



圖例  
NOTATION

ZONES

COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP E)

VILLAGE TYPE DEVELOPMENT

OPEN STORAGE

GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY

OPEN SPACE

RECREATION

OTHER SPECIFIED USES

GREEN BELT

CONSERVATION AREA

CDA

R(A)

R(B)

R(E)

V

OS

GIC

O

REC

OU

GB

CA

地帶

綜合發展區

住宅（甲類）

住宅（乙類）

住宅（戊類）

鄉村式發展

露天貯物

政府、機構或社區

休憩用地

康樂

其他指定用途

綠化地帶

自然保育區

COMMUNICATIONS

RAILWAY AND STATION (ELEVATED)

LIGHT RAIL

MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION

ELEVATED ROAD

MISCELLANEOUS

BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME

交通

鐵路及車站（高架）

輕鐵

主要道路及路口

高架道路

其他

規劃範圍界線

土地用途及面積一覽表  
SCHEDULE OF USES AND AREAS

USES	大約面積及百分率 APPROXIMATE AREA & %		用途
	公頃 HECTARES	% 百分率	
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	20.22	5.68	綜合發展區
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	34.46	9.68	住宅（甲類）
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	5.43	1.53	住宅（乙類）
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP E)	5.54	1.56	住宅（戊類）
VILLAGE TYPE DEVELOPMENT	85.29	23.97	鄉村式發展
OPEN STORAGE	13.14	3.69	露天貯物
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	13.28	3.73	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	3.46	0.97	休憩用地
RECREATION	27.41	7.70	康樂
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	1.68	0.47	其他指定用途
GREEN BELT	50.49	14.19	綠化地帶
CONSERVATION AREA	70.23	19.74	自然保育區
DRAINAGE CHANNEL	0.48	0.13	排水道
RAILWAY	0.91	0.26	鐵路
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	23.80	6.70	主要道路等
TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	355.82	100.00	規劃範圍總面積

夾附的《註釋》屬這份圖則的一部分，  
現經修訂並按照城市規劃條例第5條展示。  
THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN  
AND HAVE BEEN AMENDED FOR EXHIBITION UNDER  
SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

核准圖編號 S/YL-PS/20 的修訂  
AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/YL-PS/20

AMENDMENTS EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5  
OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

按圖城市規劃條例第5條  
展示的修訂

AMENDMENT ITEM A1

AMENDMENT ITEM A2

AMENDMENT ITEM B

AMENDMENT ITEM C

AMENDMENT ITEM D

AMENDMENT ITEM E

AMENDMENT ITEM F

AMENDMENT ITEM G

修訂項目 A 1 項

修訂項目 A 2 項

修訂項目 B 項

修訂項目 C 項

修訂項目 D 項

修訂項目 E 項

修訂項目 F 項

修訂項目 G 項

2025年9月26日 按照城市規劃條例第5條展示的  
核准圖編號 S/YL-PS/20 的修訂  
AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/YL-PS/20 EXHIBITED  
UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON  
26 SEPTEMBER 2025

Signed Ms Donna Tam 譚燕萍 簽署  
SECRETARY 城市規劃委員會秘書  
TOWN PLANNING BOARD

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的屏山分區計劃大綱圖  
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
PING SHAN - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN

SCALE 1:7500 比例尺

0 200 400 600 800 1000 METRES 米

規劃署遵照城市規劃委員會指示擬備  
PREPARED BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT UNDER  
THE DIRECTION OF THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD

圖則編號  
PLAN No. S/YL-PS/21

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO  
THE APPROVED PING SHAN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/YL-PS/20  
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

**I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan**

- Item A1 – Rezoning of a site at Wing Ning Tsuen from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Residential (Group A)7” (“R(A)7”).
- Item A2 – Rezoning of four land parcels at Wing Ning Tsuen from “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) and “GB” to “Residential (Group A)8” (“R(A)8”), and addition of symbols to link up the land parcels.
- Item B – Rezoning of a strip of land along the Mass Transit Railway Tuen Ma Line viaduct from “CDA”, “GB” and an area shown as ‘Tuen Ma Line Emergency Access Point’ to an area shown as ‘Road’.
- Item C – Rezoning of two pieces of land at Wing Ning Tsuen from “GB” to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”).
- Item D – Rezoning of a site to the north of Castle Peak Road – Ping Shan from “CDA” and “Village Type Development” (“V”) to “Residential (Group A)9” (“R(A)9”).
- Item E – Rezoning of a site to the southeast of Tong Fong Tsuen and west of the junction of Ping Ha Road and Castle Peak Road – Ping Shan from “CDA” to “Residential (Group E)1” (“R(E)1”).
- Item F – Rezoning of a site to the northeast of the junction of Ping Ha Road and Castle Peak Road – Ping Shan from “CDA” to “Residential (Group B)2” (“R(B)2”).
- Item G – Adjustment to the zoning boundary of “CDA” zone at Yung Yuen Road.

**II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan**

- (a) Revision to the planning intention of the Notes for the “CDA” zone in accordance with the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.
- (b) Deletion of two locations and the development restrictions at the Remarks of the Notes for the “CDA” zone.
- (c) Revision of ‘Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle) (on land designated “R(A)4”, “R(A)5” and “R(A)6” only)’ to ‘Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle) (on land designated “R(A)4”, “R(A)5”, “R(A)6”, “R(A)7” and “R(A)8” only)’ under Column 1 of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone.

- (d) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone to incorporate development restrictions for the new “R(A)7”, “R(A)8” and “R(A)9” sub-zones.
- (e) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(B)” zone to incorporate development restrictions for the new “R(B)2” sub-zone.
- (f) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(E)” zone to incorporate development restrictions for the new “R(E)1” sub-zone.
- (g) Incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1 of the Notes for the “V” zone; and corresponding deletion of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 2 of the Notes for the “V” zone.
- (h) Incorporation of ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ and ‘Hotel (Holiday House only)’ under Column 2 of the Notes for the “V” zone.
- (i) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for “CDA”, “R(A)”, “R(B)”, “R(E)”, “Recreation”, “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Heritage and Cultural Tourism Related Uses” and “OU” annotated “Historical Building Preserved for Cultural and Community Uses” zones on minor relaxation clauses.
- (j) Revision to the Chinese translation of the ‘Schedule II for existing industrial development’ from ‘附表II：適用於現有的工業樓宇’ to ‘附表II：適用於現有的工業發展’ in the Notes for the “R(E)” zone in accordance with the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.
- (k) Revision to the Chinese translation of the user term ‘Research, Design and Development Centre’ from ‘研究所、設計及發展中心’ to ‘研究、設計及發展中心’ in the Notes for “CDA” and “G/IC” zones.

Town Planning Board

26 September 2025

《屏山分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/YL-PS/21》  
**Draft Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-PS/21**

申述人名單  
**Index of Representations**

申述編號 <b>Representation No.</b>	提交編號 <b>Submission No.</b>	申述人名稱 <b>Name of Representer</b>
TPB/R/S/YL-PS/21-R1	TPB/R/S/YL-PS/21-S2	Busy Firm Investment Limited
TPB/R/S/YL-PS/21-R2	TPB/R/S/YL-PS/21-S4	Li Suet Fong
TPB/R/S/YL-PS/21-R3	TPB/R/S/YL-PS/21-S3	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/YL-PS/21-R4	TPB/R/S/YL-PS/21-S1	MTR Corporation Limited

公眾可於規劃署的規劃資料查詢處及城市規劃委員會網頁  
< [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/tc/plan\\_making/S\\_YL-PS\\_21.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/tc/plan_making/S_YL-PS_21.html) > 查閱就《屏山分區計劃大綱草圖  
編號 S/YL-PS/21》提出的申述。

Representations in respect of the Draft Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-PS/21 are available for public inspection at the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department and on the Town Planning Board's website at < [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan\\_making/S\\_YL-PS\\_21.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_YL-PS_21.html) >.

temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 5.9.2030, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

---

**Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District**

[Mr Raymond H.F. Au, District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW), Mr Dino W.L. Tang, Ms Carman C.Y. Cheung, Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STPs/TMYLW), and Mr Max Y.L. Wong, Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (TP/TMYLW), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 52**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-PS/20  
(RNTPC Paper No. 10/25)

---

66. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) involved, among others, rezoning of four parcels of land at Wing Ning Tsuen, Yuen Long to facilitate a proposed development for public and private housing under the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS) (Amendment Items A1 to C) (Items A1 to C). The public housing development of LSPS would be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). Busy Firm Investment Limited, which was a subsidiary of New World Development Company Limited (NWD), was the LSPS applicant of the LSPS development, and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the LSPS applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Mr Bond C.P. Chow<br>(as Chief Engineer (Works),<br>Home Affairs Department) | - | being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA;    |
| Mr Timothy K.W. Ma   | - | being a member of the LSPS Panel of Advisors;  |
| Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho   | - | having current business dealings with AECOM;   |
| Mr Rocky L.K. Poon   | - | being an employee of a company which was a subsidiary of NWD; and  |
| Mr Ryan M.K. Ip  | - | being the vice-president and executive director of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation of which had received donations from New World Group. |

67. The Committee noted that Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Board, as the proposed amendment for public housing development was the subject of amendment to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interest of Mr Bond C.P. Chow in relation to HKHA on the item needed to be recorded. The Committee noted that Mr Bond C.P. Chow had left the meeting. As Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had no involvement in the project(s) under the sponsorship of New World Group in relation to this item, he could stay in the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Timothy K.W. Ma and Rocky L.K. Poon were considered direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Messrs Timothy K.W. Ma and Rocky L.K. Poon left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

68. Other than PlanD's representatives as listed out before paragraph 66 above, the following government representatives and consultants of the LSPS project (Consultants) were invited to the meeting at this point:

**Development Bureau (DEVB)**

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

Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan      -      Senior Town Planner (Planning & Lands)

Mr Kanic C.K. Kwok      -      Town Planner (Planning & Lands)

**Consultants**

*Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited*

Mr Dickson Hui

Mr Man Ho

Mr Edison Law

*Larry H.C. Tam & Associates Limited*

Mr Spancer Wong

*Ramboll Hong Kong Limited*

Ms Katie Yu

*MVA Hong Kong Limited*

Ms Rebecca Chan

Mr Ray Mui

*AECOM*

Mr Willie Wan

Ms Cindy Lam

69. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Dino W.L. Tang, STP/TMYLW, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. Items A1 to C were related to the LSPS development while Item D was to take forward a section 12A (s.12A) application (No. Y/YL-PS/6) agreed by the Committee of the Board. Items E and F were to reflect the existing conditions and latest planning circumstances of two “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) sites and Item G was to



amend the zoning boundary of “CDA” zone arising from Item A2. The proposed amendments included:

- (a) Item A1 – rezoning of a site at Wing Ning Tsuen from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Residential (Group A) 7” (“R(A)7”) subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 82,560m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum building height (BH) of 175mPD;
- (b) Item A2 – rezoning of four land parcels at Wing Ning Tsuen from “CDA” and “GB” to “R(A)8” subject to a maximum GFA of 210,143m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BH of 160mPD;
- (c) Item B – rezoning of a strip of land along the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Tsuen Ma Line (TML) Viaduct from “CDA”, “GB” and area shown as ‘Tuen Ma Line Emergency Access Point’ to area shown as ‘Road’;
- (d) Item C – rezoning of two pieces of land at Wing Ning Tsuen from “GB” to “Government, Institution or Community”;
- (e) Item D – rezoning of a site to the north of Castle Peak Road – Ping Shan from “Village Type Development” and “CDA” to “R(A)9” subject to a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 4.5, a maximum non-domestic PR of 0.48 and a maximum BH of 105mPD, and to stipulate under the “R(A)9” zone that a GFA of not less than 5,400m<sup>2</sup> should be required for provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, which should be included for PR calculation;
- (f) Item E – rezoning of a site to the southeast of Tong Fong Tsuen and west of the junction of Ping Ha Road and Castle Peak Road from “CDA” to “Residential (Group E) 1” (“R(E)1”) subject to a maximum PR of 1 and a maximum BH of 5 storeys including car parks;
- (g) Item F – rezoning of a site to the northeast of the junction of Ping Ha Road and Castle Peak Road from “CDA” to “Residential (Group B) 2” (“R(B)2”) subject to a maximum PR of 1 and a maximum BH of 5 storeys including



car parks; and

(h) Item G – adjustment to the zoning boundary of “CDA” zone.

70. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the Plan and to tally with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.

71. As the presentation of PlanD’s representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

#### Amendment Items A1 to C

##### *Housing Mix of LSPS Development*

72. Noting that the increase in the domestic GFA for public and private housing at a ratio of 70:30 was one of the criteria for LSPS development, a Member enquired about the calculation of GFA for public and private housing under the LSPS development. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H of LSO, DEVB, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, explained that the domestic GFA of about 13,442m<sup>2</sup> generated from the adjoining government land (GL) which was capable of reasonable separate alienation or development and the third party land was excluded from the calculation of the housing mix. Based on the GFA generated from the private land of the applicant and the public and private housing ratio of 70:30, the domestic GFA for the public housing portion would be 192,641m<sup>2</sup> and that for the private housing portion would be 82,560m<sup>2</sup>. The GFA of about 13,442m<sup>2</sup> generated from such GL and the third party land was included in the public housing portion, and as a result, the domestic GFA for public housing was 206,083m<sup>2</sup> as stated in the Paper.

##### *Housing Mix of the Area and Building Design*

73. Noting that the private housing portion under Item A1 was mainly surrounded by public housing developments, a Member enquired whether there would be other private housing developments in the vicinity in future. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint Slide, said that to the immediate west

and south of the LSPS sites were three sites zoned “CDA” adjoining Long Tin Road. Out of the three “CDA” sites, the two located in the west fell within the study area of an engineering feasibility study for potential public housing development while the remaining one in the east could be developed for private housing should there be any development proposals by land owner(s) or developer(s). To the further south near Item D Site, there were areas zoned “R(B)1” and “R(E)2” that could also be developed for private housing. The Chairperson supplemented that Item D which was to reflect an agreed s.12A application (No. Y/YL-PS/6), was also intended for private residential development.

74. Another Member enquired about the reasons for the raised floor design for the public housing development at Site C2 under Item A2 as shown in Drawing 11 of the Paper. In response, Mr Man Ho, the Consultant, explained that the raised floor design of some building blocks was to cater for the provision of emergency vehicular access and to facilitate air ventilation. The same Member further enquired whether the existing grave adjoining Site C2 under Item A2 could be relocated. In response, Mr Man Ho, the Consultant, said that upon site inspection and consultation with the Ping Shan Heung Rural Committee, the existing grave, which was excluded from the LSPS site, was proposed to be preserved in-situ, taking into account its considerable size and significance to the local villagers.

#### *Traffic, Transport and Pedestrian Facilities*

75. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details about the road and junction improvement works with respect to the constraints of the existing MTR TML Viaduct;
- (b) noting that the LSPS development was located between MTR Tin Shui Wai Station and MTR Long Ping Station, the walking time from the LSPS development to the two MTR stations and the estimated demand for different transport modes;
- (c) the future maintenance and management (M&M) responsibilities for the road beneath the MTR TML under Item B and the road between Sites C1 and C2 as shown in Drawing 1 of the Paper;

- (d) whether the public transport terminus (PTT) located at the private housing portion of Item A1 was a GIC facility, whether the PTT would serve the general public, and the M&M arrangement for the PTT; and
- (e) the reasons for the difference in the width of the footpaths i.e. 3m and 3.5m respectively as shown in Drawing 1 of the Paper.

76. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD and Mr Man Ho, the Consultant, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) various road and junction improvement works had been proposed, including amongst others, upgrading the existing single track access road to a 2-lane carriageway of minimum 10.3m wide with a 3m-wide sidewalk on both sides and minimum 4m wide cycle track to enhance the traffic accessibility in the area and to cater for the anticipated development traffic flows, and upgrading and signalling the junction with Long Ping Road. The proposed improvement works had taken into account the interface with MTR TML Viaduct;
- (b) the LSPS site was located about 1 km (around 10 to 15-minute walking time) from MTR Long Ping Station. A PTT for bus, green minibus and taxi was planned at the private housing portion in Item A1, which would provide public transport services to MTR Long Ping Station and other locations to cater for the passenger demand arising from the proposed development. In addition to the planned PTT, there were bus stops along the public road under Item B to enhance the accessibility to various sites of the LSPS development. According to the modal split assumed in the Traffic Impact Assessment, around 70% to 80% of the estimated trips generated from the public and private housing of the LSPS development would rely on public transport;
- (c) the proposed road works would be gazetted under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) and carried out by the LSPS

applicant, and the road would be handed over to the Government for future M&M upon completion;

- (d) the PTT was a public facility to serve the general public. It would be constructed by the LSPS applicant and handed over to the Government for M&M upon completion; and
- (e) while the width of the footpath was generally 3m, taking into account site constraints in the vicinity such as village entrances and graves, a width of 3.5m was proposed at some sections near the future on-street bus stops/laybys.

#### *Other Technical Aspects*

77. The Vice-chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the potential visual impact was “Moderately Adverse/Significantly Adverse” from Kai Shan, i.e. viewpoint 5 (VP5), whether the proposed development would affect views to the ridgeline in the south of the proposed LSPS development and the details of the BHs of the LSPS development as shown in Drawing 17 of the Paper;
- (b) any mitigation measures proposed to alleviate the wind blockage from the LSPS development to areas located immediately downwind; and
- (c) given the proximity of the LSPS development to the MTR TML Viaduct, whether the LSPS sites would be affected by railway noise.

78. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Visual Impact Assessment, VP5 was located at the trail of Kai Shan, providing a panoramic view of Wang Chau area with Yuen Long New Town including planned public housing developments (i.e. Wang

Chau Phase 1 and Long Pin Public Housing Developments) and the LSPS development. Even without the LSPS development, there would be public housing development projects visible in this area. Together with the LSPS development, the area could be considered as an extension of Yuen Long New Town. Protection of ridgelines primarily referred to the ridgelines along the two sides of Victoria Harbour when viewed from key public viewing points. Ridgeline protection in other areas including the New Territories would be assessed on a case-by-case basis. While part of the ridgeline south of Yuen Long New Town would be obstructed as viewed from VP5 due to the LSPS development and other planned public housing developments, Kai Shan was not considered a popular/key public viewing point. Having considered the above, the LSPS development would not generate significant visual impact. Two BH profiles for the LSPS development had been shown in Drawing 17 of the Paper with the dashed lines indicating the proposed BH restrictions and the solid lines showing the BHs of the indicative scheme with BH variation;

- (b) the LSPS site was not located at a wind corridor. To mitigate the potential air ventilation impact to areas located immediately downwind, such as Wing Ning Tsuen and Ha Mei San Tsuen, the conceptual layout of the proposed LSPS development had been carefully considered, with various mitigation measures incorporated including building separations of about 15m, building setbacks from site boundaries in both private and public housing sites, raised floor design and disposition of open space; and
- (c) an Environmental Assessment, which included a Railway Noise Impact Assessment, had been conducted and the findings demonstrated that with the implementation of environmental mitigation measures incorporated in the indicative scheme, such as restricting the use of openable window facing directly the rail track, adverse rail noise impact was not anticipated. The LSPS applicant and HKHA would carry out further noise impact assessment for the private and public developments respectively at the detailed design stage.

*Land Administration*

79. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the Government or the LSPS applicant would be responsible for resuming the third party land within the LSPS site; and
- (b) how to demarcate the sites for private housing and public housing developments under the LSPS scheme.

80. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H of LSO, DEVB and Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) the third party private land located at Site C2 under Item A2 would be resumed by the Government under the Land Resumption Ordinance (Cap. 124) for public housing development, and the GFA generated from the third party land would not be included in the calculation of the 70:30 housing mix between public and private housing development in accordance with the endorsed framework of the LSPS; and
- (b) HKHA would apply for a Vesting Order from the Lands Department for the public housing development, while the LSPS applicant would apply for a land exchange for the private housing portion under LSPS development based on the development restrictions under the proposed “R(A)7” zone. The demarcation of the private housing and public housing sites would be further refined at the detailed design stage in consultation with the concerned government departments, if required.

Amendment Items E and F

*Development Parameters*

81. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was any development proposal for Item E Site to support the rezoning from “CDA” to “R(E)1” and the reason for the maximum PR of 1 for the proposed “R(E)1” zone under Item E, noting that the maximum PR for “R(E)2” was 0.6; and
- (b) whether the maximum PR of 1 for the proposed “R(B)2” zone under Item F was to reflect the PR of the existing residential developments on the site.

82. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) the Item E Site fell within the “CDA” zone, which was occupied by industrial developments with no development proposal received so far. As the other portion of the same “CDA” zone was proposed to be rezoned to “R(A)9” under Item D to take forward an agreed s.12A application (No. Y/YL-PS/6) and the Committee had agreed to rezone the remaining portion of this “CDA” site with two industrial buildings to appropriate zoning so as to facilitate early transformation of the area when considering ‘Review of Sites Designated “Comprehensive Development Area” on Statutory Plans in the New Territories for the Years 2023/2025’ (2023/25 “CDA” Review) on 23.5.2025, Item E Site was recommended to be rezoned to “R(E)1” to facilitate the phasing out of existing industrial use through redevelopment for residential use subject to planning permission. The PR restriction of 1 for the proposed “R(E)1” zone under Item E followed the PR restriction under the original “CDA” zone; and
- (b) Item F Site was mainly occupied by residential use with a private residential dwelling, a low-rise residential development named Green Orchid and some temporary structures. While Green Orchid already had a PR of 1, there was scope for the remaining parts of the site to be developed to the maximum PR of 1 as permitted under the original “CDA” zone and the proposed “R(B)2” zone.

83. The Chairperson remarked that the proposed amendments to the OZP were



mainly to facilitate the LSPS development with technical assessments conducted to ascertain the feasibility and consultation conducted, to reflect an agreed s.12A application and to follow the recommendation of the 2023/25 “CDA” Review. Should the Committee agree with the proposed amendments, the draft OZP would be gazetted for public inspection for 2 months and the representations received, if any, would be submitted to the Town Planning Board for consideration.

84. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-PS/20 and that the draft Ping Shan OZP No. S/YL-PS/20A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/YL-PS/21 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (c) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Ping Shan OZP No. S/YLPS/20A (to be renumbered as S/YL-PS/21) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for various land use zones on the OZP and the revised ES will be suitable for published together with the OZP.”

85. Members noted that as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

[The Chairperson thanked government representatives and the Consultants for attending the meeting. Representatives of DEVB and the Consultants left the meeting at this point.]

[Messrs Timothy K.W. Ma and Rocky L.K. Poon rejoined the meeting at this point.]

**Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space  
in Yuen Long District Council Area**

Type of Facilities		Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
				Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Open Space <sup>&amp;</sup>	District Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons <sup>#</sup>	158.93 ha	29.15 ha	201.40 ha	+42.47 ha
	Local Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons <sup>#</sup>	158.93 ha	117.21 ha	229.63 ha	+70.70 ha
Sports Centre		1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons <sup>#</sup> (assessed on a district basis)	24	8	21	-3
Sports Ground/Sport Complex		1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons <sup>#</sup> (assessed on a district basis)	6	2	3	-3
Swimming Pool Complex – standard		1 complex per 287,000 persons <sup>#</sup> (assessed on a district basis)	5	2	3	-2
District Police Station		1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons (assessed on a regional basis)	3	1	3	0
Divisional Police Station		1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons (assessed on a regional basis)	8	4	7	-1

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Magistracy	1 per 660,000 persons (assessed on a regional basis)	2	0	1	-1
Community Hall	No set standard	N.A.	8	13	N.A.
Library	1 district library per 200,000 persons  (assessed on a district basis)	8	3	8	0
Kindergarten/ Nursery	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to under 6	801 classrooms	476 classrooms	960 classrooms	+159 classrooms
Primary School	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11  (assessed by EDB on a district/school network basis)	1,909 classrooms	1,276 classrooms	2,494 classrooms	+585 classrooms
Secondary School	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17  (assessed by EDB on a territory-wide basis)	1,256 classrooms	1,153 classrooms	1,663 classrooms	+407 classrooms
Hospital	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons  (assessed by Hospital Authority (HA) on a regional/ cluster basis)	8,901 beds	1,122 beds	6,422 beds^	-2,479 beds^

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Clinic/Health Centre	1 per 100,000 persons  (assessed on a district basis)	16	5	14	-2
Child Care Centre	100 aided places per 25,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a local basis)	6,357 places	528 places	2,678 places	-3,679 places <sup>~</sup>
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a local basis)	15	11	19	+4
Integrated Family Services Centre	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a service boundary basis)	10	6	10	0
District Elderly Community Centres	One in each new development area with a population of around 170,000 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD)	N.A.	2	5	N.A.

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Neighbourhood Elderly Centres	One in a cluster of new and redeveloped housing areas with a population of 15,000 to 20,000 persons, including both public and private housing <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD)	N.A.	7	26	N.A.
Community Care Services (CCS) Facilities	17.2 subsidised places per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above <sup>#*</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	7,025 places	719 places	2,449 places	-4,576 places <sup>~</sup>
Residential Care Homes for the Elderly	21.3 subsidised beds per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a cluster basis)	8,699 beds	2,093 beds	6,915 beds	-1,784 beds <sup>~</sup>
Pre-school Rehabilitation Services	23 subvented service places per 1,000 children aged 0-6 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	1,308 places	280 places	820 places	-488 places <sup>~</sup>

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Day Rehabilitation Services	23 subvented service places per 10,000 persons aged 15 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	3,181 places	898 places	1,568 places	-1,613 places <sup>~</sup>
Residential Care Services	36 subvented service places per 10,000 persons aged 15 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a cluster basis)	4,979 places	818 places	3,438 places	-1,541 places <sup>~</sup>
Community Rehabilitation Day Centre	1 centre per 420,000 persons <sup>#</sup> (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	3	0	2	-1 <sup>~</sup>
District Support Centre for Persons with Disabilities	1 centre per 280,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	5	2	3	-2 <sup>~</sup>
Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness	1 standard scale centre per 310,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	4.8	1.7	2.7	-2.1 <sup>~</sup>

Note:

The planned resident population is about 1,589,300. If including transients, the overall planned population is about 1,618,400. All population figures have been adjusted to the nearest hundred.

Remarks:

- & The new provision standard and refined criteria on countability for open space promulgated under Chapter 4 of HKPSG on 30.12.2025 are yet to be reflected in this table as the figures are being updated. The changes in provision standard or countability of open space do not affect the usage and enjoyment of the existing open space by members of the public.
- # The requirements exclude planned population of transients.
- ^ The deficit in provision is based on District Council planned population while the Hospital Authority (HA) plans its services on a cluster basis, and takes into account a number of factors in planning and developing various public healthcare services. The New Territories West Cluster (NTWC) provides services for residents in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long districts. There are a number of hospital redevelopment projects planned in the First and Second Hospital Development Plans (HDPs), which will provide additional beds for serving the population and meeting projected services demand in NTWC. With the changes in the planning and development situation in Hong Kong and having regard to its territory-wide and regional planning and development strategies with the latest corresponding change in population projections, as well as the population policy of the Government, etc., the Health Bureau and the HA are currently reviewing the Second HDP by adopting a planning horizon of up to 2041 and beyond, and to project the healthcare services demand and consider the supply and conditions of the land required (including the feasibility of constructing a hospital and the associated supporting facilities on the site concerned), for optimising the Second HDP. Other factors such as the development need of individual hospitals and its cost-effectiveness, and the convenience of public access to healthcare services under various major transport infrastructure development plans are considered for determining the distribution, scale and priority, etc. of various hospital development projects under the Second HDP.
- ~ The deficit in provision is based on District Council planned population while the Social Welfare Department (SWD) adopts a wider spatial context/cluster in the assessment of provision for such facility. In applying the population-based planning standards, the distribution of welfare facilities, supply in different districts, service demand as a result of the population growth and demographic changes as well as the provision of different welfare facilities have to be considered. As the HKPSG requirements for these facilities are a long-term goal, the actual provision will be subject to consideration of the SWD in the planning and development process as appropriate. The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach with long-, medium- and short-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services which are in acute demand.
- \* Consisting of 40% centre-based CCS and 60% home-based CCS.

**February 2026**