

# **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**TPB Paper No. 11015**

**For Consideration by  
the Town Planning Board on 18.8.2025**

**DRAFT TAI PO OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/TP/31  
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/TP/31-R1 TO R958**

**DRAFT TAI PO OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/TP/31**  
**CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/TP/31-R1 TO R958**

Subject of Representations	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/TP/31-)
<p><b><u>Amendments to the Plan</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Amendment Item (Item) A1</u></b> Rezoning of a site at the junction of Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road from “Green Belt” (“GB”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A)11” (“R(A)11”) with stipulation of building height restriction (BHR).</p> <p><b><u>Item A2</u></b> Rezoning of a site at Ting Kok Road to the north of Fortune Garden from “GB” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(A)12” with stipulation of BHR.</p> <p><b><u>Item B</u></b> Rezoning of a site to the north of Shek Kwu Lung from “Open Space” (“O”) to “Government, Institution or Community (3)” (“G/IC(3)”) with stipulation of BHR.</p> <p><b><u>Item C1</u></b> Rezoning of two parcels of land adjoining <b>Items A1 and A2</b> along Ting Kok Road from areas shown as ‘Road’ to “GB”.</p> <p><b><u>Item C2</u></b> Rezoning of a strip of land to the east of <b>Item A2</b> along Ting Kok Road from “GB” to an area shown as ‘Road’.</p> <p><b><u>Item C3</u></b> Rezoning of two parcels of land to the north of Fortune Garden along Ting Kok Road from “Residential (Group C)1” (“R(C)1”) to areas shown as ‘Road’.</p>	<p><b><u>Total: 958</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Support Items A1 and A2 (Total: 6)</u></b> <b>R1 to R6:</b> Individuals</p> <p><b><u>Supports Item B (Total: 1)</u></b> <b>R7:</b> Ever Rest Limited</p> <p><b><u>Oppose Item A1 (Total: 4)</u></b> <b>R8 to R11:</b> Individuals</p> <p><b><u>Oppose Items A1 and A2 (Total: 945)</u></b> <b>R12:</b> 大埔鄉事委員會 (Tai Po Rural Committee (TPRC)) <b>R13:</b> 汀角路民生關注組 (Ting Kok Road Community Concern Group)</p> <p><b><u>Owners’ Incorporations (2)</u></b> <b>R14:</b> The Incorporated Owners of Casa Marina I <b>R15:</b> The Incorporated Owners of Casa Marina II</p> <p><b><u>Tai Po District Council (TPDC) Members (7)</u></b> <b>R16:</b> 駱小鸞 <b>R17:</b> 黃偉僊 <b>R18:</b> 林奕權 <b>R19:</b> 陳博智 <b>R20:</b> 胡綽謙 <b>R21:</b> 梅少峰 <b>R22:</b> Wong Pik Kiu</p> <p><b><u>Village Representatives (VRs)/Village Office (7)</u></b> <b>R98 and R104:</b> VRs of Lung Mei <b>R101:</b> Chairman of Ting Kok Village Office <b>R102, R103 and R105:</b> VRs of Ting Kok <b>R375:</b> VR of Sha Lan</p>

Subject of Representations	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/TP/31-)
<p><b><u>Item C4</u></b> Rezoning of a parcel of land to the north of Fortune Garden along Ting Kok Road from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(C)1”.</p> <p><b><u>Amendments to the Notes of the Plan</u></b></p> <p>(d) Incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1 of the Notes for “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone; and corresponding deletion of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “V” zone.</p> <p>(e) Incorporation of ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “V” zone.</p> <p>(f) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for “Site of Special Scientific Interest” (“SSSI”) zone on filling or excavation of land.</p>	<p><u>Private Companies (3)</u> <b>R196, R197 and R601</b></p> <p><u>Individuals (924)</u> <b>R23 to R97, R99, R100, R106 to R195, R198 to R374, R376 to R600, R602 to R954, R957 and R958</b></p> <p><b><u>Opposes Items A1, A2 and C3 (Total: 1)</u></b> <b>R955: Individual</b></p> <p><b><u>Opposes Items A1, A2, B, C4 and the Amendments to the Notes of the Plan (d) to (f) (Total: 1)</u></b> <b>R956: Individual</b></p>

Note:

- (a) The names of the representers are attached at **Annex III**. Soft copy of the submissions is sent to the Town Planning Board (the Board) Members via electronic means; and is also available for public inspection at the Board’s website at [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan\\_making/S\\_TP\\_31.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_TP_31.html) and the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department (PlanD) in North Point and Sha Tin. A set of hard copy is deposited at the Board’s Secretariat for Members’ inspection.
- (b) Among 945 representations opposing **Items A1** and **A2**, 925 representations were submitted in nine main types of standard formats: (i) R16 to R22, (ii) R33 to R35, (iii) R36 to R97, (iv) R98 to R192, (v) R193 to R200, (vi) R201 to R309, (vii) R310 to R359, (viii) R364 to R374 and (ix) R375 to R954.

## 1. **Introduction**

- 1.1 On 28.3.2025, the draft Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TP/31 (the Plan) at **Annex I**, together with the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES)<sup>1</sup>, 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 and its Notes is at **Annex II** and the locations of the amendment items are shown on **Plans H-1a** and **H-1b**.

<sup>1</sup> The Notes and ES are available at the Board’s website at:  
[https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan\\_making/S\\_TP\\_31/S\\_TP\\_31\\_s\\_tp\\_31\\_e.pdf](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_TP_31/S_TP_31_s_tp_31_e.pdf)

- 1.2 During the two-month statutory exhibition period, a total of 958 valid representations were received. On 11.7.2025, the Board agreed to consider all the representations collectively in one group.
- 1.3 This Paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations. The list of representers is at **Annex III**. The representers have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

## 2. **Background**

### ***Items A1 and A2 – Proposed Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS) Development at Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road (Plan H-1a)***

- 2.1 As part of the Government's multi-pronged strategy to increase land and housing supply in the short-to-medium term, a proposed framework of the LSPS was put forward in the 2018 Policy Address (PA) with further details in the 2019 PA. The LSPS aims to unleash the development potential of private land with consolidated ownership that is outside specified environmentally sensitive areas and not covered by Government's completed, ongoing and soon-to-commence development studies in order to boost both public and private housing supply.
- 2.2 On 19.7.2021, a LSPS Application for the sites at Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road in Tai Po (the LSPS Sites) was submitted to the Development Bureau (DEVB) for consideration and subsequently endorsed in principle by the Steering Committee on Land and Housing Supply (SCLHS) chaired by the Financial Secretary under the delegated authority from the Chief Executive in Council (CE-in-C) on 6.12.2023. To take forward the proposed LSPS development, a site at the junction of Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road (the LSPS Site A) and a site at Ting Kok Road to the north of Fortune Garden (the LSPS Site B) have been rezoned from "GB" and areas shown as 'Road' to "R(A)11" for public housing development (**Item A1**) and "R(A)12" for private housing development (**Item A2**) respectively.

### ***Item B – Existing Religious Institution and Columbarium Uses at "Ever Rest Temple" (常寂園) (Plan H-1b)***

- 2.3 On 10.11.2023, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the RNTPC) of the Board agreed to a section 12A application (No. Y/TP/36) for rezoning a site to the north of Shek Kwu Lung from "O" to "G/IC(3)" for regularising the existing religious institution and columbarium uses under the name of "Ever Rest Temple" (常寂園). The applicant originally proposed 'Columbarium' use under Column 2 that might be permitted on application to the Board. In view that the applicant had submitted detailed development proposal with supporting technical assessments, and there would have control mechanism on the details and technical requirements of the columbarium use under the licencing regime of the prevailing Private Columbaria Ordinance (PCO) and land administrative regime, the RNTPC agreed to put 'Columbarium' under always permitted Column 1 use subject to a maximum building height (BH) of two storeys and a maximum number of 763 niches as proposed by the applicant so as to streamline

the development control process. To take forward the RNTPC's decision, the site has been rezoned to "G/IC(3)" (**Item B**).

***Items C1 to C4 – Reflecting the As-built Road Alignment of Ting Kok Road Section adjoining/in proximity to the LSPS Sites and to the North of Fortune Garden (Plan H-1a)***

- 2.4 Various parcels of land along the Ting Kok Road section adjoining/in proximity to the LSPS Sites and to the north of Fortune Garden have been rezoned from "GB" and "R(C)1" to areas shown as 'Road' (**Items C2 and C3**) and from areas shown as 'Road' to "GB" and "R(C)1" (**Items C1 and C4**) as technical amendments to reflect the as-built road alignment.

*Amendments to the Notes and ES of the OZP*

- 2.5 The following amendments to the Notes of the OZP have been made:

"R(A)" zone

- (i) in relation to **Items A1 and A2**, the Remarks of the Notes for "R(A)" zone have been revised to incorporate the development restrictions for the new "R(A)11" and "R(A)12" sub-zones;
- (ii) in relation to **Item A1**, 'Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle (on land designated "R(A)1" and "R(A)10" only))' has been revised to 'Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle (on land designated "R(A)1", "R(A)10" and "R(A)11" only))' under Column 1 of the Notes for "R(A)" zone;

"G/IC(3)" sub-zone

- (iii) in relation to **Item B**, a set of Notes for "G/IC(3)" sub-zone has been incorporated with development restrictions; and

Technical Amendments

- (iv) opportunity has also been taken to revise the Notes of the OZP based on the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN).

- 2.6 The ES of the OZP has been suitably revised in view of the above amendments as well as to update the general information for various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the Planning Scheme Area and to incorporate certain technical revisions.

*The Draft OZP*

- 2.7 On 28.2.2025, the RNTPC agreed that the proposed amendments to the approved Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/30 were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance for public inspection. The relevant RNTPC Paper No. 2/25 is

available at the Board's website<sup>2</sup> and the extract of the minutes of the RNTPC meeting is at **Annex V**. Subsequently, the draft Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/31 was gazetted on 28.3.2025.

### 3. **Local Consultation**

#### *Prior to Submission of the Proposed Amendments to the RNTPC*

- 3.1 The TPRC, TPDC and Tai Po North Area Committee (TPNAC) were consulted on the proposed amendments to the OZP (**Items A1, A2 and B**) on 9.12.2024, 7.1.2025 and 16.1.2025 respectively. Subsequently, a letter from TPRC summarising their comments/concerns has been received on 13.1.2025 (**Annex VI**).
- 3.2 Members of TPRC, TPDC and TPNAC expressed concerns on the proposed LSPS development under **Items A1 and A2**, which are mainly related to site selection and availability of alternative sites; compatibility with the surrounding areas with predominately low-density developments; efficiency and urgency of the proposed LSPS development; adequacy of road capacity in the area to cater for the traffic demand; effectiveness and adequacy of the proposed traffic improvement works; need for road improvement works along Ting Kok Road even without the proposed LSPS development; concerns on traffic safety along Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road; location of proposed ingress/egress of the LSPS Site A; adequacy of public transport services and car parking provision; cumulative impacts of the increasing population along Ting Kok Road; possible disturbance to the nearby permitted burial grounds; adequacy of supporting facilities to serve the residents of the proposed LSPS development (e.g. retail facilities, schools and health care services); visual impacts to local residents and visitors; landscape impacts after the removal of trees; potential environmental, ecological and geotechnical impacts; and concerns on public safety/security issues arising from the proposed LSPS development. The TPDC Members are supportive of the Government's efforts in finding land to increase housing supply, but the proposed LSPS development should not be proceeded unless the public concerns are addressed.
- 3.3 Details of the TPDC Members' views and comments as well as responses from relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) are outlined in the minutes of the TPDC meeting on 7.1.2025 at **Annex VII**. All concerns stated in paragraph 3.2 above and responses from relevant B/Ds have been incorporated into paragraphs 10.3 and 10.4 of the RNTPC Paper No. 2/25.
- 3.4 Besides, during the processing of the section 12A application (No. Y/TP/36) relating to **Item B**, the application was published for public comments in accordance with the provision under the pre-amended Ordinance<sup>3</sup>. In considering the section 12A application on 10.11.2023, the RNTPC had taken into account the public comments received during the publication period.

---

<sup>2</sup> The RNTPC Paper No. 2/25 is available at the Board's website at:  
[https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/760\\_rnt\\_agenda.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/760_rnt_agenda.html).

<sup>3</sup> The "pre-amended Ordinance" refers to the Ordinance as in force immediately before 1.9.2023.

*Upon Gazettal of the Draft OZP*

- 3.5 During the exhibition period of the draft OZP, TPRC and TPDC Members were notified on 28.3.2025 that members of the public could submit representations on the amendments in writing to the Secretary of the Board. In addition, as Ting Kok Road Concern Group and the owners' incorporations of nearby eight private residential developments (i.e. Tycoon Place, Villa Lucca, Casa Marina I, Casa Marina II, Richwood Park, Forest Hill, Fortune Garden and The Beverly Hills) expressed concerns on the proposed LSPS development under **Items A1** and **A2** via letters received in January 2025, the said notification was also delivered to them on 28.3.2025. A total of 11 valid representations have been received from TPRC (**R12**), seven TPDC Members (**R16** to **R22**), Ting Kok Road Concern Group (**R13**) and the Incorporated Owners of Casa Marina I and Casa Marina II (**R14** and **R15**).

**4. The Representation Sites and their Surrounding Areas**

*Representation Sites under **Items A1** and **A2***

- 4.1 Representation site under **Item A1** (**Item A1** site/the LSPS Site A) (about 2.03 ha<sup>4</sup>) is located at the junction of Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road, and the representation site under **Item A2** (**Item A2** site/the LSPS Site B) (about 0.70 ha<sup>5</sup>) is located at Ting Kok Road to the north of Fortune Garden. Both sites are mainly vegetated slopes, which abut Lo Fai Road and/or Ting Kok Road but without direct vehicular access (**Plans H-2a** and **H-3a**).
- 4.2 The surrounding areas are predominantly rural in character comprising vegetated slopes, low-rise residential developments, village houses, Tai Po InnoPark and the former Shuen Wan Landfill (which is currently restored). To the north are vegetated slopes and low-rise residential developments along Lo Fai Road (including Tycoon Place, Villa Lucca, Casa Marina I, Casa Marina II, Richwood Park and Forest Hill). To the east are vegetated slopes, village houses at Wong Yue Tan and The Beverly Hills. To the south across Ting Kok Road are Fortune Garden, an area zoned "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Golf Course" on the OZP at the former Shuen Wan Landfill and Tai Po InnoPark. To the west are village houses at Ha Hang (**Plans H-1a, H-2a, H-3a, H-4a** and **H-4b**).
- 4.3 The proposed LSPS development consists of public and private housing developments. **Item A1** site has been rezoned to "R(A)11" for a proposed public housing development, subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 65,522m<sup>2</sup> (equivalent to total plot ratio (PR) of about 3.23) and a maximum BH of 83mPD. In addition, **Item A2** site has been rezoned to "R(A)12" for a proposed private housing development with a roundabout at the western portion,

---

<sup>4</sup> Site area of **Item A1** site includes additional Government land of about 3,797m<sup>2</sup> to optimise the development potential of the site.

<sup>5</sup> Site area of **Item A2** site includes the proposed roundabout with associated retaining wall/cut slope of about 1,313m<sup>2</sup>.

subject to a maximum GFA of 23,000m<sup>2</sup> (equivalent to total PR of about 4.04) and a maximum BH of 80mPD. The proposed roundabout at the western portion of **Item A2** site will be constructed by the LSPS Applicant. The proposed layout plans and section plans of the indicative LSPS Development Scheme are shown at **Drawings H-1a to H-2c (Drawings H-1a, H-2a and H-2b for Item A1 site and Drawings H-1b and H-2c for Item A2 site)**. Major development parameters of the proposed LSPS development are summarised below:

<b>Development Proposal</b>	<b>Public Housing Portion at LSPS Site A (Item A1)</b>	<b>Private Housing Portion at LSPS Site B (Item A2)</b>
Development Site Area (about)	2.03 ha	0.57 ha <sup>(a)</sup>
Total GFA - Domestic (about) <sup>(b)</sup> - Non-domestic (about)	Not more than 65,522m <sup>2</sup> 64,522m <sup>2</sup> 1,000m <sup>2(c)(d)</sup>	Not more than 23,000m <sup>2</sup> 23,000m <sup>2</sup> N/A
Housing Mix in Domestic GFA (about)	70% (public housing) / 30% (private housing) <sup>(e)</sup>	
Maximum BH	Not more than 83mPD <sup>(f)</sup>	Not more than 80mPD
No. of Storeys	18 to 21 storeys (including podium with 1 to 3 storeys)	18 storeys (including a 1-storey basement for car park)
No. of Blocks	5 residential towers above podium and 1 car park block	1 residential tower
No. of Units	1,290	460
Average Flat Size (about)	50m <sup>2(g)</sup>	50m <sup>2</sup>
Estimated Population	3,612 <sup>(g)</sup>	1,288
Supporting Facilities	- Retail Facilities - Government, Institution and Community (GIC) Facilities <sup>(h)</sup>	N/A
Local Open Space	Not less than 3,612m <sup>2</sup>	Not less than 1,288m <sup>2</sup>
Parking and Loading/Unloading (L/UL) Provision		
- Private Car Parking Spaces	176	143
- Motorcycle Parking Spaces	15	6
- Light Goods Vehicle Bays	6	N/A
- Heavy Goods Vehicle Bays	11	1
- Bicycle Parking Spaces	172	62



Note:

- (a) Development site area of **Item A2** site excludes the proposed roundabout with associated retaining wall/cut slope of about 0.13 ha.
- (b) The resultant domestic PR for public and private housing portions based on the development site area are 3.18 and 4.04 respectively.
- (c) Proposed non-domestic GFA of about 1,000m<sup>2</sup> is designated for retail facilities.
- (d) The proposed car park block and GIC facilities as required by the Government would be exempted from GFA calculation.
- (e) In calculating the housing mix under the LSPS, domestic GFA of about 10,855m<sup>2</sup> generated from inclusion of additional Government land (about 3,797m<sup>2</sup>) in **Item A1** site for enlarged public housing development is not included. If the said domestic GFA of about 10,855m<sup>2</sup> is taken into account, the housing mix of public housing / private housing would be 74% / 26%.
- (f) BH of 83mPD is currently proposed under the LSPS Development Scheme, which is slightly higher than the proposed BH of 80mPD in the previous LSPS Development Scheme with in-principle endorsement by the CE-in-C on 6.12.2023, due to the proposed adoption of Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) method. Floor-to-floor height of 3m has been assumed to allow for the adoption of MiC method.
- (g) In accordance with the “Guidelines for Planning of Site Formation of the Public Housing/Starter Homes Portion and Provision of Infrastructure and GIC Facilities” under LSPS, the assumptions of average flat size and average household size for the public housing portion are 50m<sup>2</sup> in GFA and 2.8 persons per flat respectively.
- (h) Area equivalent to about 5% of the total attainable domestic GFA of the public housing development at **Item A1** site would be set aside for the provision of social welfare facilities as per the 2020 PA. The types of facilities are subject to discussion by relevant B/Ds at the detailed design stage.

*Representation Site under Item B*

- 4.4 Representation site under **Item B** (**Item B** site) (about 0.04ha) is located to the north of Shek Kwu Lung at a secluded location screened by roadside slopes, vegetation and trees, which is occupied by the religious institution and columbarium uses known as “Ever Rest Temple” (常寂園). **Item B** site is located in the southeastern portion of Mui Shue Hang near the toe of a vegetated slope bounded by Tai Po Tai Wo Road to the south and Mui Shue Hang Playground to the north, northeast and northwest, while it is outside Mui Shue Hang Playground but accessible via a shared footpath (about 120m) and a separate footpath (about 50m) through the playground (**Plans H-1b, H-2b, H-3b and H-4c**).
- 4.5 To take forward the agreed section 12A application (No. Y/TP/36), **Item B** site has been rezoned to “G/IC(3)” to regularise the religious institution and columbarium uses, with ‘Religious Institution’ and ‘Columbarium’ as Column 1 uses subject to a maximum BH of two storeys and a maximum number of niches of 763. Based on the individual merits of a development or redevelopment proposal, minor relaxation of these restrictions may be considered by the Board on application under section 16 application. According to the applicant, there are three buildings of one to two-storey high for religious institution and/or columbarium use(s), three walls of about 3m high, an ancillary office, a proposed toilet and a Buddha statue, providing a total of 763 niches and 49 memorial tablets within **Item B** site. The detailed development proposal submitted by the applicant is at **Drawing H-7**.

*Representation Sites under Items C1 to C4*

- 4.6 Representation sites under **Items C1 to C4** (**Items C1 to C4** sites) cover various parcels of land along Ting Kok Road section adjoining/in proximity to **Items A1** and **A2** sites and to the north of Fortune Garden (**Plans H-1a, H-2a, H-3a and H-4d to H-4i**). Along the Ting Kok Road eastbound, **Item C1** site (about

0.69 ha) comprising two parcels of land adjoining **Items A1** and **A2** sites respectively has been rezoned to “GB” and **Item C2** site (about 0.86 ha), which is a strip of land to the east of **Item A2** site, has been rezoned to an area shown as ‘Road’. Along the Ting Kok Road westbound and to the north of Fortune Garden, two parcels of land under **Item C3** site (about 0.61 ha) have been rezoned to areas shown as ‘Road’ and a parcel of land under **Item C4** site (about 0.03 ha) has been rezoned to “R(C)1”. Rezoning of these items is to reflect the as-built road alignment of Ting Kok Road.

## 5. Planning Intentions

The planning intentions of the zones in relation to the above representation sites are as follows:

- (a) the “R(A)11 and “R(A)12” zones under **Items A1** and **A2** respectively are intended primarily for high-density residential developments. Commercial uses are always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building;
- (b) the “G/IC(3)” zone under **Item B** is intended primarily for religious institution and columbarium uses;
- (c) the “GB” zone under **Item C1** is intended primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone; and
- (d) the “R(C)1” zone under **Item C4** 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.

## 6. The Representations

### 6.1 Subject of Representations

- 6.1.1. During the two-month exhibition period, 958 valid representations were received, including six supporting **Items A1** and **A2**, one supporting **Item B**, four opposing **Item A1**, 945 opposing **Items A1** and **A2**, and two opposing **Items A1, A2, B, C3, C4** and/or amendments to the Notes of the OZP.
- 6.1.2. Six representations supporting **Items A1** and **A2** were submitted by individuals (**R1** to **R6**), while one representation supporting **Item B** was submitted by Ever Rest Limited (i.e. the applicant of the section 12A application No. Y/TP/36) (**R7**).
- 6.1.3. Four representations opposing **Item A1** were submitted by individuals (**R8** to **R11**). 945 representations opposing **Items A1** and **A2** were submitted by TPRC (**R12**), Ting Kok Road Community Concern Group

(**R13**), the Incorporated Owners of Casa Marina I and Casa Marina II (**R14** and **R15**), TPDC Members (**R16** to **R22**), VRs/Village Office (**R98**, **R101** to **R105** and **R375**), private companies (**R196**, **R197** and **R601**) and other individuals (**R23** to **R97**, **R99**, **R100**, **R106** to **R195**, **R198** to **R374**, **R376** to **R600**, **R602** to **R954**, **R957** and **R958**). Among 945 representations opposing **Items A1** and **A2**, 925 representations were submitted in nine main types of standard formats, including 286 representations providing additional grounds/views on top of the standard formats.

6.1.4. One representation from an individual opposes **Items A1, A2** and **C3 (R955)**, while another representation from an individual opposes **Items A1, A2, B, C4** and amendments to the Notes of the OZP (**R956**).

6.1.5. The major grounds/views of the representations, along with PlanD's responses in consultation with the relevant government B/Ds, are summarised in paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3 below. The major grounds/views of the representations are indexed at **Annex IV**.

## 6.2 Supportive Representations

### 6.2.1. **Items A1 and A2**

<b>Major Grounds/Views</b>	
(S-A1)	The proposed LSPS development will increase housing supply, which is beneficial to the future development of Tai Po District.
(S-A2)	Tai Po District is already a well-developed community, and retention of the subject "GB" zone is considered not necessary.
(S-A3)	While the proposed LSPS development is supported, it is suggested to enhance the car parking provision with due considerations on traffic capacity and road design in the area.
<b>Responses</b>	
(a)	<p>In response to (S-A1) to (S-A3):</p> <p>The supportive views are noted.</p> <p>Regarding the suggestion on car parking provision, the responses in paragraph 6.3.1.3 (d) below are relevant.</p>

### 6.2.2. **Item B**

<b>Major Grounds/Views</b>	
(S-B1)	<b>Item B</b> intends to reflect the section 12A application No. Y/TP/36 approved by the RNTPC of the Board on 10.11.2023.

(S-B2)	The rezoning application aims to regularise the columbarium use under the name of “Ever Rest Temple”, which complies with the prevailing PCO and is in line with the Government’s intention to relieve the urgent demand for niches in Hong Kong.
(S-B3)	The columbarium use is small in scale and supported by technical assessments. Relevant B/Ds had no objection to or no comment on the rezoning application from traffic, environmental, drainage, sewerage and geotechnical perspectives.
<b>Responses</b>	
(a)	In response to (S-B1) to (S-B3):  The supportive views are noted.

### 6.3 Adverse Representations

#### 6.3.1 **Items A1 and A2**

##### 6.3.1.1 *LSPS Mechanism*

<b>Major Grounds/Views</b>	
(A1)	<p>The LSPS Applicant has abused the LSPS. The land contributed by the LSPS Applicant under the LSPS Development Scheme is far less than that he/she should have contributed. While the Government has contributed considerable Government land to the proposed LSPS development, there is limited land and number of units designated for public housing. The proposed LSPS development, which requires incorporation of Government land and support from government funding and planning efforts, goes against the original intention of LSPS to integrate private land for housing development. Such imbalance deviates from the principles of “land sharing” under the LSPS.</p> <p>Should the costs of site formation for the public housing development and other infrastructure works be deductible from land premium, the Government is unlikely to gain any profit. High quality land should be reserved for land sale, rather than for the LSPS. It appears that the LSPS Applicant leverages policy support and Government land for making profit and reducing their development costs and risks.</p>
(A2)	The proposed LSPS development is a non-in-situ land exchange in nature and it is uncertain whether the prevailing legislations would allow such land exchange to be applied to the LSPS. The LSPS allows the developers to acquire fragmented plots of land and exchange them with the Government without paying premium, circumventing their land costs. Clarifications should be provided

	<p>on how to prevent developers from exploiting this mechanism and thus avoid affecting the land supply for public housing.</p> <p>Additional Government land for generating domestic GFA of 10,855m<sup>2</sup> for public housing development at <b>Item A1</b> site has not been included in the rezoning.</p>
(A3)	<p>There is no shortage of housing supply in Hong Kong, taking into account abundance of unsold flats under the current weak property market and the crackdown of public housing abuse. Also, the Northern Metropolis and Kau Yi Chau Artificial Islands, amongst other land supply initiatives, would provide adequate housing supply in the future.</p> <p>The LSPS is a transitional and obsolete arrangement, which would be a waste of public resources and violation of overall planning directions. Also, it is not necessary/urgent to provide new public housing estate in Tai Po District, since Fu Tip Estate and the two transitional housing developments in Tai Po (i.e. Lok Sin Village at Wong Yue Tan and Good House at Shuen Wan) (<b>Plan H-5</b>) have recently been completed.</p>
(A4)	<p>The LSPS should take into account public views and should not be implemented without public support. For the proposed LSPS development, the planning procedures lack transparency and relevant assessments are not provided to support rezoning. Also, the public consultation process as required for section 12A application under the Ordinance has been bypassed.</p> <p>TPRC has consulted the VRs, villagers, owners' incorporations, residents and relevant stakeholders, who have expressed opposition to the proposed LSPS development. Their concerns should be taken into account.</p> <p>The consultation period for such a large-scale development should be extended with higher transparency and inclusiveness. Holistic assessments on all relevant aspects should be conducted and made available for the public inspection.</p>
<b>Responses</b>	
(a)	<p>In response to (A1) and (A2):</p> <p>As part of the Government's multi-pronged strategy to increase land and housing supply in the short-to-medium term, the LSPS aims to unleash the development potential of private lots outside specified environmentally sensitive areas and not covered by the Government's planning efforts in order to boost both public and private housing supply. Essentially, the Government will facilitate necessary infrastructural upgrading that will enhance development intensity of the private lot(s) constituting LSPS application site, subject to the condition that the applicant will hand over part of their</p>

	<p>land, in the form of formed land, to the Government for public housing development.</p> <p>Each LSPS application should also meet the minimum requirements on housing gain i.e. (i) the LSPS application should be capable of delivering an increased domestic GFA of not less than 50,000m<sup>2</sup> and at least 1,000 additional housing units (assuming an average flat size of 50m<sup>2</sup>); and (ii) not less than 70% of the increased domestic GFA are set aside for public housing development. The proposed LSPS development in relation to <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> duly meets the said requirements on housing gain as stipulated under the LSPS guidance notes. Additional Government land for generating domestic GFA of 10,855m<sup>2</sup> for public housing under the proposed LSPS development has already been included in the rezoning under <b>Item A1</b>.</p> <p>In particular, it involves no abuse or non-in-situ land exchange, taking into account that LSPS indeed requires the LSPS Applicant to surrender its private land (i.e. private land within <b>Item A1</b> site) principally for the said proposed public housing development, while the remaining private land (i.e. private land within <b>Item A2</b> site) could be retained by the LSPS Applicant for private housing development, both through the established approvals required under the current planning procedure and the prospective land administrative procedure. CE-in-C has agreed such LSPS framework in 2020. It should be noted that cost of site formation for public housing, and construction of infrastructure and utilities in support of the whole <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites would be borne by the LSPS Applicant subject to premium assessment.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (A3):</p> <p>To catch up on land supply to meet the housing demand, the Government will continue to adopt a multi-pronged strategy to increase land supply in the short, medium and long term, through the continued and systematic implementation of a series of measures, including the LSPS. According to the Long Term Housing Strategy Annual Progress Report 2024, the Government set the housing supply target at 440,000 units to meet the housing demand in the next 10 years. Among which, the public housing supply target will be 308,000 units, and the private housing supply target will be 132,000 units. Concerted efforts by the Government (including the implementation of the LSPS) to identify suitable land for housing development shall persist. Should there be any other potential sites considered suitable for housing developments, relevant B/Ds would proceed to review their feasibility and suitability as appropriate with a view to increasing the housing land supply. <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites are considered suitable for public and private housing developments respectively.</p>

(c)	<p>In response to (A4):</p> <p>The eligibility criteria and implementation arrangements of the LSPS, including a three-stage approach to handle LSPS applications in a facilitating manner with a view to ensuring speedy delivery of housing yield of the LSPS, are endorsed by the CE-in-C and have been published for public information.</p> <p>All LSPS applications are processed in procedures comparable to the established procedure for section 12A application under the Ordinance. In Stage 1, technical assessments should be conducted and submitted in support of the LSPS applications. In Stage 2, upon receipt and vetting by the dedicated and multi-disciplinary team of government officers (i.e. the Land Sharing Office (LSO) of DEVB) in consultation with relevant B/Ds in Stage 1, the LSPS applications (together with public comments taken into account) would be put to the LSPS Panel of Advisors (the Panel) for independent and third-party opinion. Those cases receiving support from the Panel would then be submitted to the CE-in-C or SCLHS under the authority delegated by the CE-in-C for endorsement in principle. The endorsed LSPS applications would enter into Stage 3 which involves two parts – the statutory processes (mainly on town planning and road/sewerage works gazettal) and the land administrative procedures. The Government has been striving to maintain the transparency of LSPS applications and would not deprive any parties of the chance of public consultation and engagement in the process. As part of the public consultation process, the proposed LSPS development was published on DEVB's website<sup>6</sup> and all comments received from the public have been properly brought to the Panel and SCLHS.</p> <p>To take forward the proposed LSPS development, the corresponding amendments to the OZP are required and the statutory procedures for consulting the public on plan making have been duly followed. As mentioned in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.3 above, the TPRC, TPDC and TPNAC were consulted on <b>Items A1 and A2</b> prior to submission of the proposed amendments to the OZP to the RNTPC for consideration. Their comments/concerns and the responses from relevant B/Ds have been summarised in the relevant RNTPC paper considered by the RNTPC on 28.2.2025. The draft Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/31, incorporating, among others, <b>Items A1 and A2</b>, was exhibited for public inspection for two months pursuant to section 5 of the Ordinance on 28.3.2025. In accordance with section 6(1) of the Ordinance, any representation in respect of a draft plan shall be made within two months of the exhibition period, while there is no provision in the Ordinance to extend the</p>
-----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---

<sup>6</sup> Details of the LSPS application (No. LSPS/001) in relation to **Items A1 and A2** is available at the DEVB's website at:  
[https://www.devb.gov.hk/en/issues\\_in\\_focus/land\\_sharing\\_pilot\\_scheme/land\\_sharing\\_pilot\\_scheme\\_applications/application\\_received/index.html](https://www.devb.gov.hk/en/issues_in_focus/land_sharing_pilot_scheme/land_sharing_pilot_scheme_applications/application_received/index.html)

	<p>said exhibition period. All representations received will be considered by the Board at the hearing meeting(s) and persons who made the representations have been invited to attend the meeting(s) to present their views to the Board. The Board after consideration of all representations would decide whether to propose/not propose any amendment to the OZP to meet/partially meet the representations.</p> <p>Relevant technical assessments have been conducted by the LSPS Applicant to assess the potential impacts arising from the proposed LSPS development on traffic and transport, visual, landscape, air ventilation, environmental, drainage, sewerage, water supply, ecological and geotechnical aspects to support the zoning amendments to facilitate the proposed LSPS development. The findings of these technical assessments have demonstrated that the proposed LSPS development are technically feasible and there is no insurmountable technical problem identified. The relevant B/Ds have no objection to or no adverse comments on the proposed LSPS development. In taking forward the necessary infrastructural works including road and sewerage works pertaining to the proposed LSPS development, the existing public consultation procedures as required under relevant ordinance(s) would be followed. Besides, the views of relevant stakeholders received have also been conveyed to the LSPS Applicant for necessary follow-up at the detailed design stage.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

#### 6.3.1.2 Site Context and Selection

Major Grounds/Views	
(B1)	<p><b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites are not suitable for the proposed LSPS development as it is not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone. As <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites are located on hill slopes, there would be extensive site formation works, which would involve high construction costs and removal of trees.</p> <p>The areas surrounding the <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites have been over-populated and overcrowded without spare capacity to accommodate additional residential development, and infrastructure should be improved prior to the proposed LSPS development. The development intensity of the proposed LSPS development is too high and could further be increased through minor relaxation mechanism under the OZP.</p>
(B2)	<p>The proposed LSPS development would alter the unique local characters of the area, which has been developed as a high-end and low-rise community, well-preserved to allow a desirable environment for the Education University of Hong Kong (EdUHK) (<b>Plan H-5</b>) and retained for tourist and leisure/recreational spots.</p>



(B3)	<p>Public housing developments at remote locations (like <b>Item A1</b> site) would waste public resources, and future residents will have higher financial burden and long travelling time for daily commuting.</p> <p>Also, there are lack of retail facilities (including markets/supermarkets/convenience stores) and GIC/supporting facilities nearby. The proposed retail facilities with non-domestic GFA of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> at <b>Item A1</b> site are insufficient to meet the demand, and there is concern that the future residents would be required to travel to the Tai Po town centre for daily necessity.</p> <p>It is suggested not to pursue the proposed LSPS development at <b>Item A1</b> site or to locate the proposed public housing development at <b>Item A2</b> site instead.</p>
<b>Responses</b>	
(a)	<p>In response to (B1) and (B2):</p> <p>The proposed LSPS development is in line with the policy objective of LSPS to unleash the development potential of the private lots with a view to increasing both public and private housing supply in the short-to-medium term. The subject LSPS application was supported by the Panel after taking into account the site context and technical assessments conducted by the LSPS Applicant.</p> <p>Given that <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites are situated along Ting Kok Road at the fringe of Tai Po New Town with a cluster of low-rise residential developments and village houses in the proximity (<b>Plan H-5</b>), the proposed residential developments at <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites with total PRs of about 3.23 and 4.04 respectively are considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas from land use planning perspective. Minor relaxations of BHR and GFA may be considered by the Board on application under section 16 of the Ordinance on its own merits, which should be supported by relevant justifications and assessments.</p> <p>The EdUHK (<b>Plan H-5</b>) is located to the further north of <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites at an uphill location and bounded by the existing low-rise residential developments to its south. As such, from land use compatibility perspective, the proposed residential developments at <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites are considered not in conflict with adjacent university development. Besides, there are tourist and leisure/recreational spots in this area, which are mainly concentrated in Ting Kok and Tai Mei Tuk (e.g. Tsz Shan Monastery, Tai Po Lung Mei Beach, the main dam of Plover Cove Reservoir, barbecue sites, etc.), which are located away from <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites. <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites located relatively near the Tai Po town centre are considered suitable for residential developments.</p> <p>For the concerns on construction costs and tree removal, the Project Strategy and Governance Office of DEVB will scrutinise the LSPS</p>

	Applicant's proposal thoroughly to ensure that the proposed works are cost-effective and the responses in paragraph 6.3.1.5 (a) below are relevant respectively.
(b)	<p>In response to (B3):</p> <p>To support the proposed LSPS development, proposed retail facilities with non-domestic GFA of about 1,000m<sup>2</sup> will be provided at <b>Item A1</b> site to serve the basic daily needs of the future residents. In addition, there are currently two public markets managed by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) in Tai Po District, namely Plover Cove Road Market and Tai Po Hui Market, and five markets managed by the Link Asset Management Limited, namely Tai Yuen Market, Tai Wo Market, Kwong Fuk Market, Fu Shin Market and Fu Heng Market. At the detailed design stage, the Housing Authority (HA) will take into account factors such as the scale of the proposed development at the detailed design stage, the provision of nearby shopping centres and retail facilities, as well as the viability and appropriateness of the relevant facilities from both operational and financial perspectives to formulate suitable retail provision.</p> <p>As per the 2020 PA, area equivalent to about 5% of the total attainable domestic GFA of the public housing development at <b>Item A1</b> site would be set aside for the provision of social welfare facilities. The exact types of facilities to be provided are subject to further discussion by relevant B/Ds at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Regarding the views that <b>Item A2</b> site is for the public housing development instead of <b>Item A1</b> site, according to the LSPS's requirements, not less than 70% of the domestic GFA generated under the LSPS should be set aside for public housing development with incorporation of required GIC facilities and retail facilities, and <b>Item A1</b> site (about 2.03 ha) with a larger site area is considered more suitable to accommodate public housing development than <b>Item A2</b> site (about 0.70 ha).</p>

### 6.3.1.3 Traffic and Transport Aspects

Major Grounds/Views	
(C1)	<p>The existing road infrastructure in the area, including Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road (<b>Drawing H-3a</b>), has been overburdened and is unable to cater for additional population. Ting Kok Road is one of the major roads in the area providing sole connection from Lo Fai Road to the surrounding areas and serving many villages along the road. Lo Fai Road is steep, narrow and twisted, currently serving the population of EdUHK and six existing residential developments in the uphill area. Both Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road have been very congested (especially during peak hours, festivals, holidays and event occasions in the EdUHK) due to residents' high reliance on</p>

	<p>private cars.</p> <p>The traffic demand from recently completed developments (e.g. the two transitional housing developments and Villa Lucca (<b>Plan H-5</b>)), concrete batching plant at Sam Mun Tsai and Tai Po InnoPark have already occupied local road capacity. Additional traffic flow induced by the proposed LSPS development (and during construction period) would worsen the current traffic congestion and create traffic safety issues. These problems should be addressed through the implementation of appropriate improvement works (e.g. road widening (including the junction at Ting Kok Road/Fung Yuen Road), better intersection design and provision of expressway/flyover) before the additional residential developments in place.</p>
(C2)	<p>The proposed ingress/egress at Lo Fai Road for <b>Item A1</b> site (<b>Drawing H-1a</b>) is located at about 50m from the traffic light at the junction of Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road, which is considered inappropriate. When entering <b>Item A1</b> site, vehicles are required to drive along the uphill direction of Lo Fai Road and turn right to cross the downhill lane, paralysing traffic on Lo Fai Road. Spaces reserved for manoeuvring and queuing of vehicles at the proposed ingress/egress at <b>Item A1</b> site are limited, which would obstruct the traffic flows in both directions along Lo Fai Road and lead to queue-back to Ting Kok Road. The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) has not provided sufficient justifications for the above.</p> <p>The proposed ingress/egress at Ting Kok Road for <b>Item A2</b> site (<b>Drawing H-1b</b>) is also considered inappropriate. Queuing back of vehicles to/from <b>Item A2</b> site may occupy the eastbound of Ting Kok Road.</p>
(C3)	<p>The findings of the TIA (including the feasibility and effectiveness of proposed junction improvement works) are questionable, since some traffic problems/demands have not been considered (e.g. construction traffic, traffic induced by visits to Tai Mei Tuk and nearby golf course, as well as traffic capacity of branch roads). Besides, the Transport Department (TD) and Highways Department (HyD) should be invited to conduct simulation for the situation of increased traffic flow and potential traffic paralysis in the future.</p>
(C4)	<p>Currently, public transport services along Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road are insufficient, resulting in long waiting times. Coupled with the recently completed developments in the area (e.g. the two transitional housing developments (<b>Plan H-5</b>)), the proposed LSPS development with additional population would worsen the transportation problem and affect daily commute of local people. However, increase in the frequency of public transport services would inevitably induce more traffic congestion and accidents.</p>
(C5)	<p>The proposed LSPS development could not provide adequate</p>

	parking spaces, leading to illegal parking and traffic problems in the surrounding areas. Fu Tip Estate is an example that inadequate parking spaces have catalysed illegal parking at Chung Nga Road. Parking issues during construction period have not been covered.
(C6)	Traffic congestion arising from population increase would delay the timely provision of emergency services, entailing financial and fatal loss. In case of the occurrence of traffic accidents at the proposed ingress/egress of <b>Item A1</b> site, traffic from Ting Kok Road to Lo Fai Road would be disrupted and there may be difficulties in providing emergency services. Vehicle obstruction in proximity to the Tai Po East Fire Station would also be a concern. Besides, the design of emergency vehicular access (EVA) of the proposed LSPS development should be considered.
<b>Responses</b>	
(a)	<p>In response to (C1) and (C3):</p> <p>The LSPS Applicant has conducted a detailed TIA, taking into account the existing traffic conditions, the planned and committed developments in the vicinity and the traffic forecast during construction phase and upon population intake, to investigate and formulate the appropriate traffic measures to ensure that the additional traffic arising from the proposed LSPS development will not induce adverse traffic impact on the road networks within the district and is acceptable from traffic point of view.</p> <p>According to the TIA, various road improvement works (including reconfiguration of control methods at junctions, widening of road sections for provision of additional lanes and conversion of staggered crossing into straight crossing) along Ting Kok Road and Yuen Shin Road (<b>Drawing H-3a</b>) are proposed, covering a total of eight junctions including Ting Kok Road/Yuen Shin Road/Dai Fuk Street (<b>Drawing H-3b</b>), Yuen Shin Road/Dai Fat Street (<b>Drawing H-3c</b>), Tai Po Tai Wo Road/Yuen Shin Road (<b>Drawing H-3d</b>), Ting Kok Road/Dai Fat Street (<b>Drawing H-3e</b>); Ting Kok Road/Dai Kwai Street (<b>Drawing H-3f</b>), Ting Kok Road/<b>Item A2</b> site (outside Fortune Garden) (<b>Drawing H-3g</b>), Ting Kok Road/Lo Fai Road (<b>Drawing H-3h</b>), and Ting Kok Road/Fung Yuen Road (<b>Drawing H-3i</b>). The concerned road improvement works will be carried out by the LSPS Applicant prior to the population intake of the proposed LSPS development. In order to minimise traffic impact during the construction period, construction vehicles will only be allowed to access the proposed LSPS development during off-peak hours (i.e. 10:00am to 4:00pm).</p> <p>To ensure road safety during the road improvement works, the LSPS Applicant will implement temporary traffic management measures in accordance with TD's Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM), and HyD's Code of Practice for the Lighting, Signing and Guarding of Road Works.</p>

	<p>With implementation of the proposed road improvement works as recommended in the TIA, no adverse traffic impact is anticipated from the proposed LSPS development. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) has no objection to the proposed LSPS development from traffic engineering perspective, while the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East of HyD (CHE/NTE, HyD) has no objection to the preliminary plans of proposed road improvement works from highways maintenance perspective.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (C2):</p> <p>According to the LSPS Applicant, the design and the locations of the proposed ingresses/egresses at Lo Fai Road for <b>Item A1</b> site and Ting Kok Road for <b>Item A2</b> site would comply with the requirements of TD's TPDM. C for T has no objection from traffic engineering perspective.</p> <p>According to TPDM design requirements, it is more preferable to locate vehicular access on a minor road to minimise adverse traffic impact. As the Design Year 2036 forecast AM peak traffic flow at Lo Fai Road is less than that at Ting Kok Road, the LSPS Applicant proposes to locate the ingress/egress for <b>Item A1</b> site at Lo Fai Road. Despite its close proximity to the junction of Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road, the TIA results indicate that there will be ample capacity in the 2036 AM and PM peak periods, with no anticipated traffic queuing at Lo Fai Road.</p> <p>According to the TIA, for <b>Item A1</b> site, an exclusive right turn lane at Lo Fai Road northbound and a yellow box at Lo Fai Road southbound are proposed to reduce traffic conflict at the ingress/egress (<b>Drawing H-3h</b>). The entrance gate will be offset into <b>Item A1</b> site from Lo Fai Road as far as practicable to prevent vehicles from queuing back to Lo Fai Road. For <b>Item A2</b> site, a roundabout and access road are proposed from the site to Ting Kok Road, which provide queuing space for vehicles (<b>Drawings H-1b</b> and <b>H-3g</b>). Sufficient queuing space will be provided with implementation of traffic management control to manage vehicles to avoid queuing back of traffic from <b>Item A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites to Lo Fai Road and/or Ting Kok Road.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (C4):</p> <p>To cater for the potential demand of public transport services arising from the proposed LSPS development, the TIA recommends enhancing the frequency of existing bus and green minibus routes as well as providing an additional bus route travelling along Ting Kok Road, subject to further review by relevant B/Ds and service providers. TD will continue to monitor the traffic condition in the area and ensure the sufficiency of public transport provision to serve the local community.</p>

(d)	<p>In response to (C5):</p> <p>In devising the number of parking spaces for the proposed LSPS development (as stated in paragraph 4.3 above), reference has been made to the higher parking standard under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) in respect of the number of flats and retail GFA. While the exact provision of parking spaces would be determined at the detailed design stage, the TIA has confirmed that the parking provision based on the assumption of adopting higher parking standard is technically feasible.</p> <p>The Government has been actively pursuing an array of short- and medium- to long-term measures to increase the supply of parking spaces in Tai Po District, including but not limited to (i) designating suitable on-street locations as night-time parking spaces; (ii) requiring new developments to provide relevant parking and L/UL facilities in accordance with the HKPSG; (iii) providing public parking spaces in suitable GIC facilities and public open space projects in line with the “single site, multiple uses” principle; and (iv) taking forward automated parking systems.</p> <p>As advised by the LSPS Applicant, all the construction vehicles will only be parked within <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites and the temporary traffic management schemes during construction period will be formulated to avoid affecting local traffic in the later stage.</p>
(e)	<p>In response to (C6):</p> <p>The existing Tai Po East Fire Station is located about 240m from <b>Item A1</b> site and about 900m from <b>Item A2</b> site (<b>Plan H-2a</b>). It is not anticipated that the proposed LSPS development would pose any obstruction to the frontage area of Tai Po East Fire Station. Besides, for the design and provision of EVA within <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites, the LSPS Applicant is obliged to comply with the requirements of relevant departments and related legislations at the detailed design stage.</p>

#### 6.3.1.4 Visual and Air Ventilation Aspects

Major Grounds/Views	
(D1)	<p>The proposed BH up to 83mPD under the proposed LSPS development is too high, which would create adverse visual and air ventilation impacts on the local environment. The proposed high-rise/high-density development is incompatible with the existing low-rise/low-density and rural/green settings along Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road. The proposed mitigation measures (e.g. aesthetically pleasing building design) may not alleviate the visual impacts, and the scale of the proposed LSPS development (e.g. site areas and BH) should be reduced.</p>

Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (D1):</p> <p>The proposed LSPS development would bring forth some changes to the character of existing low-rise/low-density neighbourhoods in terms of building mass and BH (in number of storeys), but its maximum BH of 83mPD generally respects the existing BH profile descending from inland area at the north (with BHs ranging from about 76mPD to 113mPD of the existing residential clusters in the uphill) to the waterfront development (i.e. Fortune Garden) at the south (with BHs of about 12mPD to 36mPD) (<b>Plan H-5</b>).</p> <p>According to the Visual Impact Assessment conducted by the LSPS Applicant, based on the indicative LSPS Development Scheme, the visual impacts caused by the proposed LSPS development are generally insignificant to slightly adverse to most of the key public viewers (i.e. eight out of 12 viewing points (VPs), e.g. at Tai Po waterfront promenade) (<b>Drawings H-5e to H-5l</b>). Owing to the view direction and close proximity to <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites, the visual impacts caused by the proposed LSPS development are moderately to significantly adverse when viewed from four VPs along Ting Kok Road (<b>Drawings H-5a to H-5d</b>). To mitigate the visual impacts, the proposed LSPS development has incorporated various design measures, including provision of landscaping treatments/trees on road side and the northern portions at both <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites. For <b>Item A1</b> site, setback of not less than 5m from the southern boundary along Ting Kok Road, building separation of not less than 15m between T1 and T5 and no erection of building structures at southwestern corner are proposed (<b>Drawing H-1a</b>). For <b>Item A2</b> site, while setback of not less than 3m from the southern boundary along Ting Kok Road is proposed (<b>Drawing H-1b</b>), aesthetically pleasing building design to minimise the visual impact arising from the proposed development would be further explored at the detailed design stage.</p> <p><b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites are situated at downhill area and embedded on the hillslopes at the fringe area of Tai Po New Town. According to the Air Ventilation Assessment (Expert Evaluation) conducted by the LSPS Applicant, design measures, including setbacks along Ting Kok Road, retention of open areas without building structures at the northern portions at both <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites, as well as no erection of building structures at southwestern corner at <b>Item A1</b> site (<b>Drawings H-6a and H-6b</b>), are recommended to facilitate wind penetration and minimise the air ventilation impact. The proposed LSPS development with the design measures incorporated is unlikely to impose significant impact on the surrounding areas from air ventilation perspective.</p> <p>The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD (CTP/UD&amp;L, PlanD) has no adverse comment on the proposed LSPS development from visual and air ventilation perspectives.</p>

### 6.3.1.5 Landscape Aspect

Major Grounds/Views	
(E1)	<p>Both <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites fall within the areas zoned “GB” with many trees and dense vegetation, providing a pleasing local environment. The proposed LSPS development requires extensive tree/vegetation removal, which would induce adverse landscape impacts and disturb natural scenery and green environment.</p> <p>Meanwhile, the tree compensation ratio is low and there are difficulties in transplanting trees. High greenery provision ratio should be achieved and rare species of trees along Lo Fai Road should also be retained.</p>
(E2)	<p>Tree survey report has not mentioned the trees on Government land within “GB” zone and the species of compensatory trees.</p>
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (E1) and (E2):</p> <p>Both <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites are situated in an area of residential urban fringe landscape comprising dense vegetation, low-density residential developments and village houses in the adjacent “V” zone. The proposed LSPS development would bring forth changes to the landscape character of surrounding areas.</p> <p>According to the Landscape Master Plan and Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal (TPRP), a total of 1,065 and 351 trees (excluding 12 and 14 undesirable species) have been identified within the tree survey boundaries for <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites respectively. The coverage area of the tree survey under the TPRP conducted by the LSPS Applicant has included the entire <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites (i.e. all Government land and private land involved). No Old and Valuable Tree is found at <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites, while there are two <i>Aquilaria sinensis</i> (土沉香) (i.e. near-threatened species) at each <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites (four in total) and one <i>Lagerstroemia speciosa</i> (大花紫薇) (i.e. scheduled under Cap. 96) at <b>Item A2</b> site. Also, two large/mature trees, T1732 <i>Schima superba</i> (木荷) and T1399 <i>Machilus chekiangensis</i> (浙江潤楠) are identified in the tree survey boundaries of <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites respectively. No rare and protected species are surveyed adjacent to Lo Fai Road.</p> <p>According to the LSPS Applicant, while transplantation of existing trees in woodland at slopes is infeasible due to low survival rate after transplantation and poor to fair health and structural conditions, existing trees will be retained as far as possible. Under the LSPS Development Scheme, a total of 1,048 and 286 trees (excluding undesirable species) are proposed to be felled, while 17 and 65 trees are proposed to be retained within the tree survey boundaries for</p>



**Items A1** and **A2** sites respectively. Three of the *Aquilaria sinensis* (土沉香) (two in **Item A1** site and one in **Item A2** site) are proposed to be felled due to poor form/health/structural conditions and/or low amenity value with infeasibility in transplantation, and the remaining one not being in conflict with the development at **Item A2** site is proposed to be retained. The *Lagerstroemia speciosa* (大花紫薇) with fair health/structural condition is proposed to be felled as the tree is located on slope. One of the said mature trees (i.e. T1732) is in poor form and heavily tangled by climbers, while another one (i.e. T1399) is located on slope and will require intensive pruning of tree crown and rootball for transportation to receptor site, resulting in low survival rate after transplantation. As such, both mature trees are proposed to be felled.

Areas of about 1,142m<sup>2</sup> and 295m<sup>2</sup> for planting 584 and 142 whip trees are proposed within **Items A1** and **A2** sites respectively (**Drawings H-1a, H-1b, H-4a** and **H-4b**). For **Item A2** site, additional 19 heavy standard compensatory trees are proposed to be planted mainly around the periphery of the roundabout and along Ting Kok Road (**Drawings H-1b** and **H-4b**). Compensatory planting will involve native and local tree species. The proposed tree compensatory ratio (i.e. new tree : fell) for both **Items A1** and **A2** sites is about 0.56:1 in terms of quantity due to site constraints for provision of EVA, sufficient tree spacing for sustainable tree growth, open amenity and recreational spaces within the proposed LSPS development. Other mitigation measures/landscape treatments such as greenery on retaining walls/retaining slope profiles, toe planters and landscape gardens are proposed.

Subject to further review and implementation by relevant B/D(s) at the detailed design stage, provision of more heavy standard trees and/or whip trees within **Item A1** site (including the area along the southern site periphery abutting Ting Kok Road) could be explored in order to enhance the tree compensation ratio up to about 0.65:1. Detailed information regarding the indicative compensatory tree planting schedule (including the proposed tree species) for the proposed LSPS development has been provided in the TPRP.

The proposed LSPS development will comply with the greenery coverage requirements under PNAP APP-152 Sustainable Building Design Guidelines with the provision of planting, green buffer along site boundary, shaded outdoor spaces and visual amenity for pedestrians. The proposed greenery at various levels would visually soften the built form and help provide a smooth transition between the proposed LSPS development and the adjacent neighbourhood.

CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no adverse comment on the proposed LSPS development from landscape planning perspective.

6.3.1.6 *Environmental and Ecological Aspects*

<b>Major Grounds/Views</b>	
(F1)	<p>The natural environment along Ting Kok Road and Lo Fai Road should be protected. The proposed LSPS development would cause adverse environmental and ecological impacts. For instance, there would be environmental concerns arising from tree/vegetation clearance, and ecological concerns because of loss of fauna and flora and their habitats. Consultation with relevant departments (e.g. Environmental Protection Department (EPD)) is necessary.</p>
(F2)	<p>Increase in environmental pollution caused by the proposed LSPS development is anticipated. However, the Environmental Assessment (EA) has not given consideration on air quality, noise, and water quality impacts on the natural environment.</p> <p>The future residents of proposed LSPS development would be subject to traffic noise pollution without appropriate mitigation measures. Environmental hygiene would also be a concern.</p>
(F3)	<p>The proposed golf course development at the former Shuen Wan Landfill in the proximity to <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites (<b>Plan H-2a</b>) involved extensive tree clearance and destroyed the local environment and ecology. Noting that the submission of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was mandated for the proposed golf course development, detailed assessments for the proposed LSPS development should also be conducted.</p> <p>The future residents of proposed LSPS development would be subject to possible leakage of toxic gas from the former Shuen Wan Landfill.</p>
(F4)	<p>As the proposed LSPS development is in large-scale, disturbance (e.g. dusts, noise and water pollutants) would be created during the construction period.</p>
<b>Responses</b>	
(a)	<p>In response to (F1) and (F2):</p> <p>The EA has been conducted by the LSPS Applicant to demonstrate that no insurmountable air quality, noise and water quality impacts would be resulted from the proposed LSPS development. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) has no adverse comment on the proposed LSPS development from environmental planning perspective.</p> <p>The EA has demonstrated that the proposed LSPS development would not be subject to adverse traffic noise impact with the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures (e.g. acoustic window and/or acoustic balcony). A noise impact assessment will</p>

	<p>be conducted at the detailed design stage, to update the appropriate noise mitigation measures and address the potential noise impact (including road traffic noise) in accordance with the requirements under HKPSG and relevant practice notes, taking into account the latest layout/design and prevailing surrounding environment.</p> <p>According to the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) conducted by the LSPS Applicant, <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites are not identified as any recognised site of conservation importance or habitat of conservation interest, with records of low abundance of wildlife and low overall ecological values. With the implementation of mitigation measures (including the proposed planting of trees and plants of a majority of native species), the potential ecological impacts could be mitigated to acceptable level. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) has no adverse comment on the EcoIA. Regarding the concerns on tree removal, the responses in paragraph 6.3.1.5 (a) above are relevant.</p> <p>As advised by the LSPS Applicant, the proposed LSPS development is not environmental polluting in nature and will not result in any major environmental hygiene problem. The proposed LSPS development is also required to comply with the requirements of relevant B/Ds as well as other related legislations in respect of environmental protection. DEP and Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH) have no adverse comment on the proposed LSPS development.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (F3):</p> <p>As advised by DEP, the proposed LSPS development is not a Designated Project under Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance and hence the submission of EIA is not required. That said, the EA conducted by the LSPS Applicant has demonstrated that no insurmountable environmental impact would be resulted from the proposed LSPS development.</p> <p>Given that <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites fall within the consultation zone of the former Shuen Wan Landfill, the LSPS Applicant has conducted a preliminary landfill gas hazard assessment under the EA according to EPD's requirements and DEP has no adverse comment on the EA. A more detailed assessment will also be conducted by the LSPS Applicant at the detailed design stage.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (F4):</p> <p>As advised by DEP, the LSPS Applicant shall be responsible for complying with all relevant environmental legislations during construction and operation phases of the proposed LSPS development. The LSPS Applicant is also advised to follow the "Recommended Pollution Control Clauses for Construction Contracts" to minimise the environmental impacts during the</p>

	construction phase, and observe relevant Practice Notes (e.g. the ProPECC PN 1/24 “Minimising Noise from Construction Activities”).
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### 6.3.1.7 Other Technical Aspects

Major Grounds/Views	
(G1)	The proposed LSPS development with extensive site formation works and tree removal at slopes may alter the local topography and surface run-off, which would result in diminishing soil quality, trigger landslides and exacerbate flooding during wet season. Geotechnical Hazard Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) are required to ensure slope stability and safety of local residents.
(G2)	The proposed LSPS development in proximity to burial grounds and graves with long history would disturb the ancestors and their descendants. In particular, <b>Item A2</b> site is located in close vicinity of burial grounds and graves of the ancestors of indigenous villagers in Shuen Wan. Incense burning during festivals would also create air pollution. Details of handling the graves nearby <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites have not been provided.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (G1):</p> <p>According to the Geotechnical Assessment (GA) conducted by the LSPS Applicant, the proposed LSPS development is considered geotechnically feasible. Precautionary/upgrading works would be proposed at the detailed design stage, if necessary. Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office of CEDD (H(GEO), CEDD) has no adverse comment on the GA and advises that a natural terrain hazard study will be required at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The LSPS Applicant has conducted a DIA to demonstrate that no adverse drainage impact arising from the proposed LSPS development is anticipated with the implementation of proposed drainage works. With the incorporation of proposed peripheral drainage channels within <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites, proposed new drainage pipes for connection to existing public drainage system and upgrading of existing drainage pipes, there will be sufficient capacity to collect and discharge surface runoff at the proposed LSPS development and its vicinity. The Chief Engineer/Mainland North of Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD) has no adverse comment on the proposed LSPS development from public drainage perspective.</p>

	As advised by the LSPS Applicant, the site formation proposal will be submitted to relevant B/Ds for approval before commencement of works.
(b)	<p>In response to (G2):</p> <p>According to the LSPS Topical Guideline 1<sup>7</sup>, the LSPS Applicant is required to give due consideration to minimise the clearance of structures, such as squatters and graves, wherever possible.</p> <p>While the proposed LSPS development would not encroach onto any permitted burial grounds (<b>Plan H-2a</b>), the LSPS Applicant will give due regard to the provision of adequate buffer distance between the proposed LSPS development and permitted burial grounds, and shall conduct a comprehensive grave/urn survey at appropriate stage. The LSPS Applicant advises that a comprehensive precautionary monitoring programme will be implemented to ensure the construction being carried out safely and soundly. The orientation of flats will also be duly considered to avoid directly facing the existing permitted burial grounds and graves.</p> <p>As advised by DEP, incense burning by individuals near burial grounds and graves during festival periods are typically small in scale and in relatively short duration, which would constitute limited air quality impact.</p>

#### 6.3.1.8 Provision of GIC/Supporting Facilities and Social Concerns

Major Grounds/Views	
(H1)	The existing GIC/supporting facilities in Tai Po District, such as health care, elderly, transport, education, sports and recreational facilities, are insufficient. There are also concerns on the stability of water and electricity supply. Population increase arising from the proposed LSPS development and other planned developments in Tai Po would worsen the situation and diminish quality of life and harmony of the local community.
(H2)	The current harmonious and low-density environment, well-being and Feng Shui of the local community would be disturbed by the proposed LSPS development. Moreover, there would be less natural light infiltration and privacy due to more visual obstruction arising from the proposed LSPS development. Consequently, the property values in the area would be affected.

<sup>7</sup> To facilitate applications under the LSPS, relevant requirements relating to certain aspects of LSPS proposals are summarised in the Topical Guidelines for applicant's ease of reference, which are available at DEVB's website at:  
[https://www.devb.gov.hk/en/issues\\_in\\_focus/land\\_sharing\\_pilot\\_scheme/index.html](https://www.devb.gov.hk/en/issues_in_focus/land_sharing_pilot_scheme/index.html)

(H3)	When the proposed LSPS development in place, there would be more residents from different backgrounds in the area, which would trigger social disparity and alter the current neighborhood character. Security risks and crime rates may increase as well.
<b>Responses</b>	
(a)	<p>In response to (H1):</p> <p>The existing and planned provisions for major GIC facilities are generally adequate to meet the demand in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG and concerned B/Ds' assessments, except for the provision of divisional police station, hospital bed, child care centre, community care services facilities, residential care homes for the elderly, day rehabilitation services and residential care services in Tai Po District (<b>Annex VIII</b>)<sup>8</sup>. Hospital bed will be catered for in the 1st and 2nd Ten-year Hospital Development Plans based on the Hospital Authority's assessment on a regional/cluster basis. The provision of other social welfare facilities is a long-term goal and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department in the planning and development process as appropriate. These facilities would be carefully planned/reviewed by relevant B/Ds and premises-based GIC facilities could be incorporated in future development/redevelopment when opportunities arise. In this regard, area equivalent to about 5% of the total attainable domestic GFA of the public housing development at <b>Item A1</b> site will be set aside for the provision of social welfare facilities. As the types of GIC facilities to be provided at <b>Item A1</b> site are subject to review at the detailed design stage, such provision has not been reflected in the table for Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Tai Po District at <b>Annex VIII</b>. Besides, there are surplus planned provision of 14.77 ha of district open space and 43.15 ha of local open space in Tai Po District to cater for the planned population.</p> <p>For water supply to the proposed LSPS development, the Water Supplies Impact Assessment conducted by the LSPS Applicant has demonstrated that no adverse impact is anticipated from water supply system planning point of view. The Chief Engineer/Construction of Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD) has no adverse comment on the proposed LSPS development from water supply perspective. For electricity supply, the LSPS applicant is obligated to liaise with the service provider and provide relevant infrastructure if necessary. The Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS) has no comment on the proposed LSPS development from regulatory perspective.</p>

<sup>8</sup> The provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in the Planning Scheme Area of the OZP is also provided for information in **Annex IX**.

	Regarding the concerns on public transport provision, the responses in paragraph 6.3.1.3 (c) above are relevant.
(b)	<p>In response to (H2):</p> <p><b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites are situated along Ting Kok Road at the fringe of Tai Po New Town with a cluster of low-rise residential developments and village houses in the proximity, the proposed residential developments at <b>Items A1</b> and <b>A2</b> sites are considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas from land use planning perspective. Regarding compatibility of the proposed LSPS development with the surrounding areas, the responses in paragraph 6.3.1.2 (a) above are relevant.</p> <p>For the concerns on Feng Shui and property price, they are not relevant planning considerations and fall outside the scope of the OZP.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (H3):</p> <p>While the population in the area would be increased with the proposed LSPS development in place, as stated in response in paragraph 6.3.1.8 (a) above, there would be adequate infrastructure and social services to support the increased population to help them integrate with the existing community. Besides, public safety and order are maintained by the Hong Kong Police Force through law enforcement.</p>

### 6.3.2 Item B

Major Grounds/Views	
(I1)	There were 3,507 niches for the columbarium use under section 12A application No. Y/TP/36, in which 2,744 niches were to be sealed off. If there are additional niches to be allowed, the amendment item should not be approved.
(I2)	Under section 12A application No. Y/TP/36, the applicant proposed to stipulate 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' as Column 1 use, indicating that the applicant planned to further develop the site.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (I1):</p> <p>The restriction on maximum number of niches (i.e. 763) stipulated under the remarks of "G/IC(3)" zone is to take forward the agreed section 12A application No. Y/TP/36 for regularisation of the existing religious institution and columbarium uses. Technical assessments in support of the application were submitted by the applicant to demonstrate the feasibility of accommodating 763</p>

	<p>niches at the site. The proposed number of niches will also be controlled under the licence issued by the Private Columbaria Licensing Board (PCLB). Should there be any increase in the number of niches to be provided at the site, the applicant is required to seek the planning permission from the Board through section 16 application as well as the approval from PCLB under licensing regime.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (I2):</p> <p><b>Item B</b> is specifically intended for the religious institution and columbarium uses. Although the applicant proposed to put ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ as a Column 1 use of the “G/IC(3)” zone at the 12A application stage, the Board deliberated that such use should be stipulated as a Column 2 use so that any proposal in relation to such use would be further considered by the Board under section 16 application.</p>

#### 6.3.3 Items C3 and C4

Major Grounds/Views	
(J1)	<p><b><u>Item C3</u></b></p> <p>There is a grave with a history of about 100 years to the south of Ting Kok Road and to the east of Fortune Garden, while the details of handling the concerned grave have not been elaborated.</p>
(J2)	<p><b><u>Item C4</u></b></p> <p>The amendment would result in a narrower road alignment in proximity to the proposed golf course development.</p>
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (J1) and (J2):</p> <p><b>Items C3 and C4</b> are to reflect the as-built road alignment of Ting Kok Road westbound to the north of Fortune Garden (<b>Plans H-1a and H-2a</b>). While no new road works are involved, the permitted burial grounds and graves along Ting Kok Road would not be affected.</p>

#### 6.3.4 Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

Major Grounds/Views	
(K1)	<p>Incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1 of the Notes for “V” zone is objected, as it would deprive the rights of community to express views on the locations and design of these facilities.</p>



(K2)	Incorporation of 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' under Column 2 of the Notes for "V" zone is objected. Since "V" zone intends to provide houses, 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' use could be exploited for commercial operations.
(K3)	Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for "SSSI" zone on the filling/excavation of land clause is objected. It would allow exemption for the government departments to carry out unfettered excavation of land on ecological and cultural sensitive sites requiring protection, causing adverse impacts on natural resources.
<b>Responses</b>	
(a)	<p>In response to (K1):</p> <p>The incorporation of 'Government Refuse Collection Point' and 'Public Convenience' under Column 1 of the Notes for "V" zone, being in line with the latest MSN promulgated by the Board, is to streamline the provision of these common and essential facilities in village areas. Under the current practice, relevant government departments such as FEHD would consult the concerned local residents/DCs/RCs on the provision of such facilities, as appropriate.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (K2):</p> <p>Given the popularity of tours/visits to the villages in recent years, it is considered appropriate to add 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' under Column 2 of the Notes for "V" zone to cater for the demand for such use where appropriate, which is in line with the latest MSN promulgated by the Board. To ensure no insurmountable impacts on the surrounding areas and minimise the possible nuisance to the village environment, planning permission from the Board for such use is required.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (K3):</p> <p>The incorporation of exemption clause for government works on filling of land/pond or excavation of land pertaining to public works co-ordinated or implemented by the Government from the requirement for planning application in the conservation-related zones (including "SSSI" zone) is in line with the latest MSN promulgated by the Board. The objective is to streamline the planning application process/mechanism. The exemption clause is only applicable to public works and minor works in which no major adverse impacts are anticipated. Public works co-ordinated or implemented by the Government will be in compliance with the relevant government requirements, prevailing ordinances and regulations. Statutory control over the developments in the conservation-related zones would not be undermined.</p>

## 7. **Departmental Consultation**

The following government B/Ds have been consulted and their comments, if any, have been incorporated in the above paragraphs where appropriate:

- (a) Head (LSO), DEVB;
- (b) Secretary for Education;
- (c) Secretary for Health;
- (d) Director of Housing;
- (e) C for T;
- (f) Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department;
- (g) H(GEO), CEDD;
- (h) District Lands Officer/Tai Po, Lands Department (LandsD);
- (i) Chief Estate Surveyor/Land Supply, LandsD;
- (j) DEP;
- (k) DAFC;
- (l) CHE/NTE, HyD;
- (m) CE/C, WSD;
- (n) CE/MN, DSD;
- (o) Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department;
- (p) Director of Fire Services;
- (q) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (r) District Officer (Tai Po), Home Affairs Department;
- (s) DEMS;
- (t) Director of Social Welfare;
- (u) Director of Health;
- (v) DFEH;
- (w) Commissioner of Police; and
- (x) CTP/UD&L, PlanD.

## 8. **Planning Department's Views**

- 8.1 The supportive views of **R1** to **R6** on **Items A1** and **A2**, and **R7** on **Item B** are noted.
- 8.2 Based on the assessments in paragraph 6.3 above, PlanD does not support R8 to R958 and considers that the OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

### ***Items A1 and A2***

- (a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase land and housing supply in the short-to-medium term, and Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS) is one of the initiatives. It is considered appropriate to rezone **Items A1** and **A2** sites to take forward the endorsed LSPS development. The relevant amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan have been submitted for the Town Planning Board's (the Board's) agreement

and subsequently exhibited for public inspection under the Town Planning Ordinance. All relevant statutory and administrative public consultation procedures have been duly followed;

- (b) the proposed residential developments at **Items A1** and **A2** sites along Ting Kok Road at the fringe of Tai Po New Town are considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas from land use planning perspective. The proposed LSPS development with maximum building height (BH) of 83mPD generally respects the existing BH profile descending from inland area at the north to the waterfront at the south;
- (c) relevant technical assessments have been conducted by the LSPS Applicant to demonstrate that there is no insurmountable technical problem identified and the relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) have no objection to or no adverse comments on the proposed LSPS development;
- (d) the existing and planned provisions of Government, Institution and Community (GIC) facilities are generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in Tai Po District in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines and concerned B/Ds' assessments. The provisions of GIC facilities will be closely monitored by the relevant B/Ds;

***Item B***

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

***Items C3 and C4***

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

***Amendments to the Notes of the Plan***

- (g) the incorporation of 'Government Refuse Collection Point' and 'Public Convenience' under Column 1 and 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' under Column 2 of the Notes for "Village Type Development" zone is in line with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN) promulgated by the Board. The provision of these facilities will follow the relevant government established procedures and/or require planning permission from the Board; and

- (h) the incorporation of the exemption clause that filling of land or excavation of land related to public works co-ordinated or implemented by the Government are exempted from the requirement for planning application in the “Sites of Special Scientific Interest (“SSSI”) zone is in line with the latest MSN promulgated by the Board and will streamline the planning application process. The exemption clause is only applicable to public works and minor works in which no major adverse impacts are anticipated. Statutory control over the developments in the “SSSI” zone would not be undermined.

## **9. Decision Sought**

- 9.1 The Board is invited to give consideration to the representations taking into consideration the points raised in the hearing session, and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendment to the OZP to meet/partially meet the representations.
- 9.2 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 Plan, together with the Notes and updated ES, are suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) of the Ordinance to the CE-in-C for approval.

## **10. Attachments**

<b>Annex I</b>	Draft Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/31 (reduced size)
<b>Annex II</b>	Schedule of Amendments to the Draft Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/31
<b>Annex III</b>	Index of Representations
<b>Annex IV</b>	Index of Major Grounds/Views of Representations
<b>Annex V</b>	Extract of Minutes of the RNTPC Meeting held on 28.2.2025
<b>Annex VI</b>	Letter from TPRC received on 13.1.2025
<b>Annex VII</b>	Extract of Minutes of the TPDC Meeting held on 7.1.2025
<b>Annex VIII</b>	Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Tai Po District
<b>Annex IX</b>	Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Tai Po Planning Scheme Area
<b>Drawing H-1a</b>	Indicative Layout Plan of <b>Item A1</b> Site
<b>Drawing H-1b</b>	Indicative Layout Plan of <b>Item A2</b> Site
<b>Drawings H-2a and H-2b</b>	Indicative Section Plans of <b>Item A1</b> Site
<b>Drawing H-2c</b>	Indicative Section Plan of <b>Item A2</b> Site
<b>Drawings H-3a to H-3i</b>	Proposed Road Improvement Works of the LSPS Development Scheme
<b>Drawing H-4a</b>	Landscape Master Plan of <b>Item A1</b> Site
<b>Drawing H-4b</b>	Landscape Master Plan of <b>Item A2</b> Site
<b>Drawings H-5a to H-5l</b>	Photomontages of the LSPS Development Scheme
<b>Drawings H-6a and H-6b</b>	Proposed Air Ventilation Design Measures of the LSPS Development Scheme under Prevailing Wind Directions

**Drawing H-7**

**Plan H-1a**

**Plan H-1b**

**Plan H-2a**

**Plan H-2b**

**Plan H-3a**

**Plan H-3b**

**Plans H-4a and H-4b**

**Plan H-4c**

**Plans H-4d to H-4i**

**Plan H-5**

Development Scheme of the Agreed Section 12A

Application No. Y/TP/36

Location Plan of **Items A1, A2 and C1 to C4**

Location Plan of **Item B**

Site Plan of **Items A1, A2 and C1 to C4**

Site Plan of **Item B**

Aerial Photo of **Items A1, A2 and C1 to C4**

Aerial Photo of **Item B**

Site Photos of **Items A1 and A2**

Site Photo of **Item B**

Site Photos of **Items C1 to C4**

Building Height Profile in the vicinity of **Items A1 and A2**

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
AUGUST 2025**