

**DRAFT TSENG LAN SHUE OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/SK-TLS/9  
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/SK-TLS/9-R1 TO R4  
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/SK-TLS/9-C1 AND C2**

<b>Subject of Representations</b>	<b>Representers (No. TPB/R/S/SK-TLS/9-)</b>	<b>Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/SK-TLS/9-)</b>
<p><b><u>Amendment Item A</u></b> Rezoning of a site at Ta Ku Ling from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Residential (Group C)7” (“R(C)7”)</p> <p><b><u>Amendment to the Notes</u></b> Revision of the exemption clause for “filling or excavation of land” in the Remarks for the “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zone</p>	<p><b>Total: 4</b></p> <p><b><u>Oppose Amendment Item A</u></b> <b>R1:</b> The Conservancy Association <b>R2:</b> Individual</p> <p><b><u>Provide Views on Amendment Item A</u></b> <b>R4:</b> The Hong Kong and China Gas Company (HKCGC)</p> <p><b><u>Oppose Amendment to the Notes</u></b> <b>R3:</b> Individual</p>	<p><b>Total: 2</b></p> <p><b><u>Support R1 and/or R2</u></b> <b>C1:</b> Designing Hong Kong Limited <b>C2:</b> Individual (also <b>R2</b>)</p>

Note: The names of all representers and commenters are attached at **Annex III**.

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 On 25.2.2022, the draft Tseng Lan Shue Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-TLS/9 (the draft OZP) (**Annex I**) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments incorporated into the OZP is at **Annex II** and the location of the amendment item is shown on **Plan H-1**.
- 1.2 During the two-month exhibition period, four representations were received. On 13.5.2022, the representations were published for three weeks for public comment. Upon expiry of the exhibition period, two comments were received.
- 1.3 On 22.7.2022, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to consider all representations and comments collectively in one group.
- 1.4 This paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations and comments. The lists of representers and commenters are at **Annex III**. The submissions of representations and comments on the draft OZP are at **Annex IV**. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

## 2. **Background**

- 2.1 According to the 2013 Policy Address, the Government would adopt a multi-pronged approach to build up land reserve with a view to meeting housing and other development needs. As announced in the 2020 Policy Address, it is imperative for Government to increase land supply and develop land resources for housing development in a resolute and persistent manner to meet the keen housing demand of the public and to prevent the acute problem of land shortage from emerging again. The Government would continue to adopt a multi-pronged land supply strategy as recommended by the Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS). Whilst the Government will press ahead with the eight land supply options worthy of priority study and implementation as recommended by TFLS, concurrently, the Government still have to continue with the various ongoing land supply initiatives to increase and expedite housing land supply in the short-to-medium term, including the review on “GB” sites and vacant government land. Two stages of review on “GB” sites (“GB” review)<sup>1</sup> have been conducted. A site at Ta Ku Ling, Sai Kung (the Site) has been identified for development of housing under the second stage of “GB” review.
- 2.2 On 28.1.2022, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Board agreed that the amendments were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance. The relevant RNTPC Paper No. 1/22 is available at the Board’s website at [https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/688\\_rnt\\_agenda.html](https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/688_rnt_agenda.html) and extract of the minutes of the said RNTPC meeting is at **Annex V**. Accordingly, the OZP renumbered to S/SK-TLS/9 was gazetted on 25.2.2022.

## 3. **Local Consultation**

- 3.1 On 23.11.2021, the Housing, Planning and Environment Committee (HPEC) of Sai Kung District Council (SKDC) was consulted on the proposed amendments to the OZP. The SKDC members generally supported the proposal to increase housing land supply but expressed concerns on Amendment Item A including whether the existing Ta Ku Ling San Tsuen Access Road could be widened to serve the proposed development at the Site; whether the proposed access road could be connected with Ta Ku Ling San Tsuen Access Road to enhance connectivity; access right of the private lot within the Site; maintenance and management responsibility of the proposed access road; and compensation to the affected occupants of the temporary structures at the Site. Detailed views and comments of SKDC members are set out in the minutes of the HPEC meeting at **Annex VI**.
- 3.2 Relevant issues were further discussed at the HPEC meeting on 18.1.2022. In response to the SKDC members’ concerns raised at the HPEC meetings, relevant government departments including the Planning Department (PlanD), Lands Department (LandsD) and Highways Department (HyD), had issued replies in December 2021 and March 2022 (**Annex VII**).

---

<sup>1</sup> The first stage of “GB” review mainly covered “GB” areas which were formed, deserted or devegetated, but possessed potential for residential development. The second stage of “GB” review covered “GB” zones in the fringe of built-up areas close to existing urban areas and new towns. Vegetated “GB” sites with a relatively lower buffer or conservation value and adjacent to existing transport and infrastructure facilities would be reviewed for housing purpose.

- 3.3 On 25.2.2022, the draft OZP was gazetted for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance and SKDC members were invited to submit views on the amendments, if any, in writing to the Secretary of the Board during the exhibition period of the draft OZP. No representation or comment was received from SKDC members.

#### 4. **The Representation Site and its Surrounding Areas**

##### 4.1 **The Representation Site and its Surrounding Areas (Plans H-1 to H-4b)**

- 4.1.1 The Site (about 2.55ha), which is mainly on government land except one private lot (i.e. Lot 264 in D.D. 223), consists of two portions (**Plans H-2 and H-3**). Area (a) (about 1.79ha and ranging from about 110mPD to 150mPD) is situated on the existing terraces and vegetated downward slopes. The formed terraces at the northern portion of Area (a) are occupied by some squatters/temporary structures and a village house within the private lot. Some agricultural activities are found at the southern portion of Area (a). There is a level difference of about 40m to 70m between Area (a) and Clear Water Bay Road at about 183mPD to 187mPD. Area (b) (about 0.76ha and ranging from about 150mPD to 187mPD) is mainly occupied by vegetation on downward man-made and natural slopes. There are streams running along the boundaries of Area (a) and passing through Area (b) of the Site (**Plan H-2**). The existing vehicular access to/from the Site is via a local track from Ta Ku Ling San Tsuen Access Road and Clear Water Bay Road.
- 4.1.2 The Site abuts Clear Water Bay Road connecting to Hiram's Highway on the south. To the east and southeast of the Site are low-rise and low-density residential developments including Ta Ku Ling San Tsuen. To the north and west of the Site are vegetated slopes (**Plans H-2 and H-3**).
- 4.1.3 The Site is zoned "R(C)7" for private housing development. Area (a) includes an area designated for low-density private residential development and a private lot with an existing house. Area (b) is designated as non-building area (NBA) mainly for the associated access road and pedestrian facilities connecting with Clear Water Bay Road. The development in the "R(C)7" zone is subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 23,466m<sup>2</sup> in Areas (a) and (b) and a maximum BH of 7 storeys (24m) in Area (a). Assuming an average flat size of 70m<sup>2</sup>, it is estimated that about 330 flats can be provided. A Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE) cum Day Care Unit (DCU) is also proposed within the proposed residential development. The major development parameters are set out below:

Site Area (about)	2.55ha (total)	
	Area (a): 1.79ha <sup>(1)</sup>	Area (b): 0.76ha
Total GFA	23,466m <sup>2</sup> <sup>(2)</sup>	
BH	7 storeys (24m) (about 147.9mPD to 167mPD/ 20m to 24m)	No development is permitted within the NBA. To facilitate the provision of access connection with Clear Water
No. of Flats	330 <sup>(3)</sup>	
Social Welfare Facilities <sup>(4)</sup>	A 150-place RCHE cum 30-place DCU	

Parking Facilities	To be provided in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines	Bay Road, access road, pedestrian facilities and such related facilities may be allowed in the NBA.
--------------------	---	---

Note:

- (1) A private lot of 65.04m<sup>2</sup> is included in Area (a).
- (2) Including a GFA of about 23,270m<sup>2</sup> for the proposed residential development and a GFA of about 196m<sup>2</sup> for the existing house in private lot. The plot ratio of the proposed residential development is equivalent to about 1.3 in Area (a).
- (3) Assuming an average flat size of 70m<sup>2</sup>.
- (4) Government, institution or community facilities as required by the Government are exempted from GFA calculation and they have been included in the technical assessments.

#### 4.2 Planning Intention

The “R(C)” zone is intended primarily for low-rise, low-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Board.

### 5. The Representations and Comments on Representations

#### 5.1 Subject of Representations

5.1.1 Four representations were received. Amongst them, The Conservancy Association (**R1**) and an individual (**R2**) object to and HKCGC (**R4**) provides views on Amendment Item A, and an individual (**R3**) objects to the amendment to the Notes of the OZP.

5.1.2 The major grounds of representations and PlanD’s responses in consultation with relevant government bureau/departments are summarised in paragraph 5.2 below.

#### 5.2 Major Grounds and Views of Representations and Responses

##### Opposing Representations on Amendment Item A

##### 5.2.1 *Role of “GB” Zone*

Major Grounds	Representations
(1) The proposed housing development is against the planning intention of the “GB” zone. The Site, which has close linkage within the adjacent habitat, serves as a buffer area between residential area and ecologically sensitive area. As the Site is vegetated and can only be accessible with the provision of a new access road in the proposed “R(C)7” Area (b), the rezoning of the Site is not in line with the criteria of “GB” review. Rezoning the subject “GB” site for residential development would set an undesirable precedent for similar cases and affect	<b>R1 and R2</b>

the integrity of the habitats.	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>(a) In response to (1) above:</p> <p>To expedite housing land supply in the short-to-medium terms, various land use reviews are conducted. Two stages of “GB” review have been conducted. For the second stage, it covered “GB” zones in the fringe of built-up areas close to existing urban areas and new towns, and those vegetated “GB” sites with relatively less buffering effect and lower conservation value. The Site has been identified for private residential development and associated government, institution or community facilities in the second stage of “GB” review.</p> <p>The Site, which only takes up 1.8% of the “GB” zone on the Tseng Lan Shue OZP, is in close proximity to the cluster of low-rise residential developments in Ta Ku Ling such as Ta Ku Ling San Tsuen, with existing transport, infrastructure and supporting facilities, and has a relatively lower conservation value or buffer effect. Area (a) is occupied by existing man-made terraces with some squatters/temporary structures and a village house. Some agricultural activities are found at the southern portion of Area (a). Whilst Area (b) is covered by vegetation, the associated access road and pedestrian facilities are proposed to be in the form of elevated structures to minimise the potential impact on the existing vegetation. The Site has met the site selection criteria for the second stage of “GB” review and is considered suitable for private residential development. Relevant technical assessments conducted have concluded that the proposed development parameters and scale of the housing development including the RCHE cum DCU at the Site are technically feasible and compatible with the surrounding areas. According to the Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) conducted by HyD on the possible access road to connect with Area (a), the proposed access road is an optimal solution without insurmountable problems.</p>	

### 5.2.2 *Development Options for Increasing Housing Supply*

<b>Major Grounds</b>	<b>Representations</b>
(1) Alternative land supply options such as the use of brownfield and idle lands should be considered.	<b>R1</b>
(2) The proposed residential development would not be any type of affordable housing and could not meet the pressing need for affordable housing supply.	<b>R1 and R2</b>
(3) The proposed development intensity at the Site is more than a high side as compared with the permitted development intensity of the other “R(C)” sub-areas. Given the projected decline in population due to accelerated surge in emigration and a number of large scale residential developments under construction in Sai Kung, the proposed residential development will further	<b>R2</b>

increase the number of unoccupied units in Sai Kung.	
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>(a) In response to (1) above:</p> <p>There has been a persistent and acute demand for both public and private housing. According to the latest projection of the Long Term Housing Strategy (LTHS), the projected total housing supply target for the 10-year period (from 2022-23 to 2031-32) is 430,000 units, whilst the private housing supply target is 129,000 units. The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply progressively based on the land supply options as recommended by TFLS, including developing brownfield sites in the short to medium term, and New Development Area and reclamation outside Victoria Harbour in the medium to long term. To meet the acute housing demand in the short to medium term, the immediate and effective way of augmenting land supply is to make more optimal use of developed areas in urban areas and land in the vicinity of infrastructure, with changing land use as one of the means. Notwithstanding the pursuit of other land supply measures, the Site based on the second stage of “GB” review is considered suitable for the proposed private housing development.</p> <p>(b) In response to (2) and (3) above:</p> <p>As there is a need to maintain a healthy and stable development of private residential property market, the Government will continue to increase both land and housing supply to meet the long-term demand for private housing irrespective of the short-term fluctuation in the market. According to LTHS, the Government will update the long-term housing demand projection annually and work out a rolling 10-year housing supply target to capture the social, economic and market changes over time, and make timely adjustment where necessary. The vacancy situation in the private housing sector has been taken into account when the total housing supply target is derived.</p> <p>The development intensity of the proposed development with a maximum GFA of 23,466m<sup>2</sup> (equivalent to a PR of about 1.3 in Area (a)) is considered appropriate taking into consideration the planning context of the area<sup>2</sup> and the findings of relevant technical assessments. The proposed development also provided an opportunity to include social welfare facilities at the Site.</p>	

### 5.2.3 *Landscape and Ecological Aspects*

<b>Major Grounds</b>	<b>Representations</b>
(1) The proposed residential development will create adverse landscape and ecological impacts on the surrounding areas.	<b>R1 and R2</b>

<sup>2</sup> The permitted PRs and BHs of the residential developments in the “R(C)” zone sub-areas under the OZP are ranging from 0.25 to 1.5 and from two storeys to five storeys over one storey of carport respectively.

(2) According to the pre-land sale tree survey conducted by LandsD, approximately 981 trees of common species are identified within and near the Site. The tree survey of the EFS conducted by HyD indicates that 375 trees are identified in Area (b). As such, there are a total of about 1,356 trees. In view of the extensive site formation works for the proposed residential development, it is assumed that at least 1,000 trees would be felled.	<b>R2</b>
(3) It is concerned that adverse impact on the woodland would be under-estimated. In particular, some flora species of conservation importance have been recorded within the study area of the EFS. If these species are located within the development site, removing of these important flora species from the woodland would be inevitable.	<b>R1 and R2</b>
(4) There is no mention of transplanting or compensatory planting. There is a concern that existing mechanism for tree compensation and transplanted would be adopted to meet the target of tree compensation, which cannot re-create an equivalent ecological value and integrity of a habitat.	<b>R1 and R2</b>
(5) There are streamcourses running along the boundaries of Area (a) and passing through Area (b). Access to the main streamcourse would be severed.	<b>R2</b>

### Responses

(a) In response to (1) and (2) above:

According to the pre-land sale tree survey conducted by the landscape consultant of LandsD, there are totally 981 trees within and near the Site (including Areas (a) and (b)). The tree survey conducted under the EFS conducted by HyD also indicates that 375 trees are identified in Area (b). Given that the area of the Site is slightly smaller than the area covered by the tree survey conducted by LandsD, there are approximately 700 trees within the Site according to PlanD's estimation. The actual number of trees that would be felled would depend on the design layout of the proposed development.

The trees found in Areas (a) and (b) are mostly common trees and native woodland species. All the existing trees are in poor to fair health condition. According to the Landscape Assessment (**Annex VIII**), which includes the results of tree survey conducted by LandsD and comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, PlanD (CTP/UD&L, PlanD), it is anticipated that the general landscape of the Site will be modified to accommodate the proposed development as well as the associated site formation, geotechnical and other infrastructure works, such as the proposed access roads and pedestrian facilities. While irreversible adverse impacts on the existing vegetated area are anticipated, appropriate

landscape treatments, such as landscape treatments along the site boundary, greenery coverage, roadside planting and other quality landscape design, should be included in the residential development as well as the associated site formation and infrastructure works to ensure that it is compatible with the surrounding landscape setting.

(b) In response to (3) above:

According to the Ecological Impact Assessment conducted under the EFS, the Site is predominantly village/orchard, dry agricultural land and woodland mix. Two flora species with conservation importance, i.e. *Aquilaria sinensis* (土沉香) and *Cibotium Barometz* (金狗毛蕨), are found within the Site. Preservation of important plants in-situ by refining the alignment of the proposed road and/or transplantation will be considered at the detailed design stage. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) has no adverse comment on the proposed development and advises that Area (a) of the Site, which mainly covers area with man-made terraces and human settlement, has a low ecological value. The construction of the proposed access road and footpath at Area (b) would be subject to detailed design by the future developer to the satisfaction of relevant government departments, including the Transport Department, HyD and Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department.

(c) In response to (4) above:

Suitable landscaping and tree preservation clauses will be incorporated in the land sale conditions to preserve the existing trees as far as possible and minimise the impact arising from tree felling. Tree preservation and compensatory planting proposals as well as other necessary mitigation measures will be implemented by the future developer in accordance with Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 4/2020 on Tree Preservation and the Lands Administration Office Practice Note No. 2/2020 on Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal for Building Development in Private Projects - Compliance of Tree Preservation Clause under Lease, and that the greenery area with not less than 30% of the site area will be provided with reference to the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines.

(d) In response to (5) above:

There are streams running along the eastern boundary of Area (a) and passing through Area (b) (**Plan H-2**). According to the EFS, as no piles for the road works would need to be installed in the streambed, direct impacts on the streamcourse are not anticipated. Besides, diversion of the stream would not be required during construction of the proposed access road.

The Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department (CE/MS, DSD) advises that the proposed development would not cause any adverse drainage impact on the existing drainage system at upstream, adjacent to and at downstream of the Site. Depending on the proposed site formation and design layout of the Site, the future developer would need to preserve the stream with proposed elevated structure design in the

development and would have to take up the future maintenance of the streamcourse within the Site. Besides, the future developer is required to conduct a Drainage Impact Assessment and propose any necessary drainage upgrading works to the satisfaction of DSD. Such requirements would be incorporated in the land sale conditions of the Site at the land disposal stage as appropriate.

#### 5.2.4 *Provision of Social Welfare Facilities*

Major Grounds	Representation
(1) Provision of elderly facilities within the proposed residential development by private developer is not promising as the private developer would find some ways to get rid of providing such facilities.	<b>R2</b>
Responses	
<p>(a) In response to (1) above:</p> <p>The Social Welfare Department (SWD) has been adopting a multi-pronged approach with long, medium and short-term strategies and maintaining close liaison with relevant government departments to identify suitable accommodation for the provision of welfare facilities, so as to meet the ongoing welfare service needs of different districts. Under the existing mechanism, the Government will identify suitable land sale sites and require private developers through land sale conditions to design and construct bare-shell premises for the proposed welfare facilities according to the specifications of SWD. Upon completion of the construction works, SWD will take over the premises and select a suitable service operator through competitive bidding.</p> <p>The requirement for provision of a RCHE cum DCU at the Site has been included in the Explanatory Statement of the draft OZP. Such requirement would also be incorporated in the land sale conditions of the Site, as appropriate.</p>	

#### *Representation Providing Views on Amendment Item A*

#### 5.2.5 *Other Technical Aspect*

Major Views	Representation
(1) The future developer should evaluate the potential risk on the town gas pipelines in the vicinity of the Site along Clear Water Bay Road and recommend necessary mitigation measures. HKCGC should be consulted in the design and construction stages.	<b>R4</b>
Responses	
<p>(a) In response to (1) above:</p> <p>The Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS) advises that</p>	

the future developer would be required to undertake a quantitative risk assessment to assess the potential risks associated with the high pressure gas pipeline and implement mitigation measures if necessary to reduce the risk level. Moreover, the future developer should liaise with HKCGC in respect of the exact locations of existing and planned gas pipes/gas installations in the vicinity of the Site and any required minimum buffer distance from such installations during the design and construction stages of the development.

*Opposing Representation on Amendment to the Notes of the OZP*

5.2.6 *Exemption clause for “filling or excavation of land” in the Remarks of the “CA” zone*

Major Grounds	Representation
(1) Exemption of public works co-ordinated or implemented by Government which involve filling and excavation of land within the “CA” from the requirement of planning permission would result in insufficient control. For instance, the provision of a hiking trail in Tai Sheung Tok by the Government, which might involve excavation of land, has not obtained planning permission from the Board.	<b>R3</b>
Responses	
<p>(a) In response to (1) above:</p> <p>The incorporation of the ‘exemption clause’, i.e. exempting works involving filling or excavation of land pertaining to public works co-ordinated or implemented by Government from the requirement of planning application, in the “CA” zone of the draft OZP is in line with the latest revision of Master Schedule of Notes which was promulgated by the Board on 24.8.2021. The objective of including this exemption clause for the “CA” zone is to streamline the planning application process/mechanism. Whilst such works are exempted from planning permission, they still have to conform to any other relevant legislations, the conditions of the government lease concerned, and other government requirements, as may be applicable.</p> <p>The concerned hiking trail in Tai Sheung Tok forms part of the proposals of the Recommended Outline Development Plan for the Planning Study on Future Land Use at Anderson Road Quarry (ARQ) – Feasibility Study (the Feasibility Study) to provide improvement works to the existing local paths to connect the ARQ Site to the Wilson Trail Section No. 3. Relevant technical assessments were conducted under the Feasibility Study and there was no adverse comment from relevant government departments. Recommendations of the Feasibility Study, including the proposed hiking trails, were reported to the Board on 8.3.2013. The improvement works, which are being carried out by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), are scheduled for completion in mid-2023.</p>	

### 5.3 The Comments on Representations

There are two comments on representations submitted by Designing Hong Kong Limited (**C1**) and an individual (**C2**). **C1** supports the opposing representations (**R1** and **R2**) on similar grounds. **C2** (also **R2**), reiterates the views stated in the representation. As the major concerns raised in the comments are largely similar in nature to the grounds of representations **R1** and **R2**, the responses to the representations in paragraphs 5.2.1 to 5.2.3 above are relevant.

## 6. Departmental Consultation

6.1 The following government bureau/departments have been consulted and their comments have been incorporated in the above paragraphs, where appropriate:

- (a) Chief Estate Surveyor/ Land Supply, LandsD;
- (b) District Lands Officer/Sai Kung, LandsD;
- (c) Director of Social Welfare;
- (d) CTP/UD&L, PlanD;
- (e) DEMS;
- (f) CE/MS, DSD;
- (g) DAFC; and
- (h) Project Manager (East), CEDD;

6.2 The following government bureau/departments have been consulted and they have no comment on the representations and comments:

- (a) Secretary of Development;
- (b) Commissioner for Transport;
- (c) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, HyD;
- (d) Director of Environmental Protection;
- (e) District Officer (Sai Kung), Home Affairs Department;
- (f) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (g) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene;
- (h) Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department;
- (i) Chief Engineer (Geotechnical Engineering Office), CEDD;
- (j) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (k) Director of Fire Services; and
- (l) Commissioner of Police.

## 7. Planning Department's Views

7.1 The views provided in **R4** are noted.

7.2 Based on the assessments in paragraph 5 above, PlanD does not support **R1** to **R3** and considers that the OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

Amendment Item A

- (a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged strategy to increase housing land supply for both public and private housing including reviewing of “Green Belt” sites on an on-going basis. Taking into account that there is no insurmountable technical problems identified for the proposed housing development on traffic, landscape, ecology, environmental and drainage aspects, it is considered suitable for rezoning the representation site (the Site) to “Residential (Group C)7” for increasing the housing land supply (**R1** and **R2**);
- (b) the Site is intended for private housing development to maintain a healthy and stable development of private residential property market. The development intensity of the proposed development is considered appropriate taking into consideration the planning context and the findings of relevant technical assessments (**R1** and **R2**);
- (c) there is an existing mechanism for the Government to require the provision of social welfare facilities at suitable land sale sites. The requirement for provision of social welfare facilities in the development would be specified in the land sale conditions as appropriate (**R2**); and

Amendment to the Notes of the OZP

- (d) the incorporation of the exemption clause for filling or excavation of land pertaining to public works co-ordinated or implemented by Government is to streamline the planning process. Incorporation of this exemption clause for the “Conservation Area” zone is in line with the latest revision of the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (**R3**).

**8. Decision Sought**

- 8.1 The Board is invited to give consideration to the representations and the related comments taking into consideration the points raised in the hearing session, and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendment to the draft OZP to meet/partially meet the representations.
- 8.2 Should the Board decide that no amendment should be made to the draft OZP to meet the representations, Members are also invited to agree that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

**9. Attachments**

<b>Annex I</b>	Draft Tseng Lan Shue Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-TLS/9 (reduced size)
<b>Annex II</b>	Schedule of Amendments to the Approved Tseng Lan Shue Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-TLS/8
<b>Annex III</b>	Lists of Representers and Commenters
<b>Annex IV</b>	Submissions of Representations and Comments
<b>Annex V</b>	Extract of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Rural and New Town

	Planning Committee held on 28.1.2022
<b>Annex VI</b>	Extract of the Minutes of the Meeting of HPEC of SKDC held on 23.11.2022 (in Chinese only)
<b>Annex VII</b>	Written Replies in December 2021 and March 2022 in Response to SKDC Members' Follow-up Questions raised at the HPEC Meetings (in Chinese only)
<b>Annex VIII</b>	Landscape Assessment with Tree Survey Extracts
<b>Plan H-1</b>	Location Plan of the Representation Site
<b>Plan H-2</b>	Site Plan of the Representation Site
<b>Plan H-3</b>	Aerial Photo of the Representation Site
<b>Plans H-4a and H-4b</b>	Site Photos of the Representation Site

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**  
**AUGUST 2022**