



West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)

Mr Michael K.K. Cheung - Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and  
West Kowloon (STP/TWK)

Ms Jacqueline Y.H. Chan - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West  
Kowloon

**Applicant's Representatives**

*Far East Consortium International Limited*

Ms Josephine Chiu

Mr Raymond Fong

Mr Macro Lee

Ms Fanny Yip

Mr William Lai

*Arup*

Ms Theresa Yeung

Mr Leo Huang

Ms Carmen Chu

Ms Karen Chan

Mr Jason Leung

*Singular Studio Limited*

Mr Franklin Yu

Ms Derek Tam

*Ramboll Hong Kong Limited*

Mr Tony Cheng

*JMK Consulting Engineers Limited*

Mr Edmond So

*H Plus Limited*

Ms Yvonne Yau

8. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. To ensure smooth and efficient conduct of the meeting, a time limit of 15 minutes was set for presentation of the applicant. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the application.

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning of the application site (the Site) from "Green Belt" ("GB") and "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") to "Residential (Group B) 9" ("R(B)9") to facilitate a proposed private residential development with social welfare facilities, including a 100-place residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) cum 30-place day care unit (DCU) (RCHE cum DCU) and a centre of home care services for frail elderly persons (HCS), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. While PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application, it was considered more appropriate to stipulate a total gross floor area (GFA) and a requirement for a minimum provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to better reflect the intention of the proposed private RCHE cum DCU in the indicative scheme and allow flexibility to provide more GIC facilities in terms of types and floor area, instead of disregarding the floor space that was constructed or intended for use solely as GIC facilities from GFA calculation as proposed by the applicant. In addition, on 24.1.2025, the Committee partially agreed a section 12A (s.12) application No. Y/TW/19 to rezone a site at Fu Yung Shan from "GB" and "Village Type Development" to "R(B)9" (the similar application). Should the Committee agreed/partially agreed to the subject application, the Site would be rezoned to "R(B)10". Appropriate revisions to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP would be recommended when the relevant proposed amendments were submitted to the Committee for consideration.

[The Vice-chairperson, Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu and Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

10. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) under the indicative scheme, a total of 613 flats were proposed. The total plot ratio (PR) would be 4.47, including a domestic PR of 4 and a non-domestic PR of 0.47, with a maximum building height (BH) of 180mPD. A maximum domestic GFA (equivalent to a domestic PR of 4) (with non-domestic GFA for GIC facilities proposed to be exempted) was proposed to be incorporated in the Notes of the OZP. The proposed GIC facilities (equivalent to a non-domestic PR of 0.47) comprised social welfare facilities, including an HCS as requested by the Social Welfare Department (SWD), and a privately/self-financed RCHE cum DCU, which could help address the demand from the elderly requiring varying levels of care. An access road, with a footpath on one side, would connect the Site to Po Fung Road. The application supported the housing supply targets highlighted in the recent Policy Address, which emphasised the critical need for both public and private housing. The proposed development would optimise the underutilised land resources, increase the supply of private residential units and comply with the “Single Site, Multiple Use” principle;
- (b) the Site was situated within an established residential neighbourhood with various areas zoned “Residential (Group A)” and “R(B)”. In particular, some existing residential developments could be found to the south of Tuen Mun Road. The proposed development at the Site was considered not incompatible with the surrounding area;
- (c) the proposed maximum PR and BH were compatible with other existing and proposed residential developments in the vicinity. In 2022, the Committee agreed to rezone two “GB” sites to “R(B)6” (with a maximum domestic PR of 4 and a maximum BH of 180mPD) for development of Starter Homes Project by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) (the Starter Homes Project Site) and “R(B)7” (with a maximum domestic PR of 4) for private residential development respectively. On 24.1.2025, the Committee partially agreed to an application (No. Y/TW/19) for rezoning a site at Fu Yung Shan from “GB” and “V” to “R(B)9” (with a maximum total PR of 3 and maximum BH of 150mPD) for private residential

development (i.e. the similar application). Approval of the current application was in line with the previous decisions of the Committee; and

- (d) various technical assessments had been conducted, and confirmed that the proposed development was technically feasible. Relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds), including the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), Environmental Protection Department (EPD), Transport Department (TD), Water Supplies Department and SWD, etc., had no in-principle objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

11. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

*Exemption of GFA for Social Welfare Facilities*

12. Noting that PlanD did not agree to the applicant's proposal to exempt the GFA for all social welfare facilities except the HCS, the Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the floor area of the RCHE cum DCU would not be eligible for GFA exemption under the OZP as it would be under private/self-financed operation, and whether there were any precedents for granting GFA exemption to social welfare facilities not required by the Government;
- (b) details of the requirements to be incorporated in the Notes and ES of the OZP, in particular the types of GIC facilities, their operation and/or completion dates, whether the applicant could subsequently opt not to provide the RCHE cum DCU, and how to ensure the implementation of the "Single Site, Multiple Use" principle at the Site;
- (c) details of the arrangement for granting of GFA exemption for social welfare facilities under private/self-financed operation, if any; and

- (d) whether the social welfare facilities proposed in the similar application (No. Y/TW/19) were exempted from GFA calculation.

13. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) under the current practice, should there be an exemption clause for GFA calculation for GIC facilities including social welfare facilities under the Notes of the OZP, the clause would stipulate that only those facilities required by the Government could be exempted, unless under exceptional cases. Hence, the GFA for the HCS (i.e. about 303m<sup>2</sup>) under the indicative scheme required by SWD would be exempted from GFA calculation whereas the GFA for the private RCHE cum DCU (about 2,718.5m<sup>2</sup>) initiated by the applicant but not required by SWD would not be eligible for GFA exemption;
- (b) to better reflect the intention to provide a private RCHE cum DCU as proposed in the indicative scheme, a total GFA, i.e. 28,394.5m<sup>2</sup> (including 25,676m<sup>2</sup> for the proposed residential development and 2,718.5m<sup>2</sup> for the proposed RCHE cum DCU), and a minimum provision of GIC facilities would be stipulated in the Notes of the proposed “R(B)10” zone. The types of GIC facilities to be provided, i.e. a RCHE cum DCU and an HCS, could be specified in the ES of the OZP. As such, the mandatory provision of RCHE cum DCU might also be incorporated as lease conditions during the land exchange stage with reference to the provisions/requirements under the Notes and ES of the OZP. This would also safeguard the implementation of the “Single Site, Multiple Use” at the Site;
- (c) according to the incentive scheme to encourage provision of RCHE premises in new private developments – time-limited enhancements launched by the Lands Department (LandsD), concession of GFA up to 12,000m<sup>2</sup> or 10% of the total permissible GFA under lease, whichever was the greater, would be granted by LandsD under lease; and

- (d) a total PR of 3, including a domestic PR of 2.53 and a non-domestic PR of 0.47 for RCHE, was proposed under the similar application (No. Y/TW/19). The approach of stipulating a total GFA and a minimum provision of GIC facilities had also been adopted in other cases. A consistent approach would be adopted in formulating the requirements in the Remarks of the Notes for both the “R(B)9” zone (for the similar application) and the “R(B)10” zone (for the current application). The proposed amendments to the Tsuen Wan OZP would be submitted for the Committee’s consideration prior to the publication of the draft OZP.

14. The Vice-chairperson enquired if the applicant could provide further justifications to support their proposal for exempting the floor area of all social welfare facilities from GFA calculation, irrespective of whether they were requested by the Government or not. In response, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant’s representative, said that the HCS was proposed based on the applicant’s liaison with SWD. In addition, the proposed RCHE cum DCU, though under private/self-financed operation, could help address the surging demand arising from an ageing population and the need for ageing in place among the elderly in the middle-income group, who had limited options between Government-subsidised elderly facilities and luxury private facilities. The elongated configuration of the Site was designed to provide outdoor space with greening and viewing corridors for the enjoyment of the users of the proposed social welfare facilities. SWD had no objection to the proposed mix of social welfare facilities at the Site.

*Development Intensity*

15. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that a non-domestic PR of 0.47 for the RCHE cum DCU accounted for about 11% of the total PR of 4.47, while 5% of the domestic GFA would be allocated for social welfare facilities in new public housing developments, whether the ratio of non-domestic GFA to total GFA was excessive, and whether there were any established criteria for determining the permissible percentage of total GFA for provision of social welfare

facilities in private developments; and

- (b) whether the bulk of the proposed development would be further increased, resulting in adverse visual impact, if the floor area of the RCHE cum DCU was subsequently required by the Government and thus exempted from GFA calculation, and if more GIC facilities were added to fully utilise the non-domestic PR of 0.47.

16. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) provision of social welfare facilities in private developments would be subject to various factors, including the intention of the project proponent, the scale and design of the development, and the operational need (e.g. the optimal operation size) of the social welfare facility. Hence, it might not be feasible to set a fixed ratio of total GFA for the provision of social welfare facilities in private developments. SWD's advice would be sought on the types and scales of the social welfare facilities, and technical assessments would be conducted to demonstrate that their provision would not induce or be subject to insurmountable technical problems. Under the application, SWD considered that the types and scales of the proposed social welfare facilities were appropriate and the applicant had also demonstrated the technical feasibility of the proposal; and
- (b) in determining the types and floor area of social welfare facilities to be required by the Government within any development, SWD would take into account a host of factors, including locational requirements, demand for such facilities and availability of funding, etc. For the subject case, only the floor area of an HCS (i.e. 303m<sup>2</sup>) was proposed to be exempted from GFA calculation. While flexibility had been allowed for SWD to adjust the floor area of social welfare facilities and types of services to be provided, SWD indicated that they had no intention to further increase in the floor area of social welfare facilities required by the Government on top of an HCS (i.e. 303m<sup>2</sup>) at the current stage. Relevant B/Ds would also

advise on the appropriateness and technical feasibility at the detailed design/land exchange stage if additional GIC facilities were to be included in the development.

17. The Chairperson supplemented that land use compatibility, technical feasibility, policy support from relevant B/Ds would be considered when determining the types and scales of social welfare facilities to be provided within a private development. As the size and context of the sites for private developments varied considerably, it might not be appropriate to adopt a fixed percentage of floor area for the provision of social welfare facilities. Moreover, while a relatively high proportion of floor area for such facilities could benefit the society as a whole, it might impose a financial burden on the project proponents. For social welfare facilities required by the Government, the facilities would be handed over to the Government upon completion of construction, and the exemption of GFA could provide flexibility to adjust the size of such facilities at the detailed design stage. With reference to the similar application (No. Y/TW/19), the Chairperson said that the non-domestic PR (i.e. 0.47) accounted for about 16% of the total PR (i.e. 3). Hence, the proposed non-domestic PR accounting for about 11% of the total PR (i.e. 4.47) was generally consistent with the approach adopted in previous approved applications.

18. A Member expressed concerns about the trend of increasing total PR, noting that in the similar application No. Y/TW/19, a total PR of 3, including a non-domestic PR of 0.47 for social welfare facilities, was approved whereas a total PR of 4 (with GFA exemption for social welfare facilities) and 4.47 (including a non-domestic PR of 0.47 for social welfare facilities) were proposed for the HKHS's Starter Homes Project and the proposed development at the Site respectively. The current application adding 0.47 non-domestic PR on top of the domestic PR of 4, which resulted in a higher total PR than some previous cases, was considered an undesirable trend. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the proposed domestic PR of 4 was generally in line with those ranging from about 2.1 to 4 for the other "R(B)" sites in the vicinity, as well as the HKHS site with a maximum domestic PR of about 4 (calculated from the maximum GFA restriction of 97,200m<sup>2</sup> stipulated in the Notes of the OZP). The additional PR for social welfare facilities proposed by the applicant as a planning merit had been taken into account in the technical assessments. It should be noted that as the similar application was situated at Fu Yung Shan with a village-type setting, a lower domestic PR of 2.53 was considered

appropriate to suit the local character. In view of the above, the proposed domestic PR of 4 under the current application was considered not unacceptable.

*Shared Use of Proposed Access Road*

19. With reference to paragraphs 8.1.1 and 9 as well as footnote 9 of the Paper, a Member enquired about details of the communication between the applicant and HKHS regarding the shared use of the proposed access road, including the construction, maintenance and management (M&M) responsibility of the proposed access road and the compensatory planting therein. In response, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that the proposed access road comprised two portions: (i) the new portion adjoining the Site (the new portion); and (ii) the existing service road of Yau Kom Tau Water Treatment Works (the remaining portion). A temporary haul road would first be constructed by HKHS at the remaining portion as the construction access for its Starter Homes Project. The temporary road would then be reinstated to its original conditions before being handed over to the applicant, subject to further liaison and agreement with concerned government departments and HKHS. To minimise interface issues between the proposed development and HKHS's Starter Homes Project due to the overlapping development programmes, the applicant had liaised with HKHS and reached agreement on the shared use of the temporary haul road during construction. Construction works on the Site and the new portion of the access road via Tuen Mun Road would proceed concurrently with other projects by sharing the use of the temporary haul road. The construction of the remaining portion of the proposed access road would commence once the temporary haul road was no longer in use by other development(s), or by 2033, whichever was earlier. The proposed access road, including the new portion and the remaining portion, would be upgraded to a two-lane, two-way carriageway with footpath connecting the Site to Po Fung Road by the applicant. The lot grantee would bear the M&M responsibility for the proposed access road, including the compensatory planting therein.

*Comments from HKHS*

20. In response to a Member's enquiry about the reason for multiple comments submitted by HKHS objecting to and providing views on the application, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that under the current proposal,

the proposed access road would connect the Site to Po Fung Road, which would become a public road after the completion of the road improvement works by HKHS and the developer of “R(B)7” zone respectively. While the applicant committed to maintaining and managing the proposed access road, it could be handed over to the Government for M&M upon request. Suitable requirements would be incorporated into the lease during land exchange application, including non-exclusive use of the proposed access road given that it would also serve Yau Kom Tau Water Treatment Works. Discussions and negotiations between the applicant and HKHS had taken place during the processing of the current application, given the overlapping development programmes of the proposed development and HKHS’s Starters Home Project. The first comment from HKHS objected to the application on the basis of the potential conflict of the proposed road widening works by the applicant and the construction works at the Starter Homes Project Site. After liaison between the applicant, HKHS and relevant B/Ds, consensus had been reached on the shared use of the temporary haul road, which was reflected in the further information (FI) submitted under the application. Based on the FI, HKHS subsequently submitted comments providing views on the FI only, instead of objecting to the application. For the sake of completeness, all public comments, including the various comments by HKHS at different stages of the application, were included in the Paper. The potential traffic impact during both the construction and operational stages had been duly assessed in the TIA, and TD had no objection to the TIA and the application.

#### *Provision of Transport Facilities*

21. The Chairperson and two Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether there were any existing public transport services near the Site, and whether there was any spare capacity to cater for the additional demand arising from the proposed development;
  - (b) the walking distance from the Site to the nearest existing public transport services, including green minibus (GMB) or franchised buses;
  - (c) whether shuttle bus services connecting the Site to major public transport facilities (especially MTR Tsuen Wan Station and Tsuen Wan West Station) would be provided by the applicant;

- (d) whether the proposed car parking provision complied with the relevant requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG); and
- (e) whether the proposed access road would be utilised by public transport services including GMB or franchised bus, other than the shuttle bus services to be provided by the applicant and the private cars of residents at the Site.

22. In response, Ms Carmen Chu, the applicant's representative, with the aid of some plans, made the following main points:

- (a) there was no existing public transport directly serving the Site;
- (b) future residents could walk from the Site via the proposed access road to Po Fung Road where a GMB stop was located;
- (c) a weather-proof pick-up/drop-off point would be provided within the Site, providing shuttle bus services between the Site and MTR Tsuen Wan Station and Tsuen Wan West Station;
- (d) the proposed provision of car parking spaces would meet the high-end requirements of HKPSG; and
- (e) an approximate 24m long lay-by would be provided outside the Site at the end of the access road, which could be used by public transport services, including GMB and franchised buses, if required.

23. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, supplemented that there was an existing GMB route No. 96A providing feeder service between Yau Kom Tau Village and MTR Tsuen Wan Station. TD would closely monitor the public transport demand and ensure timely provision of public transport services, including GMB or franchised bus, to serve the future population at the Starter Homes Project

Site, which could also benefit future residents at the Site. The proposed shuttle bus services for the Site had been included in the TIA and scrutinised by TD, and TD had no objection to the TIA.

24. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry on the future provision of public transport services, Mr B.K. Chow, Assistant Commissioner/Urban, TD, said that according to the TIA submitted by the applicant, the proposed shuttle bus services could accommodate the demand of future residents at the Site. TD would closely monitor the passenger demand in the area and determine if any adjustment or expansion of public transport services would be required.

### *Ecological Impact*

25. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details of the ecological impact, noting that the overall ecological value of the Site was considered as low to moderate; and
- (b) whether a rare bird species, *Eumyias thalassinus* (銅藍鵲), had been recorded in the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) and whether any mitigation measures had been proposed, noting that it had been observed at the Site as mentioned in the public comment.

26. In response, Mr Tony Cheng, the applicant's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site, together with the proposed access road, comprised mixed woodland with modified watercourses. Most of the flora and fauna were common species, except for one individual of the *Dalbergia balansae* (南嶺黃檀) in poor form and/or poor structural condition with low suitability for transplanting, which was proposed to be felled and replaced by native species. Besides, one amphibian species (*Rana latouchii*) (闊褶蛙) had been identified, and would be translocated to adjacent similar habitats before commencement of construction works at the Site. No significant

ecological impact was anticipated with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, which were accepted by AFCD; and

- (b) ecological surveys covering both dry and wet seasons had been conducted in the EcoIA. *Eumyias thalassinus* (銅藍鷓) was not observed during the ecological survey within the Site, and AFCD had no comment on the EcoIA.

### *Compensatory Planting*

27. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the distribution of the 744 new trees to be planted at grade, on the sky garden and in podium gardens, noting the limited site area;
- (b) details of the species and size of the new trees; and
- (c) whether the proposed tree compensation ratio of 1:1.07 could be achieved, given the concerns regarding structural stability, wind load and M&M challenges for trees on the sky garden and podium gardens.

28. In response, Ms Yvonne Yau and Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) of the 744 new trees, 422 would be planted within the Site, while 322 new trees would be planted along the proposed access road outside the Site. A combination of one to two rows of evergreen trees with shrubs or various heights was proposed at-grade along the boundary of the Site;
- (b) a total of 14 species would be provided, including 12 native common species (e.g. *Cinnamomum burmannii* (陰香), *Cinnamomum camphora* (樟) and *Liquidambar formosana Hance* (楓香)), with the heights ranging from 2m to 5m; and

- (c) larger trees would be proposed at grade while smaller trees and hedging plants would be provided in the podium gardens and/or on the sky garden and/or sky bridge, which had struck a balance between safety and maximisation of greening opportunities.

*Provision of GIC Facilities in a Wider Area*

29. In response to a Member's enquiry about the current provision of various GIC facilities within Tsuen Wan District, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that taking into account the population at the Site, there would be a surplus of beds of RCHE, which could also serve a wider area including Kwai Tsing District Council (DC) Area where a shortfall of RCHE beds was observed. Given the high percentage of elderly with long-term care needs as shown in the 2021 Census and following consultation with SWD, it was considered appropriate to provide RCHE at the Site. While there were shortfalls for community care services facilities, day rehabilitation services and residential care services, the provision of such facilities under private initiatives were subject to various factors, including the intention of project proponent and SWD's views. Moreover, the deficit in provision was based on the planned population in the concerned DC Area while SWD would adopt a wider spatial context/cluster in assessing provision for such facilities. As HKPSG requirements for these facilities were a long-term goal, the actual provision would be subject to SWD's consideration in the planning and development process as appropriate. The Government had been adopting a multi-pronged approach with long-, medium- and short-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more social welfare services in acute demand.

*Design and Management of Social Welfare Facilities at the Site*

30. The Chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:
- (a) whether there would be any outdoor area for the enjoyment of users of the social welfare facilities at the Site and whether access to the podium gardens would be exclusive to them or shared with residents of the residential development;

- (b) whether any technical assessments had been conducted to assess the air quality and noise impacts on the users of the social welfare facilities, given the Site's proximity to Tuen Mun Road; and
- (c) details on the sharing of M&M responsibility for the Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) among various parties, given that the STP would serve the residential development, RCHE cum DCU under private/self-financed operation and an HCS as requested by the Government.

31. In response, Messrs Franklin Yu and Tony Cheng and Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant's representatives, with the aid of some plans, made the following main points:

- (a) the garden on 1/F would be open to users of the RCHE cum DCU and HCS;
- (b) an Environmental Assessment, including Traffic Noise Impact Assessment and Air Quality Impact Assessment, had been conducted, and concluded that the social welfare facilities and residential development would not be subject to adverse noise and air quality impacts. EPD had no objection to the application from environmental planning perspective; and
- (c) the provision of an STP within a residential development was a proven and mature technology in Hong Kong, with precedents such as Mount Pavilia in Sai Kung and The Esplanade in Tuen Mun. The STP would be centrally managed while the management fee would be shared among the private residents, RCHE cum DCU and HCS based on their respective shares. Such details would be incorporated in the Deed of Mutual Covenant (DMC), which was a standard practice for managing shared facilities in composite developments.

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

32. As the applicant's representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairperson informed the applicant's representatives that the hearing procedure of the application had been completed and the Committee would

deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 10-minute break.]

### Deliberation Session

33. The Chairperson remarked that the application sought to rezone the Site from "GB" and "G/IC" to "R(B)9" for a proposed private residential development with provision of social welfare facilities. In considering the application, Members might focus on two major issues, i.e. the impact of rezoning the "GB" site and the development intensity of the proposed development. The Committee had previously agreed to rezone a site from "GB" to "R(B)6" with similar development intensity in the area. It was an established practice that the floor area for privately operated social welfare facilities would be GFA accountable, while the GIC facilities as required by the Government would be exempted from GFA calculation. This practice was reasonable and fair, and had been adopted in various OZPs, including the "Residential (Group C) 3" ("R(C)3") zone (with a private RCHE) on the approved Mid-level East OZP No. S/H12/14, where a maximum GFA of 11,010m<sup>2</sup>, with not less than 2,258m<sup>2</sup> GFA for the provision of RCHE and related elderly facilities, was stipulated in the Notes of the OZP. Should the current application be agreed or partially agreed by the Committee, statutory plan-making procedures would commence, including, inter alia, submission of the proposed amendments to the approved Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/39 for the Committee's consideration, publication of the draft OZP, consideration of the representations received, if any, by the Town Planning Board, and submission of the draft OZP to the Chief Executive in Council.

34. Members generally supported the application and considered that the proposed private RCHE cum DCU could help meet the increasing market demand and was in line with the Government's initiative. A few Members opined that as the provision of social welfare facilities within the Site could be regarded as a planning merit warranting favourable consideration, an effective monitoring mechanism should be in place to ensure the timely realisation and/or continuous operation of such facilities. To avoid abuse of the system, LandsD might consider charging a different premium if the applicant failed to obtain the

necessary operating licence for the social welfare facilities.

35. The Vice-chairperson supported the application in considering that relevant B/Ds had no objection to the application. The “Single Site, Multiple Use” principle should not be confined to government projects but should also be encouraged in private developments to better utilise scarce land resources. While there was a need for privately operated RCHE, the shortfalls in other types of social welfare facilities were more acute. Where there was clear policy support or a concrete implementation plan from the proponent, the Board might consider granting GFA exemption for the proposed social welfare facilities, so as to leverage private initiatives to fill the critical gaps in service provision and to uphold the “Single Site, Multiple Use” principle.

36. A Member, who expressed support for the application, pointed out that any development on the Site was subject to a maximum PR of 8 under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) for being a Class A site, or a maximum PR/GFA stipulated in the OZP, whichever was the lower. By stipulating a maximum domestic PR of 4 and a maximum non-domestic PR of 0.47 (for the RCHE cum DCU) with GFA exemption for the HCS as required by the Government or a maximum domestic PR of 4 with GFA exemption for all social welfare facilities proposed (i.e. both the HCS and the RCHE cum DCU) in the Notes of the OZP, which was merely a matter of presentation, the building bulk of the proposed development would remain unchanged, as the PR control for the proposed “R(B)10” zone on the OZP was more stringent than that under the B(P)R and hence should prevail. The stipulation of a minimum floor area requirement for social welfare facilities could ensure their provision and reflect the applicant’s initiative. Regarding the shared M&M responsibility of the STP among various parties, the same Member expressed concerns that if residents of the private residential development moved in before the operation of the RCHE cum DCU and HCS, they might need to bear the full M&M costs for the STP. The lease conditions therefore should set out clearly the respective responsibilities among different parties to avoid possible disputes in the future. Moreover, given the difficulty in maintaining trees on the sky garden and/or sky bridge, the provision of compensatory trees in such locations was not desirable and might affect the feasibility of achieving the proposed tree compensation ratio of 1:1.07, which should be addressed at the detailed design stage.

37. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the application.

The provision of privately operated RCHE was not uncommon in Hong Kong. The issue of ensuring the timely and sustainable operation of such facilities at the Site was acknowledged, and could be monitored through appropriate lease conditions and licensing requirements, subject to further liaison with relevant B/Ds. It was an established practice to exempt social welfare facilities as required by the Government from GFA calculation, while privately operated facilities were GFA accountable. Whether the floor area of private/self-financed social welfare facilities would be exempted from GFA calculation should be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the individual merits of each application. While some privately proposed facilities might not address the most acute shortfalls, it was difficult to mandate the provision of specific type of facilities as private initiatives were primarily profit-driven, whereas government provision would be subject to funding and resource availability of SWD. In processing s.12A rezoning applications and s.16 applications, comments from SWD would be sought on the appropriate types and scales of social welfare facilities to be provided. The “Single Site, Multiple Use” principle was also applicable to private developments, subject to land use compatibility and interface considerations among different users. The sharing of M&M responsibility for the STP at the Site could be addressed, say through DMC. As for the proposed compensatory planting, the current proposal was indicative and the detailed provision would be further scrutinised at the building plan submission and/or lease modification stages. PlanD would convey to the applicant the Committee’s view on this issue, as appropriate.

[Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu left the meeting during deliberation.]

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application to rezone the application site to “Residential (Group B) 10” with stipulation of appropriate development parameters and minimum provision of government, institution and community facilities in the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The relevant proposed amendments to the Tsuen Wan OZP, together with the revised Notes and Explanatory Statement, would be worked out in consultation with relevant government departments and submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.