

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North)
Environmental Protection Department
Ms Clara K.W. U

Director of Lands
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comment in respect of the Draft Fu Tei Au and Sha Ling
Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-FTA/17
(TPB Paper No. 10934)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

63. The Secretary reported that the amendments incorporated in the Fu Tei Au and Sha Ling Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-FTA/17 (the draft OZP) were related to a public housing project at Wa Shan, Fanling to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) with Housing Department (HD) as the executive arm. The proposed public housing development was supported by an Engineering Feasibility Study conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai - being a member of HKHA;
(as Director of Lands)

Ms Fancy L.M. Cheung - being a representative of the Director of Home
(as Chief Engineer (Works), Affairs who was a member of the Strategic
Home Affairs Department) Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing
Committee of HKHA;

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong | - having current business dealings with HKHA; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA; and |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - conducting contract research projects with CEDD; being a member of a focus group of CEDD on the study related to the Kau Yi Chau Artificial Islands; and being an honorary professional adviser of CEDD associated with the development of New Territories North. |

64. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong and Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Franklin Yu would not join the meeting on the item. The interests of Mr Andrew C.W. Lai and Ms Fancy L.M. Cheung were direct and they had left the meeting temporarily for the item.

Presentation and Question Sessions

65. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the representers and commenter inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than the person who was present, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenter, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comment in their absence.

66. The following government representatives and representer/commenter were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan | - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN) |
|-----------------------|---|

Ms Amy Y.T. Chong	-	Assistant Town Planner/Shia Tin, Tai Po and North (ATP/STN)
-------------------	---	---

CEDD

Mr F.S. Sit	-	Chief Engineer (CE)
Mr Bruce L.C. Cheung	-	Senior Engineer

HD

Ms Lily L.H. Sze	-	Senior Planning Officer
Mr Tony M.H. Leung	-	Senior Architect (SA)

WSP (Asia) Limited

Mr Dan W.H. Chau]	
Ms Daphne Y.M. Lam]	Consultants
Ms Reasonlie Y.Y. Cheung]	

Representer/Commenter

R3/C1 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill	-	Representer and Commenter
-------------------	---	---------------------------

67. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comment. The representer/commenter would then be invited to make her oral submission. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, the representer/commenter would be allotted 20 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representer/commenter two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representer/commenter had completed her oral submission. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representer/commenter. After the Q&A session, the government representatives and the representer/commenter would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the representations and comment in their absence and inform the representers and commenter of the Board's decision in due course.

68. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comment. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, PlanD, briefed Members on the representations and comment, including the background of the draft OZP, the grounds/views of the representers and commenter and PlanD's views on the representations and comment as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10934 (the Paper).

69. The Chairperson then invited the representer/commenter to elaborate on her representation/comment.

R3/C1 – Ms Mary Mulvihill

70. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

Visual Impacts

- (a) the location, size and visual impact of the proposed public transport terminus and car park building (PTT building) was shocking. It would be visually imposing but its impacts were downplayed in the photomontages of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The proposed visual mitigation measures would not be able to alleviate the impacts. There was no explanation why the PTT could not be built underground;
- (b) the LVIA admitted that the visual impact of the proposed development on some viewpoints was considered “substantially adverse” and would inevitably alter the existing visual context and visual amenity of the locality. The development would not be fully in line with the planned visual context of the Fanling North New Development Area (NDA) as a riverside community. It would reduce the visual openness. While the LVIA stated that in a wider context, the proposed development would become an extension of the Fanling/Sheung Shui New Town, it should be noted that the development would be out of context in the New Territories;

Site Layout

- (c) there was little separation between the PTT building and the adjacent residential blocks. The exceptional bulk of the PTT building would block the natural lighting and air ventilation of the lower floors of those adjacent blocks. The building separation should be more than the minimum requirement of 15m. The number of public housing units should not be an overriding consideration in planning for the public housing development;
- (d) the proposal failed to use space efficiently. The area planned for roads and emergency vehicular access was excessive, requiring the felling of a large number of trees and unnecessary paving within the public housing site (the Site). Only small trees could be planted in a few areas of the Site;

Provision of Government, Institution or Community Facilities

- (e) the government, institution or community provision at a level of not less than 5% of the proposed domestic gross floor area would not be sufficient to serve the aging population;

Noise Mitigation Measures

- (f) it was not clear whether the proposed noise mitigation measures, such as acoustic fin/windows, fixed glazing window, etc., were as effective as those recently adopted in Singapore. In any event, the installation of those mitigation measures would make it difficult for the future residents of the public housing to dry their clothes, affecting their living environment and building structures;

Public Housing Need

- (g) the need for more public housing units was questionable, especially when Hong Kong was facing a budget deficit and flat prices were going down. The provision of public housing had encouraged some people not to work hard such that they could be eligible for public housing. Instead of building more public

housing, the Government should collect relevant information or data from various sources, e.g. the Inland Revenue Department and Companies Registry, to identify those public housing tenants who had already owned private properties or were directors of companies that owned properties, and then take back their public housing units;

Others

- (h) the size of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) was too small to cope with the heavy workload of RNTPC given that there were many section 16 applications in the rural areas. The Government should address the issue when appointing new Board members for the next term;
- (i) many approved section 16 applications for animal boarding establishment had been revoked. Some approved applications might involve a number of extension of time (EOT) for discharging approval conditions. Apparently, such EOT applications had been abused as a means to seek planning permission for clearing and forming the application sites such that the sites could be used for other purposes at a later stage, and hence creating new brownfield sites; and
- (j) PlanD's information on similar section 16 applications for animal boarding establishment presented in RNTPC papers was not consistent. For instance, some similar applications quoted in the RNPTC Paper for application No. A/YL-KTN/759 in May 2021 could not be found in the RNTPC Paper for application No. A/YL-KTN/954 in mid-October 2023 but subsequently, some similar cases re-appeared in the RNPTC Paper for application No. A/YL-KTN/958 in late October 2023. As a reply to her enquiry was pending, the issue was brought up to this meeting.

[Mr Ben S.S. Lui joined the meeting during R3/C1's presentation.]

71. As the presentation of the representer/commenter had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Question and Answer (Q&A) session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the government

representatives and/or the representer/commenter to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties.

Environmental Impacts of Fanling Bypass (Western Section)

72. Some Members and Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning (DoP), asked the following questions:

- (a) given that concerns on the environmental impacts such as air quality and traffic noise arising from Fanling Bypass (Western Section) on the proposed public housing development were already raised at the previous RNTPC meeting when the proposed zoning amendments were considered, what the changes to the layout of the proposed development were and whether the traffic noise could be mitigated at source to the benefits of the future residents;
- (b) the reasons for not incorporating environmental mitigation measures in the design of Fanling Bypass (Western Section) to mitigate the traffic noise at source;
- (c) a cost comparison of using acoustic architectural measures to mitigate the traffic noise and providing mitigation measures at source; and
- (d) the background of Fanling Bypass (Western Section) and its function to serve the new developments in the North District, e.g. the Kwu Tung North and Fanling North NDAs.

73. In response, Mr Tony M.H. Leung, SA, HD, Mr F.S. Sit, CE, CEDD and Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, PlanD made the following points:

- (a) the traffic noise from Fanling Bypass (Western Section) had to be mitigated to avoid adverse impacts on the residents of the proposed public housing development. One of the functions of the PTT building was to mitigate the traffic noise. Besides, acoustic measures, such as acoustic windows and acoustic balconies, were needed. The proposed acoustic windows would be

effective for noise mitigation and allow natural ventilation. The Government had reviewed the possibility of incorporating noise mitigation measures at source for Fanling Bypass (Western Section) after receiving RNTPC's comments. The Government's decision to maintain the layout was based on a balanced consideration of a host of factors, including the feasibility to install noise mitigation measures at the public housing development, the costs of mitigation at source and at the public housing development, and the impact of revising the design of Fanling Bypass (Western Section) for noise mitigation on the scheduled commencement of the road construction in 2025. If the traffic noise could be mitigated at source, it would certainly minimise the design constraints and allow greater design flexibility for the layout of the public housing development;

- (b) the subject public housing development was not yet proposed when Fanling Bypass (Western Section) was planned. There was no noise mitigation measure proposed at Fanling Bypass for the public housing development. The Fanling Bypass (Western Section) project was gazetted in September 2022 after consultation with the District Council in the same year, and the objections to the gazetted road works were being processed. As tenders for the road works would be invited shortly, any substantial changes to the design of Fanling Bypass (Western Section) would severely delay the implementation of the project to provide an important road link for the North District; and
- (c) if noise barriers were added to Fanling Bypass (Western Section), the project cost would be increased. For the proposed public housing development, there was no cost estimate at the moment but incorporation of acoustic architectural measures would generally increase the construction cost for the concerned units up to about 10% to 15% according to previous housing project experience. The need for acoustic architectural measures would depend on the effectiveness of the PTT building in serving as a noise screen. At the moment, it was estimated that of the 4,200 housing units to be built at the Site, acoustic architectural features would be required for about 350 units.

74. The Chairperson remarked that Fanling Bypass (Western Section) was a crucial project to serve the development of the Kwu Tung North and Fanling North NDAs. It had

been scheduled to seek funding from the Legislative Council for the remaining phases of the Kwu Tung North and Fanling North NDAs in 2024 which would cover the construction of Fanling Bypass (Western Section). Late completion of Fanling Bypass (Western Section) might affect the population intake of the two NDAs.

75. The Chairperson and three Members raised the following questions/requests:

- (a) whether it would be possible to provide mitigation measures at source for a short section of the road adjacent to the Site;
- (b) noting that enhancement works for existing roads were commonplace in Hong Kong, it should be technically feasible to provide noise mitigation measures at source. While timely implementation of the road project was important, there was some leeway as the construction would not commence until 2025. CEDD should clarify whether it was possible to speed up the procedures for the provision of mitigation at source; and
- (c) given that the choice of not mitigating the traffic noise at source would not be conducive to good planning, more justifications should be provided.

76. In response, Mr F.S. Sit, CE, CEDD, reiterated that it was undesirable to add noise screening at Fanling Bypass (Western Section) at the current final stage of detailed design. That said, he would relay Members' views to the relevant team in CEDD for further consideration.

PTT Building

77. Two Members asked the following questions:

- (a) how the car parking provision was worked out; and
- (b) considering that the proposed BH of 40m of the PTT building appeared to be excessive, the BH requirement of the said building if it was not designed for noise screening.

78. In response, Mr Tony M.H. Leung, SA, HD, made the following points:

- (a) the car parking provision was proposed in accordance with the upper limit set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, i.e. 1 car parking space to 8 units; and
- (b) the proposed PTT building was taller than a usual PTT building as it was intended to mitigate the traffic noise from Fanling Bypass (Western Section). The BH of the said building could be reduced if the traffic noise could be mitigated at source.

79. Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, PlanD added that the proposed PTT building would include a PTT on the ground floor and four upper floors for car parking. If the PTT was built underground, the construction cost would increase and additional ventilation facilities would be needed.

80. Two Members noted that reduction of the BH of the PTT building would help improve the living environment of the future residents and asked if there was no noise mitigation at Fanling Bypass (Western Section), whether it was possible to reduce the BH of the PTT building, and whether rooftop noise screening along the building edge similar to the one at Olympian City One could be an alternative approach to mitigate the traffic noise impact.

81. In response, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, PlanD and Mr Tony M.H. Leung, SA, HD said that the scope to reduce the BH of the PTT building and provide rooftop noise screen could be explored at the detailed design stage.

BH Restriction on “R(A)” Zone

82. A Member noted that the public housing development was taken as an extension of Fanling New Town and asked about the justifications for the proposed BH restriction of 170mPD, taking into account that the maximum BH of the developments in Fanling was about 140mPD, and whether the proposal for additional BH was due to the design constraints imposed by Fanling Bypass (Western Section).

83. In response, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, PlanD made the following points:

- (a) the domestic and non-domestic plot ratios of the proposed public housing development were 6.5 and 0.2 respectively, which were comparable to those of the Fanling North development. For the BH, the highest BH in the Fanling North development was about 145mPD. The proposed development at the Site would have variation in BH profile from 50mPD to 167mPD. The proposal for adopting a higher BH at the Site had taken into consideration various factors including the BH profile of the surrounding Fanling North development, allowance for incorporating modular integrated construction (MiC) technology, and the need to optimise the development potential of the land. According to the findings of the technical assessments undertaken for the public housing development, the proposed development intensity would not cause insurmountable problems; and
- (b) the LVIA undertaken for the public housing development had indicated that the development would result in substantial visual impacts on some viewpoints. To mitigate the visual impacts, landscape design, buffer planting and façade treatment were proposed. In addition, the building separation and the BH difference between the residential blocks and PTT building would create visual variations that would help address the visual impact. With the implementation of visual mitigation measures for the proposed development, the visual permeability and visual relief could be enhanced.

Other

84. In response to a Member's question related to the section 16 applications for animal boarding establishment as raised by R3/C1, the Chairperson said that as the matter was not related to the draft OZP, it should be dealt with separately and reported to the Board in due course.

85. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A session had been completed. She thanked the representer/commenter and the government representatives for attending the meeting. The

Board would deliberate on the representations and comment in closed meeting and would inform the representers and commenter of the Board's decision in due course. The representer/commenter and government representatives left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

86. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

Fanling Bypass (Western Section)

87. Whilst having no objection to the "R(A)" zoning for the Site, the Vice-chairperson and some Members expressed the following views in relation to the design of the Fanling Bypass (Western Section):

- (a) it was disappointing that CEDD had not properly followed up Members' request to mitigate the traffic noise of Fanling Bypass (Western Section) at source as raised to the government representatives at the RNTPC meeting on 31.3.2023 when considering the proposed amendments to the draft OZP;
- (b) CEDD's response that it was not feasible to add noise screening at Fanling Bypass (Western Section) for the public housing development at this rather late stage was not convincing and unsubstantiated. Given that the road works had not commenced and only changes to the design of a short section of the road would be needed, CEDD was obliged to review the design of that section of the road to the benefit of the future public housing residents;
- (c) in assessing whether to mitigate the traffic noise of Fanling Bypass (Western Section) at source, the benefits of reducing the need for mitigation measures at the Site should also be taken into account; and
- (d) revisions to the design of the road at the current stage would remove the need to provide mitigation measures at the road after its completion.

88. For Members' background information, Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, DoP, remarked that

Fanling Bypass (Western Section) had already gone through the statutory procedures of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Ordinance some years ago. At that time, the proposed public housing development had not yet been proposed and thus was not covered in the approved EIA. It would be helpful if CEDD could provide information on the procedures and implications should there be any revisions to the design of Fanling Bypass (Western Section) in order to address the traffic noise impact on the proposed public housing development.

89. Ms Clara K.W. U, Principal Environmental Protection Office, Environmental Protection Department (EPD), advised that in general, installation of noise barriers might cause visual concerns from the public according to the experience of the road widening works for Tolo Highway. Therefore, EPD would also consider alternatives such as low-noise road surfacing, acoustic windows and screening by means of less noise-sensitive buildings to mitigate traffic noise impact where appropriate. That said, if needed, installation of noise barriers at the concerned section of Fanling Bypass (Western Section) could be provided through submission of a noise mitigation plan under the Environmental Permit granted to CEDD under the EIA Ordinance. Although it might be tight for CEDD to amend the design at the current stage as they were about to issue the tender invitation, the revision of the noise barriers at the Fanling Bypass (Western Section) under EIAO should not be on the critical path. If the Board decided to maintain the “R(A)” zoning and requested the Government to mitigate the traffic noise at source, EPD would work promptly with the relevant government departments to further study the mitigation measures of the road project.

Public Housing Development

90. Three Members had the following observations regarding the design of the proposed development:

- (a) the proposed BH of the PTT building (40m) would imply a floor-to-floor height of about 6m or 7m for each car parking floor. Such design was not reasonable and a very massive structure would be built. There should be scope to reduce the BH of the PTT building;
- (b) the proposed BH of about 170mPD for the public housing development at the Site was higher than that for the Fanling North development (i.e. some 140mPD with

a plot ratio of 6.5) even taking into account the adoption of MiC. It was not sure if the proposed BH was due to the noise constraints imposed on the Site; and

- (c) it was necessary for HD to critically review the BH, layout and design of the proposed public housing development as the current proposal was considered undesirable.

Options to Improve Layout and Design of the Public Housing Development

91. Members generally supported the “R(A)” zoning but some had grave concerns about the noise impact of Fanling Bypass (Western Section) posing constraints on the layout and design of the proposed public housing development, especially the bulk of the PTT building, which would greatly affect the living quality of the future residents. To address such concerns, the Chairperson, the Vice-chairperson and some Members raised options on the way forward, including:

- (a) to defer a decision on the representations so as to allow time for the government departments to review the possibility of addressing traffic noise at source and the layout and design of the proposed public housing development for the Board’s further consideration;
- (b) to require the submission of a Layout Plan under the “R(A)” zone to the Board for approval under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance so that the Board could scrutinise the layout and design of the proposed public housing development in detail at the planning application submission stage;
- (c) to attach a condition to the Board’s decision requiring the Government to provide noise screening at Fanling Bypass (Western Section); and
- (d) to request relevant government departments to report back to the Board on the results of their review of the possibility of addressing traffic noise at source and the layout and design of the proposed public housing development within a specified period, say one month, and if still found not satisfactory, asking them to conduct further review and report back to the Board again.

92. At the invitation of the Chairperson, the Secretary made the following clarifications on the statutory plan-making process:

- (a) under the pre-amended Town Planning Ordinance (pre-amended Ordinance), the draft OZP should be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval on or before 28.3.2024 if no extension to such statutory time limit was made;
- (b) imposing the requirement for the submission of a Layout Plan under the “R(A)” zone to the Board for approval would involve a proposed amendment to the draft OZP under section 6B(8) of the pre-amended Ordinance, triggering the process of inviting and processing further representations;
- (c) unlike the processing of planning applications, there was no provision for the Board to impose an approval condition during the plan-making process; and
- (d) apart from inviting the relevant government representatives to report back to the Board, the following follow-up actions as adopted in some previous cases could also be considered:
 - (i) to record Members’ concerns in the minutes of the meeting and relay the concerns to relevant parties by PlanD;
 - (ii) to issue letters by the Secretariat or the Chairperson to relevant government departments or parties on behalf of the Board for their attention or necessary actions; and
 - (iii) to set out the specific issues and requirements in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft OZP for the project proponent to follow.

93. The Vice-chairperson said that since Members’ main concern was to mitigate the traffic noise at source, i.e. incorporating noise mitigation measures at Fanling Bypass (Western Section), it might be ineffective to require planning permission for the public housing

development. Given that Members had generally no objection to the “R(A)” zoning, consideration might be given to requesting relevant government departments to review separately the possibility of addressing traffic noise at source and the layout and design of the proposed public housing development and then report back to the Board.

94. After some discussions, Members considered that the “R(A)” zoning and related development restrictions were appropriate. The OZP should not be amended to meet the representations and all grounds of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting. To address Members’ concerns in relation to Fanling Bypass (Western Section), Members also agreed on the following:

- (a) relevant government departments should be requested to review the possibility of addressing traffic noise at source and the layout and design of the proposed public housing development and report back to the Board in about a month’s time; and
- (b) the ES of the OZP should be amended to spell out the need to address the traffic noise at source and to improve the layout and design of the proposed public housing development.

95. After deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold R1 to R3, and agreed that the draft Fu Tei Au and Sha Ling OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- “(a) the representation site (Items A1 and A2 as a whole) is one of the priority brownfield clusters identified by the Government with high development potential for public housing development. An engineering feasibility study comprising technical assessments on different aspects such as traffic, environmental, ecological, geotechnical, drainage, landscape, visual and air ventilation, etc. has been conducted and confirmed that there is no insurmountable technical problems and no significant adverse impact induced by the development with the implementation of appropriate mitigation/improvement measures. Further enhancement of development layout and design of the proposed development will also be conducted taking

account of the noise mitigation measures along Fanling Bypass (Western Section). It is considered suitable to zone the sites as “Residential (Group A)” for increasing housing supply (**R1 to R3**);

- (b) a multi-pronged approach has been adopted to identify suitable sites or premises in different types of development projects for the provision of more social welfare services so as to meet the ongoing welfare service needs of the district. Due regard is given to various factors for the provision of welfare facilities in the vicinity. The current provision of social welfare facilities in the proposed public housing development was agreed by and will be closely monitored by the Social Welfare Department (**R3**);
- (c) the proposed development is located about 500m away from San Wai/Tai Ling Firing Range, and hence it is not anticipated to have any negative impact on the operation of the firing range (**R1**); and
- (d) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the proposed amendments have been duly followed. The exhibition of the draft Fu Tei Au and Sha Ling Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-FTA/17 and provisions of submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance (**R1**).”

96. The Board agreed to amend the ES of the draft Fu Tei Au and Sha Ling OZP No. S/NE-FTA/17 as follows:

New paragraph added after paragraph 9.1.5 of the ES of the OZP

“The traffic noise from the planned Fanling Bypass (Western Section) to the south of the proposed public housing development should be mitigated at source as far as practicable to allow greater design flexibility for the latter. The building height, layout and design of the public housing development, particularly the public transport terminus and car park building, should be improved to create more openness with minimised visual impact, and achieve reasonable massing, building separation and stepped height arrangements.”

97. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) and 29(8) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[Mr Franklin Yu joined and Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho and Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-TKLN/51

Proposed Temporary Research and InnoTech Centre for a Period of 3 Years in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 359 S.A and 359 RP in D.D. 80, Lin Ma Hang Road, Ta Kwu Ling North (TPB Paper No. 10935)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

98. The following representative of the Planning Department (PlanD) was invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan - District Planning Officer/Shau Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN)

99. The Chairperson extended a welcome and informed Members that the applicant and his representative had indicated not to attend the meeting. She then invited PlanD’s representative to brief Members on the review application.

100. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site and the surrounding areas, the applicant’s proposal and justifications, the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town