng Chau Reclamation Concern Group (坪洲填海關注組)**

Mr Fung Kam Lam	- Representer's Representative
-----------------	--------------------------------

**R2 – Mary Mulvihill**

Ms Mary Mulvihill	- Representer
-------------------	---------------

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

46. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms S.H. Lau, STP/SKIs, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendment item on the draft Peng Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), the grounds/views of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11033 (the Paper). The amendments mainly involved the rezoning of a site to the south of Wai Tsai Street (the Site) from "Village Type Development" ("V") to "Residential (Group C) 5" ("R(C)5") subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 0.75 and a maximum building height

(BH) of 3 storeys (9m) to facilitate a proposed flat development in order to take forward the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC)'s decision on 16.8.2024 to agree to a s.12A application No. Y/I-PC/2 (i.e. Item A).

47. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the Plan, to tally with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans and to incorporate other technical amendments.

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

R1 – Peng Chau Reclamation Concern Group (坪洲填海關注組)

49. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Fung Kam Lam made the following main points:

*Item A*

- (a) he did not object to developing the Site for ten 3-storey houses which had been approved under a section 16 (s.16) application (No. A/I-PC/14) but he opposed rezoning the Site from "V" to "R(C)5" under Item A;
- (b) under the "R(C)5" zoning, the landowner had the right to take forward a flat development with maximum permissible development parameters under the OZP, i.e. a maximum PR of 0.75 and a maximum BH of 3 storeys (9m), regardless of the development scheme under the previously approved s.16 application. Planning application for the proposed flat development would also not be required. The Board could not perform the gatekeeper role to scrutinise the development proposal and the public could not exercise their right to make comments under the Town Planning Ordinance;
- (c) under the "R(C)5" zoning, the proposed flat development was permitted to develop up to a set of "inflated" development parameters since there was no site coverage (SC) restriction under the OZP, and certain ancillary facilities such as plant room and private open space could be exempted from PR and/or

SC calculations, resulting in large development scale and building footprint;

- (d) the Site was located within an existing village cluster. The proposed flat development at the Site up to both maximised and “inflated” development parameters as mentioned in paragraphs 48(b) and (c) above would eventually become a single elongated residential block, which was entirely incompatible with the surrounding low-rise and low-density village houses;
- (e) ground floors of New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEHs) in the “V” zone were commonly used as small grocery stores/retail shops/eating places with local character. Rezoning the Site from “V” to “R(C)5” would alter the local character of Peng Chau. Unleashing the development potential of the Site for flat development should not be a relevant planning consideration;
- (f) according to the discussion at the RNTPC meeting on 16.8.2024 regarding the s.12A application (No. Y/I-PC/2), land exchange involving agricultural lots for NTEH development would not be allowed under the prevailing land policy unless it was a Small House development. Therefore, the only way to develop the Site (which involved surrender of agricultural lots) for residential use was flat development instead of NTEH development. It was queried that the current rezoning was to cater for the land exchange rather than based on planning considerations;

*Amendments to the Notes of the OZP*

- (g) the rationale for incorporating ‘Flat’ use under Column 2 of the Notes for the “V” zone was unclear as there was still available land for flat development on Peng Chau; and
- (h) the revision to the Notes for the “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) zone to exempt filling or excavation of land pertaining to public works co-ordinated or implemented by the Government, and maintenance or repair works from the requirement for planning permission would allow the concerned works to proceed without even minimal supervision. The Board was relinquishing its

monitoring role over such works, resulting in potentially significant adverse impact on the natural environment. The statutory procedures allowing the public to provide comments would also be eliminated.

R2 – Mary Mulvihill

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

*Item A*

- (a) she opposed Item A;
- (b) rezoning the Site from “V” to “R(C)5” would increase the development scale, footprint and number of units. Under the First Schedule of the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R), the Site could be developed with a SC of 80% and a PR of 4, which would result in a single long residential block instead of individual houses. That was not in line with the planning intention of the OZP to reflect the existing low-rise village-type developments around Peng Chau Ferry Pier and to retain the rural character of Peng Chau. The rezoning would alter the scene and landscape of the island and adversely affect tourists’ experience;
- (c) approval of the rezoning would trigger a substantial number of similar developments and set an undesirable precedent in other “V” zones;

*Amendments to the Notes of the OZP*

- (d) she opposed the amendments to the Notes of the OZP;
- (e) no detailed explanation was provided for incorporating ‘Flat’ use under Column 2 of the Notes for the “V” zone. Flat development was incompatible with village house development and there were no relevant planning guidelines or assessment criteria for applications for ‘Flat’ use in the “V” zone promulgated by the Board;



- (f) the planning intention of the “V” zone was to provide housing for indigenous villagers. The incorporation of ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ and ‘Flat’ uses under Column 2 for the “V” zone would encourage abuse of the NTEH policy and result in developments being sold to outsiders;
- (g) even though there were no recognised villages on Peng Chau, the “V” zone of the Peng Chau OZP was intended for NTEH-type development and the Site should not be rezoned from “V” to “R(C)5” for flat development. Also, ‘Flat’ use should not be incorporated under Column 2 for the “V” zone to allow planning permission for flat development. By making reference to the Cheung Chau OZP, for which the Board had considered the representation a few months earlier, the “V” zone of the Cheung Chau OZP was planned for NTEH-type development and had not been rezoned to “Residential” zoning. Inconsistent approach should not be adopted in examining rezoning applications on two similar rural OZPs;
- (h) the incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ uses under Column 1 for the “V” zone and the corresponding deletion of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ uses under Column 2 would affect public scrutiny of the location and design of such facilities;
- (i) the public had raised concerns on the design, material and necessity of some newly constructed facilities in rural areas. The revision to the planning intention and the Remarks of the Notes for the “CPA” zone to exempt filling or excavation of land pertaining to public works co-ordinated or implemented by the Government, and maintenance or repair works from the requirement for planning permission would give the Government unfettered and unaccountable power to act without adequate supervision, undermining the planning process and disregarding community interest;

*Others*

- (j) she expressed other views not related to the OZP amendments;
- (k) the Tai Po blaze tragedy drew attention to fire safety issues. Under the streamlining arrangement for considering planning applications currently adopted by the two Planning Committees (PCs) of the Board, the cases were not discussed at the meetings. Members did not raise questions on the streamlined cases and made a hasty decision to approve the planning applications in one go. For instance, even where the previous planning permission had been revoked due to repeated non-compliance with approval conditions pertaining to fire safety and/or other technical requirements, subsequent planning applications would still be approved. This would nullify the statutory planning application mechanism; and
- (l) it was difficult to access documents on TPB's website and downloading often took a long time, which impeded her in providing comments or submitting representations before deadlines. That greatly affected the public consultation process.

51. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, the representer and representer's representative had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to PlanD's representatives and/or the representer/representer's representative. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board nor for cross-examination between parties.

#### *Land Administration and Development Restrictions*

52. Noting that the Site comprised old schedule agricultural lots and NTEH development at the Site would not be permitted under a land exchange involving surrender of agricultural lots (as recorded in the minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on 16.8.2024 in respect of the consideration of the s.12A rezoning application at the Site), and R1's concern that the proposed flat development at the Site might eventually become a single elongated residential block with large development scale and building footprint, a Member had the following questions:

- (a) more explanation on the land exchange policy involving surrender of agricultural lots and whether rezoning of the Site from “V” to “R(C)5” was the only way to develop the Site for residential use to facilitate flat development in lieu of NTEH development; and
- (b) whether a residential development with large development scale and building footprint would take place at the Site.

53. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following points:

- (a) the Site comprised two pieces of old schedule agricultural lots. As advised by the Lands Department (LandsD), in general, NTEH development (other than Small House) would not be permitted under a land exchange involving surrender of agricultural lots. Having said that, a land exchange involving surrender of agricultural lots to facilitate non-NTEH type private residential development, including flat or house, could still be considered under the land administration regime; and
- (b) under the “R(C)5” zoning, it was the landowner’s decision to develop the Site for ‘House’ or ‘Flat’ use. Notwithstanding that, both ‘House’ and ‘Flat’ developments were subject to the same set of development restrictions under the “R(C)5” zone, i.e. a maximum PR of 0.75 and a maximum BH of 3 storeys (9m). As demonstrated in the indicative scheme of the s.12A application (No. Y/I-PC/2), given a maximum PR of 0.75 and a maximum BH of 3 storeys (9m), the SC of the proposed development was about 25%. Besides, the Buildings Department (BD) would take into account compliance with the “Sustainable Building Design Guidelines” as promulgated in Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-152 and the development restrictions stipulated in B(P)R when scrutinising building plans for the proposed residential development at the Site. Therefore, a “box-like” residential development with a BH of 3 storeys and an SC up to 80% would unlikely take place at the Site.

54. Regarding the land exchange policy involving surrender of agricultural lots, Mr Maurice K.W. Loo, Director of Lands, supplemented that in general, NTEH development other than that under the New Territories Small House Policy would not be permitted under a land exchange involving surrender of agricultural lots. In other words, only a NTEH development which met the criteria as a Small House under the New Territories Small House Policy would be considered for a land exchange involving surrender of agricultural lots.

#### *Rezoning Application*

55. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether a consistent approach had been adopted by PlanD in examining the rezoning applications on the Cheung Chau OZP and the Peng Chau OZP as mentioned by R2, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD said that the amendment item on the Cheung Chau OZP was to take forward an agreed s.12A application to rezone a site in Fa Peng from "R(C)6" to "R(C)9" to facilitate a proposed residential development consisting of six NTEHs with an increase in PR and BH while the amendment item on the Peng Chau OZP was to take forward an agreed s.12A application to rezone the Site from "V" to "R(C)5" to facilitate a proposed flat development since 'Flat' use was not permitted under the original "V" zone. While all s.12A rezoning applications were considered on a case-by-case basis, they should be acceptable in terms of planning and land use compatibility and supported by relevant technical assessments. The proposed developments could only proceed if there were no insurmountable technical issues and relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) had no objection or adverse comment.

#### *Others*

56. Noting R2's allegation that fire safety issues were not properly dealt with at the s.16 application stage as many s.16 applications were processed under the streamlining arrangement, a Member asked PlanD's representatives to respond to the allegation. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) at the s.16 application stage, for example, for applications involving brownfield operations in rural areas, the applicants might submit fire service installation (FSI) proposals to support their applications. The submitted FSI proposals would be circulated to the Fire Services Department (FSD) for

comment. FSD would examine the FSI proposals and recommend whether the application could be approved or not. Should the applications be recommended for approval, FSD would also advise on whether approval conditions in relation to the submission and/or implementation of the FSI proposals should be imposed. For the proposed residential development at the Site, the provision of fire safety measures, such as the design of means of escape/emergency vehicular access, would be dealt with at the building plan submission stage and scrutinised by BD and FSD; and

- (b) even the planning applications were selected for streamlining arrangement, Members would still duly consider the cases before making a decision.

57. The Secretary supplemented that under the streamlining arrangement, planning applications that were relatively straightforward and fulfilled the agreed selection criteria (i.e. the ‘streamlined applications’) would be considered by respective PC of the Board in one go. A summary table of the ‘streamlined applications’ together with the PC papers would be provided to Members before the meeting for their information and consideration. While the streamlined arrangement obviated the need for PlanD’s representatives to present the cases at the meetings, Members could still raise questions on the applications and PlanD’s representatives were available to answer Members’ questions before a decision was made. All planning applications, together with the supporting submissions such as FSI proposals and/or technical assessment reports, were circulated to relevant B/Ds for comment, and if necessary, relevant approval conditions would be imposed.

58. 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. The Board would further deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board’s decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representer, representer’s representative and PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

59. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported or had no objection to

the OZP amendments, and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations. All grounds of the representations had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentations and responses made by PlanD's representatives at the meeting.

60. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided not to uphold R1 and R2 and agreed that the draft Peng Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- “(a) Item A is to take forward the decision of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee on an agreed section 12A (s.12A) application for proposed flat development. At the s.12A application stage, relevant technical assessments had been conducted to support the application. The proposed development is considered not incompatible with the existing neighbourhood and general rural character of the area, and will not cause significant adverse impacts to the surroundings, while concerned government bureaux/departments have no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed development at Item A site (the Site). The “Residential (Group C) 5” zoning and relevant development restrictions for the Site are considered appropriate;
- (b) the incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ uses under Column 1, as well as ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ and ‘Flat’ uses under Column 2 of the Notes for the “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 procedures and/or require planning permission from the Board; and
- (c) 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 “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) 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 “CPA” zone would not be undermined.”

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

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:10 p.m.]

[Messrs Vincent K.Y. Ho, Daniel K.W. Chung, Rocky L.K. Poon and W.H. Poon left the meeting during the lunch break.]

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

63. 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 K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Dr C.M. Cheng

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West  
Transport Department  
Ms Vilian W.L. Sum



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

[Mr Simon Y.S. Wong, Ms Vilian W.L. Sum and Mr Bond C.P. Chow joined the meeting at this point.]

**Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District**

**Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan  
No. S/YL/28

(TPB Paper No. 11034)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

64. The Secretary reported that Amendment Item A was to take forward the decision of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board) on a section 12A (s.12A) application No. Y/YL/19 which involved the rezoning of a site for private residential development, and the application was submitted by Giant Star International Limited, which was a subsidiary of New World Development (NWD) Company Limited, with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Dr Tony C.M. Ip	] having current business dealings with AECOM;
Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho	]
Mr Rocky L.K. Poon	- being an employee of a company which was a subsidiary of NWD;
Mr Ryan M.K. Ip	- being the vice-president and executive director of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from New World Group before; and
Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu	- being the director and chief executive officer of an organisation which had received donations from Chow Tai Fook Charity Foundation (related to NWD).

65. Members noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Messrs Ryan M.K. Ip and Ricky W.Y. Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Messrs Vincent K.Y. Ho and Rocky L.K. Poon had already left the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

66. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers inviting them to the hearing, but other than one who was present, 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.

67. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the representer were invited to the meeting at this point:

#### ***PlanD's Representatives***

Mr Raymond H.F. Au	- District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW)
Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu	- Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW)
Ms Carmen K.K. Cheung	- Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West

#### ***Representer***

#### R57 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill	- Representer
-------------------	---------------

68. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives 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 2 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 PlanD's representatives or the representer. After the Q&A session, PlanD's representatives and the representer would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

69. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu, STP/TMYLW, PlanD briefed Members on the representation, including the background of the amendment items on the draft Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan (the draft OZP), the grounds/views of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11034 (the Paper). The amendment items included:

- (a) Item A – rezoning of a site at the junction of Shap Pat Heung Road (SPHR) and Tai Shu Ha Road East (Item A Site) from “Village Type Development” (“V”) to “Residential (Group A) 9” (“R(A)9”) subject to a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 6 and a maximum building height (BH) of 120mPD;
- (b) Item B – rezoning of a site near the junction of SPHR and Yuen Long Tai Yuk Road from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “R(A)10” subject to a maximum PR of 6.5, with the domestic PR not exceeding 6, and a maximum BH of 25 storeys (excluding basement(s)). In addition, a gross floor area (GFA) of not less than 2,495m<sup>2</sup> should be provided for government, institution or community (GIC) facilities which should be included for PR calculation; and
- (c) Item C – rezoning of a site to the west of Yuen Long Pau Cheung Square from “R(A)” to “R(A)11” subject to a maximum domestic GFA of 3,088m<sup>2</sup>, a maximum non-domestic GFA of 1,552m<sup>2</sup>, a maximum GFA of 4,723m<sup>2</sup> for provision of residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) and a maximum BH of 30 storeys (excluding basement(s)).

70. 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.

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

R57 – Mary Mulvihill

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

- (a) she expressed discontent that the representation hearings for three OZPs were arranged on one day. There were too many details for Members to take on, particularly considering that the draft Kwun Tong (North) OZP was such a complicated plan;
- (b) the TPB meetings (i.e. the full Board meetings) were scheduled bi-weekly and no OZPs were discussed at some meetings. The representation hearings should be arranged at different meetings so that the general public could have more time to look into the issues;
- (c) she raised strong objection to all the amendment items on the draft OZP;

*Item A*

- (d) the proposed development reserved more than half of the site area for road or decorative paving. Having a substantial amount of land paved with asphalt would lead to rising temperatures in the New Territories;
- (e) high towers overwhelmed the low-rise district, leading to significant adverse visual impact;
- (f) as shown in Attachment VIII of RNTPC Paper No. 7/25 on the provision of open space and major GIC facilities within the Yuen Long OZP, there were shortfalls in the provision of child care centre (-473 places/-62%), community care services facilities (-583 places/-54%), RCHE (-383 beds/-29%), day rehabilitation services (-97 places/-25%), residential care services (-343 places/-57%) and integrated community centre for mental wellness (-0.5/-

50%). No community facilities were provided in exchange for taking up almost 3,000m<sup>2</sup> of government land (GL) for private development;

- (g) the government responses of having no objection to the proposed development were unconceivable, given that various Policy Addresses pledged to address the shortfalls in the provision of community facilities. The allocation of 5% of the domestic GFA in the planned public housing development for social welfare facilities was not guaranteed;
- (h) while 40 trees to be felled would be compensated, there remained concern on tree felling;
- (i) the 149 objecting/adverse comments out of 159 public comments received under the s.12A application No. Y/YL/19, which were mainly on the grounds of traffic, environmental, visual and landscape impacts, land use compatibility, setting of undesirable precedent and retaining the “V” zone for Small House development, were not adequately addressed. Unfortunately, none of those objectors attended the subject hearing;
- (j) whether the land had any foreseeable public uses was not addressed in the government responses. Given the extensive GL involved, whether the concerned criteria for including GL in land exchange could be fulfilled was in doubt;
- (k) it was doubtful whether Members’ concerns on the potential residential/industrial interface could be addressed by the requirement for submission of layout plan together with relevant technical assessment(s) under section 16 (s.16) application as stipulated in the Notes of the “R(A)9” zone;

*Item B*

- (l) she requested an explanation on why Item B was numbered to “R(A)10” sub-zone noting that it was proposed to be rezoned to “R(A)9” in the concerned

s.12A application. Whether it was merely a numbering exercise or had implications should be clarified;

- (m) only two small sized GIC facilities (i.e. a child care centre and a day care centre for the elderly) were proposed at the site which was formerly zoned “G/IC” and reserved for school use but no longer required in view of changing demographics and social needs. The site should be developed into other community facilities, e.g. RCHE and health care facilities for mental health, which were urgently needed;
- (n) the site could also be developed into student hostels to cope with the increasing number of university students or private subsidised housing similar to the concept applied in the site zoned “R(A)7” at Lam Hi Road;
- (o) the government departments had shirked their responsibility to address community needs, which could have been met under the former “G/IC” zoning, while allowing the landowner to generate revenue from the development;
- (p) the design of a “multi-functional courtyard” decking over the access road within the site was intended to include more site area for PR calculation. The design was undesirable and unacceptable as the access road would be enclosed by deck-over structures;
- (q) the podium design with a height at 11.15mPD between the two residential towers would obstruct the wind corridor and adversely affect air ventilation;
- (r) the 55 objecting/adverse comments received under the s.12A application No. Y/YL/20, which were mainly on the grounds of traffic, environmental and air ventilation impacts, land use compatibility, the design of the proposed social welfare facilities and retaining the “G/IC” zone for provision of community facilities, were not adequately addressed. The government responses indicated that no public comment was considered to be substantial or adverse. All concerns were disregarded by stating “no insurmountable impact”;

*Item C*

- (s) the site was the subject of a previous s.16 application No. A/YL/319 for proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction for permitted flat with shop and services and social welfare facility uses, which was rejected by RNTPC in November 2024 as the proposed relaxation of PR was considered excessive and could not be regarded as minor; and approving the application would undermine the PR control of the “R(A)” zone, the cumulative impact of which would overstrain the capacity of the existing and planned infrastructures in the area. The s.12A application No. Y/YL/21 with the same development parameters was subsequently agreed by RNTPC in March 2025, which was inconsistent with its previous decision in a short period of 4 months;
- (t) the development parameters of the proposed development greatly exceeded the PR and site coverage restrictions of the “R(A)” zone on the draft OZP. The PR under Item C was double the PR under Items A and B, as well as the prevailing domestic PR of 6 for Yuen Long New Town in general;
- (u) while fully supporting the development of RCHE, she did not support the arrangement that, for the benefit of the developer, allowed commercial use at a residential site under the pretext of facilitating the provision of RCHE with an exempted GFA of 12,000m<sup>2</sup>;
- (v) the proposed development had an excessive podium height of 36m, which far exceeded the standard podium height of 15m;
- (w) approval of the proposed development had set an undesirable precedent for encouraging similar building design that would adversely affect ventilation and penetration of natural light to residential buildings;
- (x) there was no provision of open space for the residential units and the RCHE. While the proposed streetscape enhancement works were welcomed, they could not be regarded as a substitute for the open space requirement and the



land involved did not belong to the applicant;

- (y) the provision of vertical greenery on the building façade, which might pose artificial and fire hazards, was not genuine greenery provision;
- (z) there was no guarantee that the RCHE would be provided at the proposed development. The intention could be to facilitate the conversion of those floors to office use in future. Similar to an approved development in Tsim Sha Tsui under s.16 application No. A/K1/271 of a comparable scale, the subject development was in essence commercial with only a minor residential component;
- (aa) it was not justified that the proposed RCHE providing less than 200 beds would allocate five floors to dormitories but two floors to ancillary office and back-of-house (BOH) facilities, the dormitory on 7/F had a headroom of 4.5m and the BOH floors had a headroom of 4.8m. Besides, the RCHE would not be provided with adequate natural ventilation and light;
- (bb) the proposed RCHE should be equipped with terrace or roof-top design to cater for residents with mobility difficulties in accessing natural light;
- (cc) the government response was an example of obfuscation. She requested an explanation of why a development that exceeded the development parameters of both the “R(A)” and “Commercial” zonings and had a massive podium far in excess of that allowed in the “R(A)” zone could be permitted;

*Amendments to the Notes of the OZP*

- (dd) incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1 of the Notes for the “V” zone would deprive the community of scrutinising the location and design of these facilities; and
- (ee) incorporation of ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ under Column 2 of the Notes for the “V” zone would encourage abuse of the Small House policy

and result in developments being for sale to outsiders.

73. As the presentations of PlanD's representative 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 PlanD's 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.

#### *GIC Facilities*

74. Noting the shortfalls in some GIC facilities, a Member enquired whether the required GIC facilities were determined after the development project was established or they were assigned to various developments in the community based on the district needs, and how to strike a balance in the provision of different types of facilities. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that both approaches would be applied in the provision of GIC facilities. The provision was planned on the basis of the population in the district with reference to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the requirements of relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds). For some selected welfare facilities, the standards set under HKPSG were long-term goals and assessed in a wider spatial context or on a regional/cluster basis. Actual provision of these facilities would be carefully planned/reviewed by relevant B/Ds. Moreover, during the processing of planning applications, the Social Welfare Department (SWD) would be consulted on relevant planning applications and consider whether there was a need to provide government or subsidised facilities in the proposed development or whether there was any adverse comment on the proposed privately funded facilities. Under this approach, project proponents of the developments under Items B and C had proposed to provide a number of social welfare facilities. SWD had no adverse comment on the proposed child care centre and day care centre under Item B and expressed support for the proposed RCHE under Item C.

#### *Land Exchange of Item A Site*

75. A Member enquired whether the requirement for submission of layout plan for the proposed development under Item A would have any bearing on the subsequent arrangement

of the land exchange for Item A Site. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD said that planning and land administration were two separate regimes. In terms of land use planning, Item A was rezoned to “R(A)9” for private residential use. The project proponent was required to submit layout plan together with relevant technical assessment(s) to demonstrate that there was no insurmountable problem in the proposed development under s.16 application for the Board’s approval. While the Lands Department (LandsD) had expressed no adverse comment on the aspect of land exchange in the s.12A application No. Y/YL/19, it would be further consulted upon receipt of the s.16 application. There was GL in the application site and the inclusion of GL in the proposed development would be assessed against the established criteria upon receipt of the land exchange application by LandsD.

76. 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.

#### *Issue of Downloading Files from TPB’s Website*

77. In response to the difficulty in downloading files from the portal of the Board raised by Ms Mary Mulvihill (R57) in the morning session of the meeting, the Chairperson informed Ms Mulvihill that Members had discussed the issue among themselves after being updated on follow-up actions taken by the Secretariat. To ascertain whether the alleged difficulty in downloading files was a common problem, colleagues of PlanD had tried downloading using different office desktops or home computers but no problem was encountered. The difficulty in downloading files might be due to the capacity of the home computer or the speed of the wireless network connection. Two weeks earlier, a senior town planner of PlanD had conducted a one-to-one session with Ms Mulvihill to explain how to save and read the files on the screen more easily. If necessary, another similar session could be arranged with demonstration using a computer in hand. Alternatively, hard copy of the relevant documents would be available for viewing at the Planning Enquiry Counters of PlanD. Ms Mulvihill said that the Chairperson’s response was unacceptable. Every general member of the public should be able to turn on the home computer and access the documents for the purpose of public consultation. There were difficulties in printing the files in different formats and searching for information in the large-sized files without a directory even when using office computers, and separate files should be created by subject. If the problem lay in the Government Cloud services, an alternative such as a temporary website should be provided in the interim to

facilitate public access to the relevant documents. The Chairperson noted her points and repeated the offer of assistance to Ms Mulvihill, while Ms Mulvihill still considered it unacceptable if there was no change to the downloading system.

78. The Chairperson said that the Board would further deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representer and PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

### Deliberation Session

79. Members generally considered that the amendment items and amendments to the Notes of the OZP could be supported. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported or had no objection to the OZP amendments, and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representation. All grounds of the representation had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentation and responses made by PlanD's representatives at the meeting.

80. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1 to R56** on Item C, and decided not to uphold R57 and agreed that the draft Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

#### "Items A, B and C

- (a) Items A, B and C are to take forward the decisions of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee on three agreed section 12A applications for proposed private residential developments and private residential-cum-residential care home for the elderly development subject to respective plot ratio and/or gross floor area and building height restrictions. The proposed developments are considered not incompatible with the surrounding environment and relevant technical assessments have been conducted, which demonstrate that no insurmountable impacts on the surroundings are anticipated, while the concerned government bureaux/departments have no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed developments at the

respective sites. The zoning and relevant development restrictions for the respective sites on the OZP are considered appropriate; and

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

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

81. 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.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong left the meeting during deliberation.]

**Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

82. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 3:20 p.m.