

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

TPB Paper No. 10828
For Consideration by
the Town Planning Board on 1.8.2022

DRAFT LAM TEI AND YICK YUEN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/TM-LTY Y/11

CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO.
TPB/R/S/TM-LTY Y/11-R1 TO R421 AND
COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/TM-LTY Y/11-C1 TO C11

**DRAFT LAM TEI AND YICK YUEN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/TM-LTY/11
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO.
TPB/R/S/TM-LTY/11-R1 TO R421 AND
COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/TM-LTY/11-C1 TO C11**

Subject of Representations (Amendment Items)	Representers (No. TPB/R/ S/TM-LTY/11-)	Commenters (No. TPB/R/ S/TM-LTY/11-)
<p><u>Item A</u> Rezoning of two sites to the north of Hong Po Road (HPR) from “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) and “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”)</p> <p><u>Item B</u> Rezoning of a site to the east of Tsing Shan Firing Range from “GB” to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”)</p> <p><u>Amendments to the Notes</u> Revision of the Remarks for “Conservation Area” (“CA”) and “GB” zones on exemption clause for the diversion of stream/excavation/land filling</p>	<p><u>Total: 421</u></p> <p><u>Oppose (418)</u> <u>Items A and/or B (417)</u> R2: Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) Member R3: The Conservancy Association R4 and R5: Concerned Land Owners R6: Local Concern Group R7 to R10: Brownfield Operators R11 to R14: Village Representatives (VRs) of Tao Yuen Wai, Nim Wan Tsuen, Tsz Tin Tsuen and Tin Sum Tsuen R15: Owners’ Committee of Villa Pinada R16 to R418: Individuals</p> <p><u>Amendments to the Notes (1)</u> R419: Individual</p> <p><u>Providing Views (3)</u> R1: Tuen Mun Rural Committee (TMRC) R420: MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) R421 (also C11): Individual</p>	<p><u>Total: 11</u></p> <p><u>Support R5 (5)</u> C4 to C8: Companies</p> <p><u>Support R2 to R5, R8 and R9, R13, R16 to R18, R23, R26 to R34, R44, R54, R63, R65 to R68, R71 to R76, R81, R83 and R87 (1)</u> C3: Individual</p> <p><u>Support R219, R318 and R420 (1)</u> C9: Individual</p> <p><u>Support R420 and R421 (1)</u> C11 (also R421): Individual</p> <p><u>Oppose Items A and B (2)</u> C2 and C10: Individuals</p> <p><u>Providing Views (1)</u> C1: TMDC</p>

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 20.8.2021, the draft Lam Tei and Yick Yuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TM-LTYT/11 (the Plan) at **Annex I** was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments to the OZP is at **Annex II** and the locations of the amendment items are shown on **Plan H-1**.
- 1.2 During the two-month statutory exhibition period, a total of 421 valid representations were received¹. On 26.11.2021, the representations were published for public comments. Upon expiry of the publication period, a total of 11 valid comments on the representations were received.
- 1.3 On 9.2.2022, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to consider all the representations and comments of the Plan collectively in one group.
- 1.4 This Paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations and comments. The lists of representers and commenters are at **Annexes III and IV** respectively². The summary of representations and comments and the Government's responses are at **Annex V**. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

2. Background

Proposed Public Housing Development and supporting infrastructural facilities (Items A and B)

- 2.1 The 2013 Policy Address stated that the Government would adopt a multi-pronged approach to build up land reserve with a view to meeting housing and other development needs. As announced in the 2014 Policy Address, about 150 sites were identified for housing developments. Amongst these potential sites, three sites, namely San Hing Road (SHR), SHR Site Extension and Hong Po Road (HPR) at the northern fringe of Tuen Mun New Town (TM New Town) comprising land zoned "R(E)", "R(E)1" and "GB" on the LTYT OZP and Tuen Mun (TM) OZP³, have been identified for public housing development and provision of the associated government, institution and community (GIC) facilities.

¹ On 9.2.2022, the Board noted 11 representations with the required identity information missing should be treated as not having been made pursuant to sections 6(2) and 6(3) of the Ordinance. As a result, there are 421 valid representations.

² The names of all representers and commenters are attached at **Annexes III and IV** respectively. Soft copy of their submissions is sent to the Town Planning Board Members via electronic means; and is also available for public inspection at the Board's website at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/plan_making/S_TM-LTYT_11.html and the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department in North Point and Sha Tin. A set of hard copy is deposited at the Town Planning Board Secretariat for Members' inspection.

³ A portion of the proposed development project falls within the TM OZP, which is not under the current proposed amendments to the OZP.

- 2.2 In September 2014, the Housing Department (HD), Planning Department (PlanD) and other relevant departments consulted TMDC on the proposed public housing development at SHR Site⁴. TMDC members expressed concerns mainly related to traffic impact and compensation and rehousing/relocation of affected residents and brownfield operators. In light of the various concerns raised by TMDC members, the Government decided to review the development scheme taking into account the views expressed by TMDC.
- 2.3 In view of the acute demand for public housing, the Government has stepped up its efforts to increase the supply by maximising the development potential of each public housing site. The Government decided in 2017 to combine the SHR Site, SHR Site Extension and HPR Site into one single development site with an area of about 29 ha for integrated and comprehensive public housing development with GIC uses and associated infrastructural works (including the proposed Road L7 and realigned HPR (**Plans H-5 and H-6**)), in order to fully utilise the development potential and maximise the production of housing units (with a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 6.5).
- 2.4 To facilitate and ascertain the technical feasibility of the comprehensive public housing development, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) conducted an engineering feasibility study (EFS)⁵ for the proposed public housing development, associated GIC and supporting infrastructural facilities to provide about 21,600 public housing units accommodating about 61,000 people. The EFS was completed in the first half of 2021.

Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- 2.5 Opportunity was also taken to revise the Notes of the OZP to incorporate the amendments of the Revised Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN) agreed by the Board in 2018, i.e. deleting 'Market' use and subsuming it under 'Shop and Services' use. Also, with a view to streamlining the planning application process/mechanism, technical amendments were made to the Remarks of the Notes to exempt the diversion of stream/excavation/land filling works pertaining to public works co-ordinated or implemented by Government and minor works (i.e. maintenance, repair or rebuilding works) from the requirement of planning application (the 'Exemption Clause') under "CA" and "GB" zones.

Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- 2.6 On 23.7.2021, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) agreed that the proposed amendments to the approved Lam Tei and Yick Yuen OZP No. S/TM-LTTY/10 were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance for public inspection. The relevant RNTPC Paper No. 6/21 is

⁴ The development area of SHR Site in 2014 was smaller than the current one.

⁵ As the EFS study area covered more than 20 ha, it is a Designated Project (DP) under Schedule 3 Item 1 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO). Thus, an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been conducted in accordance with EIAO. The EIA Report was approved by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) on 30.12.2020.

available at the Board's website and the Secretariat for Members' inspection, while the extract of the minutes of the RNTPC meeting is at **Annex VII**.

3. Local Consultations

- 3.1 Prior to the consideration by RNTPC as mentioned in paragraph 2.6 above, PlanD, CEDD and HD consulted TMRC on 26.6.2021 and TMDC on 6.7.2021 regarding the proposed amendments to the OZP for the proposed public housing development. TMRC raised concerns mainly on traffic and drainage impacts brought by the proposed development and its relevant mitigation measures and compensation and rehousing arrangement for the affected residents and brownfield operators. TMDC Members expressed concerns on the potential traffic impact, inadequate social welfare and GIC facilities arising from the increased population in the Tuen Mun District and lack of local consultation. TMDC requested further information mainly on planned GIC and social welfare facilities within the proposed development, details on traffic aspect, and compensation arrangement for the affected brownfield operations. On 19.7.2021, further information has been submitted to TMDC. PlanD, CEDD and HD consulted TMDC again on 2.11.2021 and TMDC Members raised similar concerns as mentioned above. The detailed views and comments of TMRC and TMDC, as well as the responses of PlanD/CEDD/HD are recorded in the minutes of the said meetings at **Annexes VIII, IXa and IXb** respectively.
- 3.2 On 18.8.2021, upon the request of a TMDC Member, PlanD together with CEDD and other concerned departments conducted a joint site visit to the proposed public housing sites and attended the local forum with the TMDC Member, TMRC Members, a then Legislative Council Member, concerned VRs, local residents and brownfield operators.

4. The Representation Sites and the Surrounding Areas

- 4.1 The Representation Sites under Items A and B and the Surrounding Areas
- 4.1.1 The Representation Sites (the Sites) (about 22.05 ha), being at the northern fringe of TM New Town, are located to the north of HPR, west of Lam Tei Interchange, south of Tsing Chuen Wai, Tuen Tsz Wai and San Hing Tsuen and Chung Shan, and east of the Tsing Shan Firing Range (**Plans H-1 and H-2**). The Sites are currently occupied by various brownfield operations (including open storage yards, warehouses, workshops and carparks), farmland, rural settlements and scrubland (**Plans H-2a to H-2b and H-4a to H-4e**). They are currently accessible from SHR to the northeast and HPR to the south (**Plans H-3a and H-3b**).
- Proposed Public Housing Development and supporting infrastructural facilities*
- 4.1.2 The development parameters of the proposed public housing development (**Plans H-5 and H-6**) are as follows:

Total Site Area*	About 29.7 ha ⁶
Total PR	Maximum 6.5 (assuming a domestic PR of 6 and a non-domestic PR of 0.5)
No. of Domestic Storeys	About 32 - 46 storeys
No. of Blocks	22 blocks
No. of Flats	About 21,600 flats
Population	About 61,000 persons
Target Completion Date	2030 to 2033
Supporting Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Secondary School, Four Primary Schools, Kindergartens and Social Welfare Facilities • Retail Facilities • Two Public Transport Interchanges (PTIs) • Sewage Pumping Station (SPS) and Fresh and Salt Water Service Reservoirs (FSWSR)

* comprises the Sites, proposed Road L7 and realigned HPR.

4.1.3 Item A is zoned “R(A)” (about 21.52 ha) with a maximum PR of 6.5 and a maximum building height (BH) of 160 mPD for the proposed public housing development (**Plan H-1**). The details of the Item A are listed below:

	SHR	SHR Site Extension	HPR
Total Rezoning Area*	About 21.52 ha		
Net Site Area for Housing Development	About 6.87 ha	About 1.43 ha	About 7.08 ha
Total PR	Maximum 6.5		
Building Height Restriction (BHR)	Maximum 160 mPD		

⁶ A portion of the development project (about 7.65 ha) falls within the TM OZP. The area concerned is mainly for the proposed Road L7 and the realigned HPR, the proposed public transport interchanges, and the proposed sewage pumping station (**Plans H-5 and H-6**). Since the alignment of the proposed Road L7 and the realigned HPR would be subject to further refinement, proposed amendments to the TM OZP would be conducted at later stage.

	SHR	SHR Site Extension	HPR
Supporting Facilities⁷	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kindergartens • Two Primary Schools • Social Welfare Facilities • Retail Facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two Primary Schools and One Secondary School • Retail Facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kindergartens • Social Welfare Facilities • Retail Facilities

* including the area for the proposed schools and internal roads

4.1.4 Item B is zoned “G/IC” (about 0.53 ha) for the proposed FSWSR to support the proposed public housing development (**Plan H-1**).

4.2 Planning Intentions

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

- (a) the “R(A)” zone is intended primarily for high-density residential developments. Commercial uses are always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building; and
- (b) the “G/IC” zone is intended primarily for the provision of Government, institution or community facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organizations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.

5. Representations

5.1 Subject of Representations

5.1.1 There are a total of 421 representations, including 418 adverse representations (**R2 to R419**) and 3 representations providing comments (**R1, R420 and R421**).

⁷ Various GIC facilities, including schools, kindergartens, child care centres, neighbourhood elderly centres, residential care home for the elderly and day care unit and integrated children and youth services centre, etc., are proposed within the public housing development (subject to detailed design and requirements of concerned bureaux/departments). According to the 2020 Policy Address, the Hong Kong Housing Authority, together with the Development Bureau, will explore to set aside about 5% of the gross floor area (GFA) of future public housing projects for the provision of social welfare facilities, as far as practicable. HD, in consultation with the Social Welfare Department (SWD), will further consider the type of social welfare facilities to be provided at the proposed development at the detailed design stage.

- 5.1.2 Amongst the 418 adverse representations (**R2 to R419**), 417 oppose to Items A and/or B, and 1 representation (**R419**) opposes to the amendments to the Notes of “CA” and “GB” zones regarding the ‘Exemption Clause’. The adverse representations were submitted by a TMDC Member (**R2**), VRs of Tao Yuen Wai (桃園圍) (**R11**), Nim Wan Tsuen (稔灣村) (**R12**), Tsz Tin Tsuen (紫田村) (**R13**) and Tin Sum Tsuen (田心村) (**R14**), the Owners’ Committee of Villa Pinada (**R15**), The Conservancy Association (**R3**), concerned land owners (**R4 and R5**), brownfield operators (**R7 to R10**), a local concern group (**R6**) and individuals (**R16 to R419**). Besides, **R13** accompanied with 374 signatures from individuals, **R15** accompanied with 53 letters from individuals in form of two sets of sample letters and 907 signatures, **R61** accompanied with 159 signatures from local organisations and individuals, and **R192** accompanied with 40 signatures from individuals. Apart from the above, 34 representations (i.e. **R16 to R20, R25 to R36, R47 to R49, R65, R67, R79 to R88, R417 and R418**) are made on 6 sets of sample letters.
- 5.1.3 The remaining 3 representations submitted by TMRC (**R1**), MTRCL (**R420**), and an individual (**R421**) provide views/suggestions to the amendment items of the Plan.
- 5.1.4 The major grounds of representations as well as their major suggestions, and PlanD’s responses, in consultation with the relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds), are at **Annex V** and summarised in paragraph 5.2 below.

5.2 Major Grounds and Views of Representations

Representations in respect of Items A and B for Proposed Public Housing Development and supporting infrastructural facilities

5.2.1 Housing Land Supply

	Major Grounds/ Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
(1)	According to the 2021 Policy Address, the Government would develop Northern Metropolis to provide housing and infrastructure in North New Territories. The proposed development should be put on hold until the issues such as traffic capacity, compensation and rehousing/relocation arrangement of affected residents/brownfield operators and insufficient provision of GIC facilities are addressed. The Government should also explore other means to increase flat production, e.g. urban renewal, instead of pursuing the proposed development.	R13, R14, R177 and R179
(2)	While it is noted that some areas under the amendment items are brownfield and contain less buffer and	R3, R47, R79 to R88, R111,

ecological function, the areas close to hillslope are comparatively performing good buffer function as mentioned in the planning intention of the “GB” zone. The proposed amendments would set an undesirable precedent for similar amendment in future.	R114, R154, R176, R179, R180, R196, R296, R364, R406, R417 and R418
--	--

Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1) and (2)</p> <p>The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to make available sufficient supply of housing land progressively to meet the acute demand for housing. The Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS) stressed that there was no single solution to the land shortage problem. The Government has therefore been developing land resources through various measures. Apart from reviewing existing land uses of sites within the territory, the Government has also been actively taking forward other land supply projects such as Northern Metropolis, various new development areas (NDAs), land reclamation, etc..</p> <p>To meet the housing need of the community and the housing supply target, the Development Bureau (DEVB), together with relevant departments, amongst other options, has been carrying out land use reviews, including the review on “GB” sites since 2012, for conversion to residential use.</p> <p>Being located at the northern fringe of TM New Town, served by existing roads and met the selection criteria of the Stage 2 review of “GB” sites, the Sites thus were identified for public housing development and provision of the associated GIC facilities. Since the Sites, currently occupied by various brownfield operations (including open storage yards, warehouses, workshops and carparks), farmland, rural settlements and scrubland (Plans H-2a to H-4e), are largely devegetated, deserted or formed, they are not serving a buffer function between urban and sub-urban development areas and are considered suitable to meet the housing demand in short to medium term.</p> <p>For the concerns on traffic capacity, compensation and rehousing arrangement and provision of GIC facilities please refer to the responses in paragraphs 5.2.2, 5.2.4 and 5.2.6 below.</p>

5.2.2 Traffic and Transportation

Major Grounds/ Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
(1) Traffic infrastructures should be in place along with the proposed public housing development. It is suggested that Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass should be built	R1, R69, R276 and R305

Major Grounds/ Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
as soon as possible to alleviate the unsatisfactory traffic condition of the area. The local road network, including Shun Tat Street and Ng Lau Road, should also be improved. Overhead cables (OHLs) are suggested to be relocated underground to make way for grade separation of Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Castle Peak Road and other road improvement works. Pedestrian bridge connecting Tuen Ma Line (TML) Siu Hong Station, Yan Tin Estate and Tsing Lun Road should be provided.	
(2) The current traffic condition of Tuen Mun District is undesirable with constant traffic congestions. Additional population arising from the proposed development will overstrain the existing road capacity, public transport system, in particular buses and the railway system. The Government should build new roads and plan new mass transit system to alleviate the traffic condition.	R2, R9 to R20, R47, R51, R54, R61, R62, R66, R70, R71, R74, R77, R79, R89, R97 to R100, R105, R107 to R110, R112, R114 to R127, R129, R132 to R137, R140 to R152, R155 to R169, R172 to R179, R186 to R190, R192, R196 to R203, R205 to R215, R217 to R242, R245, R248, R249, R251 to R255, R257 to R262, R264, R266 to R270, R274 to R294, R295, R297 to R314, R316 to R361, R367 to R385, R387 to R405, R407, R417 and R418
(3) There will be insufficient parking spaces to meet the increased population. It is suggested to provide more than 2,000 parking spaces along with the proposed development.	R1, R2, R74, R110, R185, R190, R250, R265, R295, R298, R300, R308, R310, R355, R356, R417 and R418
(4) The function of Road L7 is in doubt. It is expected that drivers would not take longer routes to detour around the area. It is anticipated that Lam Tei Interchange would still be the bottleneck of traffic in Tuen Mun.	R1, R2, R13, R69, R276 and R305

Responses	
(a)	In response to (1) to (4)

	Responses
	<p>Preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (TTIA) has been conducted under the EFS to assess the traffic and transport impact arising from the proposed public housing development.</p> <p>The Sites are currently accessible via SHR to the northeast and HPR to the south (Plans H-3a and H-3b). It is proposed to realign and upgrade the existing HPR and construct the proposed Road L7 to serve the proposed public housing development (Plans H-6 and H-7a). Together with the proposed Road L7, a looped road network would be formulated in the area and can serve as an alternative route for traffic within the Tsz Tin Tsuen area to join Tuen Mun Road via the interchange at Tsing Tin Road instead of Lam Tei Interchange (Plan H-7b), bringing traffic relief to a certain extent owing to the growing development in the Northwest New Territories (NWNT). With the implementation of the proposed Road L7, it would improve the traffic network and connectivity for existing developments and other future potential developments in the vicinity.</p> <p>To enhance the pedestrian connectivity from the proposed development to TML Siu Hong Station and to alleviate the congested pedestrian condition of northern Siu Hong Road footpath, a footbridge is proposed to connect the northern Tsing Lun Road footpath with the existing footbridge near Ng Lau Road (Plans H-7a and H-7c). It will facilitate access to existing escalator system connecting the Siu Hong Station podium. Footpath together with cycle track would be provided along the proposed Road L7 and the realigned HPR.</p> <p>Two PTIs with bus and minibus termini, taxi stands and associated facilities are proposed for comprehensive provision of public transport services to cope with the transport demand arising from the proposed public housing development (Plan H-7a). Feeder bus services to Siu Hong Station PTI (North) and Tuen Mun Town Centre and regular bus services to other districts are also proposed to cater for the future passenger demand, subject to the decision of the Transport Department and bus companies.</p> <p>Parking spaces will be provided at the proposed public housing development according to the upper end standard of the latest Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) requirements subject to detailed design.</p> <p>According to the findings of the EFS, with the implementation of the aforementioned improvement measures and proposed road junction improvement works together with long-term strategic road works (including Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass which are targeted to be commissioned not later than 2036) being implemented, the proposed public housing development will have manageable traffic impact on the local and nearby road links, junctions and transport facilities, and will not induce insurmountable problem to the traffic network in the area from traffic point of view. In this regard, there is no strong justification to carry out the</p>

	Responses
	<p>proposed road works which involved the relocation of OHLs as suggested by the representers.</p> <p>Nevertheless, detailed TTIA will be conducted in the investigation and design stage to further review and formulate improvement measures to minimize the traffic impact brought by the proposed public housing development.</p>

5.2.3 Environmental, Ecological and Visual and Landscape Issues

	Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
(1)	The visual impact of some of the visually sensitive receivers would still be moderately or substantially adverse even with mitigation measures. There is a concern that potential visual impact brought by the proposed development cannot be solved by any mitigation measures.	R3, R9 R69, R136, R153, R214 and R216
(2)	There is a concern that the proposed development would have adverse air ventilation, air quality impacts and wall effect to the low-rise developments nearby.	R9, R69, R136, R153, R214 and R216
(3)	The proposed development including the realigned HPR is in close vicinity to Villa Pinada, San Hing Tsuen and Tsz Tin Tsuen, noise barrier along roads should be built to reduce possible impacts to existing residents.	R2
(4)	The proposed development is located in a noise sensitive area and could be susceptible to potential noise impacts arising from railway operations. The future Environmental Assessment Study at the detailed design stage should take into account and address any air-borne noise issue from TML and LRT as well as implement noise mitigation measures at the proposed development to ensure full compliance with statutory requirements. The requirement should be stipulated in the planning brief.	R420
(5)	The proposed development would affect a group of <i>Litchi chinensis</i> (Lychee trees) and around 1,300 trees are to be felled and replaced with replacement trees. The existing mechanism for tree compensation would not preserve individual trees with high maturity and amenity value. It is suggested that a review on development scale, urban design, tree transplantation plan should be conducted to avoid direct felling of the trees.	R2, R3, R107, R152, R296 and R421

	Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
(6)	There is a concern on the ecological impact (i.e. ecosystem and biodiversity) arising from the proposed development, such as a species of crab is to be translocated. The replacement trees are ornamental in nature and unlikely to attract the displaced flora and fauna. Areas covered with existing trees should be retained.	R421
(7)	The OHLs within the development boundary would impose adverse health impact to future residents.	R1, R2 and R76
(8)	The proposed development is within the San Hing Tsuen Site of Archaeological Interest (SAI). There is no information on where exploration work has been carried out.	R421

	Responses
(a)	<p>In response to (1)</p> <p>A Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) was conducted under the EFS. The proposed development will inevitably alter the visual context of the area. However, the Sites are located at the northern fringe of the TM New Town. The maximum BH of 160 mPD as stipulated on the OZP is considered compatible with the existing/planned BH of the high-rise housing developments in TM New Town (including the public housing developments in Tuen Mun Area 54 to the south of the proposed development (with planned BH ranging from about 120 mPD to 140 mPD)) (Plan H-10). The development parameters of the proposed public housing development could utilize the developable land in meeting the acute demand on public housing and its associated social welfare facilities.</p> <p>Suitable mitigation measures, including planting, greening, building form and disposition, building separation, façade treatment and stepped building heights, will be further considered at the detailed design stage to mitigate residual visual impacts. It is concluded that the proposed development will not create significant disturbance to general viewing experience of the public and could be integrated to existing environment as shown in the photomontages at Plans H-11a to H-11f. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD has no objection to the proposed public housing development from urban design perspective.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (2)</p> <p>Preliminary Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) was conducted under the EFS to evaluate the proposed development and establish guiding principles for its conceptual layout in air ventilation terms.</p>

	Responses
	<p>To minimise the potential air ventilation impact to the surrounding area, building block disposition aligned with the prevailing wind direction, building separations of at least 15m at the localised air paths between residential towers have been adopted in the preliminary layout as shown in Plans H-6 and H-12. With the incorporation of good building design measures, no insurmountable air ventilation issue is anticipated for the proposed development. In this regard, CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no objection to the proposed public housing development from air ventilation perspective. At detailed design stage, a quantitative air ventilation assessment shall be carried out to assess the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures and optimise the building arrangement of the proposed public housing development. A planning brief will also be prepared to set out the planning parameters and the design requirements to guide its future development.</p> <p>Regarding the air quality impact, quantitative operation air quality impact from vehicular emission associated with the proposed public housing development and the existing and planned road network, and industrial emissions in the vicinity of the Sites has been assessed in the approved EIA. The findings of the approved EIA concluded that the predicted cumulative air quality impacts on all air sensitive receivers would comply with the Air Quality Objectives. Therefore, no adverse air quality impact during operation phase is anticipated.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (3) and (4)</p> <p>The EIA has been conducted to demonstrate the environmental acceptability of the proposed public housing development in accordance with EIAO and the EIA Report was approved by the DEP on 30.12.2020.</p> <p>The approved EIA has assessed the potential noise impacts arising from the proposed development. Road noise impacts are proposed to be mitigated by road side noise barriers and application of low-noise road surfacing material at some sections of the realigned HPR and the roads in the vicinity. To mitigate the road and rail traffic noise impacts, acoustic windows on some residential blocks of the proposed development, concrete boundary wall for the proposed social welfare facilities, and restriction of locating more noise sensitive welfare uses at façade facing the realigned HPR and access road in the proposed development have also been recommended (Plan H-7d). With the mitigation measures proposed, no insurmountable noise impact is anticipated.</p>
(d)	<p>In response to (5)</p> <p>According to the broad-brush tree survey of the approved EIA, about 1,300 trees within the Sites would be in conflict with the development and are proposed to be felled, majority of the species are recorded as common</p>

	Responses
	<p>species in Hong Kong. No registered Old and Valuable Trees (OVTs) were identified.</p> <p>Nevertheless, to compensate the loss of greenery, not less than 1,300 new trees (min. compensatory ratio 1:1) are proposed to be planted as far as practicable (about 800 of them to be provided within the proposed public housing and school sites and other 500 trees in the vicinity as far as practicable (Plan H-8)). Detailed tree survey will be conducted and Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal will be prepared at the detailed design stage to avoid unnecessary tree felling, finalise tree treatment and allocate compensatory planting areas.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the residual landscape impact is considered acceptable. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no objection to the proposed public housing development from landscape point of view.</p>
(f)	<p>In response to (6)</p> <p>According to the ecological impact assessment of the approved EIA, the works limit of the proposed development mainly consists of urban, village and orchard area (about 25.8 ha) of “negligible” or “low” ecological value and only parts of the works area consist of the woodlands (about 1.2 ha) of “low” ecological value, natural and semi-natural streams (about 285m in length) of “low” ecological value and a semi-natural stream (about 264m in length) of “medium” ecological value (Plan H-9).</p> <p>The affected woodlands have been subject to constant human disturbance (i.e. grave-sweeping activities) and most of the species recorded were exotic. The proposed development will avoid impact to most of the flora species of conservation importance, including 12 <i>Aquilaria sinensis</i> (土沉香) and 3 <i>Pyrenaria spectabilis</i> (大果核果茶). Considering aforementioned habitat value, species diversity, the size of woodlands loss and avoidance of species of conservation importance, the loss of woodlands due to the proposed development will result in “minor” ecological impact. With the implementation of the mitigation measures, including transplantation of the affected flora species of conservation importance and woodland enhancement planting with native flora species at the existing village/orchard habitat, the residual impact on the woodland loss due to the project is considered to be acceptable (Plan H-9).</p> <p>Most of the affected natural and semi-natural streams are small in size and without any records of species of conservation interest, except for a semi-natural stream section outside the north-eastern boundary of the HPR Site, where two crab species of conservation interest <i>Cryptopotamon anacoluton</i> (鰓刺溪蟹) and <i>Somanniathelphusa zanklon</i> (鐮刀束腰蟹) were identified. The proposed development will avoid direct impact to the upper section of the stream, where majority of the crab species were recorded and a buffer zone of minimum 6m alongside the southern bank of</p>

	Responses
	<p>the stream would be provided (Plan H-9). Although one locality of <i>Cryptopotamon anacoluthon</i> is found unavoidably impacted, the crabs are proposed to be translocated to suitable undisturbed stream habitat to the north of HPR Site before construction (Plan H-9). Taking into account the nature of the works involved, species diversity of the watercourses, minimization of direct impacts and with the implementation of the mitigation measures, the residual impact to the loss of streams due to the project is considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) has no objection to the proposed development from nature conservation point of view.</p>
(f)	<p>In response to (7)</p> <p>The approved EIA confirmed that the strength of the electric field (ELF) and magnetic field (EMF) generated from the 400kV OHLs (Plan H-6) are well below the stipulated guideline limits issued by the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection in 1998. Thus, the ELF and EMF generated by OHLs will not pose a hazard to human health.</p>
(g)	<p>In response to (8)</p> <p>The central part of Item A encroaches onto the San Hing Tsuen SAI (Plan H-2a). The approved EIA recommended that prior to the construction phase, an archaeological field survey should be conducted at the northern part of SHR Site upon land resumption and clearance of structures. The scope and programme of the proposed archaeological work shall be agreed with Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO). Subject to the findings of the survey, appropriate mitigation measures would be proposed by the project proponent in prior agreement with AMO. There is no proposed or declared monuments, graded or proposed to be graded historic buildings, Government historic sites or new items proposed for grading by the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) within the Sites.</p>

5.2.4 Land Resumption, Compensation and Rehousing

	Major Grounds/Comment(s)/ Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
(1)	Numerous squatters will be affected by the proposed development. There is a concern over compensation and rehousing (C&R) arrangements for the affected squatter residents. The Government should adopt Zone A ex-gratia compensation rate for resuming the concerned lots.	R1, R2, R47 to R60, R62 to R77, R79 to R99, R101 to R104, R106, R107, R111, R113, R115, R116, R130, R181 to R184, R193 to R196, R260, R266 to R270, R299, R362 to R366, R390

	Major Grounds/Comment(s)/ Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
(2)	Brownfield operations within the Sites will be affected by the proposed development. There is a concern over C&R arrangements for the affected brownfield operations.	R1, R2, R47 to R60, R62 to R77, R79 to R99, R101 to R104, R106, R107, R111, R113, R115, R116, R130, R181 to R184, R193 to R196, R260, R266 to R270, R299, R362 to R366, R390
(3)	It was the government's planning to develop San Hing Tsuen for rural industry use. The brownfield operators invested huge amount of money and efforts for their operations in producing products and providing services to meet the essential needs of the society. Some of the operations could not be accommodated in conventional industrial buildings. Relocating the operations will also involve massive investments which are not affordable to them. It seems that the resumption of land for the proposed development denies their contribution to the society. It would likely lead to the closure of their businesses and uprooting rural industries. The operators and their employee would lose their livelihood. The Government should strike a balance between housing and benefit of other stakeholders and preserve the representers' operations.	R7, R8, R21 to R23, R61, R62, R69, R70, R73, R78, R107, R141, R152, R256, R328, R408 to R418
(4)	An area of about 100,000 sq.ft (about 9,290 sq.m) at the to-be-decommissioned Lam Tei Quarry or Yuen Long Industrial Estate should be granted to the ice manufacture plant at the south-eastern tip of SHR Site for local reprovisioning of the plant (Plan H-2a). It would help the operator to preserve his existing clients, in particular the clement plants in the vicinity.	R21
(5)	It is suggested to refine the development boundary/the road alignment to avoid conflict with certain squatters, lots and/or graves.	R1, R12, R47 to R53, R55 to R61, R72, R73, R79 to R88, R362, R363 and R365

	Responses
(a)	In response to (1)

	Responses
	<p>The C&R arrangements for affected residents and brownfield operators are outside the scope of the OZP and not within the ambit of the Board. When land is required to be resumed and cleared for development projects, the Government will follow up with the affected parties on their C&R arrangements in accordance with prevailing policies⁸ and established mechanism.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (2) to (4)</p> <p>Brownfield operations are business undertakings. While the Government does not make “one-on-one” re-provisioning arrangements for brownfield operators affected by development projects, they may wish to move their businesses to other locations zoned “Open Storage”, “Industrial” and/or “Industrial (Group D)” (“I(D)”) in the New Territories. The revised “Town Planning Board Guidelines on Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance” (TPB PG-No. 13F) promulgated by the Board in March 2020 set out the criteria for assessing planning applications for open storage and port back-up uses, which help channel such uses to more suitable locations. In parallel, the Government will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) provide eligible business undertakings with ex-gratia allowances according to prevailing C&R arrangements; and (ii) provide assistance on planning and land matters if operators have identified suitable relocation sites in the market. <p>Part of the San Hing Tsuen was zoned “I(D)” on the draft Lam Tei and Yick Yuen OZP No. S/TM-LTYYY/1 gazetted on 7.6.1996. In view of the relocation of Hong Kong’s industries and the finalisation of the alignment of the then West Rail (now TML), the industrial area together with the adjoining areas were subsequently rezoned to “R(E)” on the LTYYY OZP in 2000 and remained unchanged until 2021. The “R(E)” zone was intended primarily for phasing out of existing industrial uses through redevelopment for residential use on application to the Board. Whilst existing industrial uses will be tolerated, new industrial developments are not permitted in order to avoid perpetuation of industrial/residential (I/R) interface problem. The area of the Sites had no longer been intended for industrial development since 2000.</p> <p>Taking into account the low utilisation of land by brownfield operations at the Sites, the I/R interface problem, the proximity of the Sites to TM New Town and the findings of the EFS, the Government considers that the Sites are suitable to be rezoned from “R(E)” to “R(A)” for high density public</p>

⁸ On 3.5.2022, the Government announced the enhancement measures to the ex-gratia compensation arrangement for landowners and business operators, and the package was approved by the Finance Committee on 27.5.2022. Under the enhancement measures, the Ex-gratia Zonal Compensation System (Zonal System) for landowners will be merged from four zones to two zones. Upon merging, land resumed for public housing projects located outside NDAs together with NDA projects and other development uses will be classified under “Tier One”, and its compensation rate is pitched at that of Zone A under the former system, representing a 60 per cent increase in the ex-gratia compensation compared to that normally receivable under Zone B prior to merging.

	Responses
	housing development with a view to meeting the acute public housing demand over the territory.
(c)	<p>In response to (5)</p> <p>In determining the development area, the Government would take into account land use efficiency and rationalised site boundary for an optimised development layout. In general, the Government aimed at minimising land resumption especially to minimise impact to existing dwellers while achieving the most public housing units under various technical constraints and limitations. Taking into account the above, it is considered that the proposed development is pragmatic and balanced scheme.</p>

5.2.5 Local Employment

Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
There is a lack of employment opportunities in the area. As a result, residents in the area commuting to work in other districts would put extra burden on the traffic capacity in the area.	R2

Responses
The HSK/HT NDA and YLS Development will provide about 163,630 employment opportunities for NWNT, including Tuen Mun District. The implementation of the aforesaid projects will bring more jobs closer to residents in the NWNT region and help redress the current imbalance in the spatial distribution of population and jobs in the territory. Furthermore, the proposed schools, retail shops and GIC facilities in the proposed development would also provide some employment opportunities for the local residents.

5.2.6 Provision of GIC facilities

	Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
(1)	There is insufficient provision of healthcare service in Tuen Mun, a new hospital and a Community Health Centre (CHC) should be built and Tuen Mun Hospital (TMH) should be expanded to meet the pressing demand. It is also suggested to provide a wide range of community and social welfare facilities to meet the need of different age groups.	R1, R15 to R20

	Major Grounds/ Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
(2)	Additional population arising from the proposed development will overstrain the already under pressure healthcare service, education, recreation, market and other supporting facilities in Tuen Mun. The situation is reflected in particular in the long waiting time in TMH. It is unacceptable that most of the GIC facilities are not meeting the HKPSG standards. It is suggested to reduce the number of buildings and population in order to meet the standards.	R1, R2, R9 and R10, R47, R61 to R64, R66, R68, R70, R71, R74, R76 to R87, R107, R108, R112, R114 to R116, R118, R123, R131, R135, R141, R145, R147, R148, R152, R170, R171, R176 to R180, R185, R191, R192, R197, R200, R208, R219, R220, R222, R223, R234, R235, R241, R249, R254, R255, R259, R261 to R263, R265, R274, R279, R288, R290, R291, R294, R295, R301 to R305, R307, R308, R312, R315, R317 to R319, R321 to R323, R326, R327, R331, R340, R351, R355, R356, R359, R361, R386, R389 to R391, R395, R407, R417, R418 and R421
(3)	The provision of schools at the proposed development is unnecessary as there are surplus school places in Tuen Mun District.	R4, R49, R75, R79 to R88

	Responses
(a)	<p>In response to (1) and (2)</p> <p>Based on the HKPSG requirements, the planned provision of GIC facilities in the whole Tuen Mun District is generally adequate to meet the need of the planned population (including the proposed development) except for hospital beds, clinic/health centre, child care centre (CCC), community care services facilities and sport centre (Annexes X and XI). The proposed development would also provide recreational, retail facilities and various GIC facilities, as mentioned in paragraph 4.1.3 above, to meet the need of the future residents and that of the Tuen Mun District.</p> <p>The Hospital Authority (HA) plans its services on a cluster basis. In planning and developing various public healthcare services, HA takes into account a number of factors, including the increase of service demand as a result of population growth and demographic changes, advancement of medical technology, manpower availability as well as organisation of services of the clusters and hospitals, to inform the service planning. HA monitors the service utilisation and updates the service demand projection regularly according to the latest population projection parameters and development plan of the Government.</p>

	Responses
	<p>For hospital services, the New Territories West Cluster (NTWC) provides services for residents in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long. There are a number of hospital (re)development projects planned in the Second Ten-year Hospital Development Plan (HDP), which will provide additional beds for serving the population in NTWC. The projected service demand will be catered for in the Second Ten-year HDP.</p> <p>The HA's general outpatient services are committed to providing community-based primary care services. At present, there are three general out-patient clinics in Tuen Mun District. In view of the service demand, the HA is planning for a sizeable CHC in the public housing development project in Tuen Mun Area 29 West led by the HD, whilst the proposal of redevelopment and re-provisioning of the Tuen Mun Clinic site (where the HA's General Out-patient Clinic is located) has been committed and aiming at future service expansion.</p> <p>HKPSG requirements for social welfare facilities are a long-term goal and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of relevant B/Ds in the planning and development process as appropriate, and as detailed design proceeds. PlanD and SWD will also work closely to ensure that more community facilities can be included in new and redevelopment proposals from both public and private sectors in Tuen Mun District.</p> <p>SWD has all along adopted a multi-pronged approach, and maintained close liaison with relevant government departments, to identify suitable accommodation for the provision of welfare facilities, so as to meet the ongoing welfare service needs of different districts. Under the existing mechanism, when a NDA or site is identified as having potential for housing or GIC development, relevant government departments will plan for the proposed development with the required community facilities (including recreational, education, welfare facilities, etc.), taking into account the views of the community during the process.</p> <p>According to the 2020 Policy Address, about 5% of the GFA of future public housing projects could be set aside for the provision of social welfare facilities as far as practicable. The social welfare facilities (such as CCC and community care services facilities), as well as other GIC facilities would be integrated comprehensively in the proposed public housing development and would be further considered in consultation with the relevant government departments in the detailed design stage.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (3)</p> <p>Based on Education Bureau's (EDB) assessment, 5 sites have been reserved for development of 4 primary schools and a secondary school at the EFS stage. As mentioned in Chapter 3 of HKPSG, comprehensively planned and designed housing projects, public or private, should, as a matter of principle, be self-supporting in the provision of primary school places. The provision of adequate primary school places within comprehensive housing</p>

	Responses
	developments would have the merit of minimising the travelling time required of students residing in the estates. In this regard, it is considered that there is a need to reserve school sites at the proposed development to meet the need of the future residents.

5.2.7 Public Consultation

Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
There is a lack of consultation. On 6.7.2021, TMDC did not agree the proposed amendments and requested the Government to refine the development proposal before further consulting TMDC. No further consultation with TMDC was conducted and the proposed amendments were then submitted to the Board in late July 2021. After the gazettal of the draft OZP, the Government conducted pre-clearance survey and registration with the residents. The Government should further consult the residents and businesses in Siu Hong Court, Yan Tin Estate, San Hing Tsuen and Tuen Mun Area 54 to refine the development scheme.	R5, R6, R47 to R49, R65, R67, R74, R300, R417 and R418

Responses
<p>The established statutory and administrative public consultation procedures for OZP amendments had been followed. As detailed in paragraph 3 above, prior to the consideration of the proposed amendments to the OZP by RNTPC, PlanD together with concerned departments jointly consulted TMRC and TMDC on 26.6.2021 and 6.7.2021 respectively on the proposed development. The views and comments received have been duly relayed to the RNTPC upon submission of the proposed amendments to the OZP.</p> <p>In view of TMDC's concerns on the proposed development, further information has been submitted to TMDC on 19.7.2021. PlanD together with concerned departments also jointly attended TMDC on 2.11.2021 to further consult TMDC. Nevertheless, upon the request of a TMDC Member, PlanD together with concerned departments conducted a joint site visit and attended the local forum with, amongst others, local residents and brownfield operators on 18.8.2021 providing details in relation to the traffic and transport aspects of the proposed public housing development and information on C&R arrangements for the affected residents and brownfield operators.</p> <p>The draft OZP incorporating the proposed amendments was published for two months under the Ordinance. The amendment details, including the relevant RNTPC Paper and technical assessments, were made available to the members of the public on the Board's website. Members of the public could submit representations in respect of the proposed amendments to the Board. Upon the exhibition of the representations received under the Ordinance, members of the public could submit comments on the representations within three-week time.</p>

All representers and commenters have been invited to the Board to present their views.

5.2.8 Site Specific Proposals

R4 and R5 are submitted by concerned landowners with site specific grounds/comments and proposals (**Plans H-13a to H-13f** and **Plans H-14a to H-14f** respectively).

	Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)/Proposal(s)	Rep. No.
(1)	The northern TM New Town is already predominant by public housing developments with the ratio of public to private flats of about 72:28. The proposed private housing developments would help create a balanced housing mix for different social groups contributing to the long-term sustainability and vibrancy of the community. There is also a shortage of supply in private housing sector which accelerates the soaring property price. Provision of private flats meets the market need and demand, and is also in line with the Government's policy for enhancing private housing supply.	R4 and R5
(2)	The proposed private housing developments could be implemented earlier as the proposed public housing development might be delayed by public objections and judicial reviews (JRs). The programme of their private housing developments have been delayed due to the proposed public housing development.	R4 and R5
(3)	The representers have long had a genuine intention to develop the respective representation sites (Plans H-13a and H-14a) into private housing. Planning applications have been approved for low-density residential development on the sites in accordance with the previous "R(E)" zoning. The Government's intention to develop their land for public housing development deprived their private development rights.	R4 and R5
(4)	According to the indicative layout plan of the proposed public housing development (Plans H-5 and H-6), locating school within the representation site of R4 appears to be in conflict with the estimated provision and requirement of GIC facilities for the area. There is a surplus of school site reservations and a deficit of facilities for children and the elderly. It is proposed to incorporate a Day Care Centre for the Elderly (DCE) and a CCC in the private housing development to meet the demand of the district.	R4

	Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)/Proposal(s)	Rep. No.
(5)	It is proposed to rezone the representation site of R4 to “R(A)1” with the intention for private housing development. The proposed zoning will facilitate a private residential scheme with a provision of about 1,998 flats (Plan H-13d and Annex VI), which is technically feasible as demonstrated in the EIA report for the public housing development. The proposed “R(A)1” zoning would contain the same development parameters of the “R(A)” zone, i.e. a maximum PR of 6.5 and a maximum BH of 160 mPD. Requirement on the provision of specified social welfare and retail facilities could also be stipulated in the Notes of the OZP of the proposed “R(A)1” zone. The representer also proposed two alternative layout plans with the proposed private housing development integrated into the public housing development scheme (Plans H-13e and H-13f).	R4
(6)	It is proposed to rezone the representation site of R5 to “R(A)1” to facilitate the proposed private housing scheme with a reduced site area (about 1,516.5 m ² , compared with the approved development) (Plan H-14e), which only represents about 0.7% of the entire “R(A)” zone. The proposed private housing development would not result in a significant loss of “R(A)” land for public housing purpose. The proposal is at the north-eastern fringe of the SHR Site and the proposed public housing scheme would not be significantly affected (Plan H-14f). The proposal is also technically feasible as demonstrated by relevant technical assessments submitted by the representer. The key development parameters and the master layout plan submitted by the representer are at Annex VI and Plan H-14d .	R5

	Responses
(a)	<p>In response to (1)</p> <p>In view of the acute demand for public housing, the Government has stepped up its efforts to identify suitable sites for public housing development. The Sites are considered suitable for public housing development to meet such housing demand in short to medium term. According to bi-census 2016, the public and private housing mix within Tuen Mun District is about 53:47. Taking into account all the planned and existing residential developments, the public and private housing ratio in Tuen Mun District is about 51:49 as in mid-2022.</p>

	Responses
	<p>In view of the above, it is considered that the proposed public housing development is a pragmatic and balanced approach to achieve the Government's housing policy.</p> <p>Furthermore, a private housing development located in Tuen Mun Area 54 (namely the NOVO LAND) (with about 4,500 units and associated retail facilities) (Plan H-10) is approaching its completion to meet the private housing demand in the locality.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (2) and (3)</p> <p>According to the Lands Resumption Ordinance and other relevant legislation, the Government could resume land if such resumption is for a public purpose as required under the law. The Government will follow the established mechanism to seek authorisation for land resumption and handle any objections beforehand. The proposed public housing development is in line with the current Government housing policy to resume land for public purpose.</p> <p>On the other hand, the proposals put forward by R4 and R5 require land exchange applications to the Government prior to implementation of their proposals. There is no evidence that the proposed private developments could be implemented faster than the proposed public housing development. Moreover, there is no ground that the public housing development would be subject to JR. Even if a JR was raised, it would affect not only the implementation programme of the public housing development but also the proposals under the representation sites of R4 and R5.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, instead of developing the representation sites of R4 and R5 for piecemeal private housing developments, it is considered more appropriate to include them into the entire public housing development, which would result in a comprehensive layout with more efficient use of land and a better utilisation of scarce land resources.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (4)</p> <p>The proposed public housing development would provide various GIC facilities, including schools, kindergartens, CCCs, neighbourhood elderly centres, residential care home for the elderly and day care unit and integrated children and youth services centre, etc. to meet the need of the future residents and that of the Tuen Mun District. 'Social Welfare Facility' is always permitted within the "R(A)" zone allowing flexibility on the provision of community facilities to cope with the changing need of the community.</p>

	Responses
	For the provision of school sites, Response (b) in paragraph 5.2.6 is relevant.
(e)	<p>In response to (5) and (6)</p> <p>If parts of the Sites are carved out for private residential developments, it would involve substantial change in the development layout of the proposed public housing development. It would not only affect the comprehensiveness of the public housing development but also induce a substantial review on the technical assessments on various aspects such as traffic, air ventilation and infrastructure proposals under the EFS, resulting in a delay in the implementation programme of the public housing development.</p> <p>There is no submission by R4 to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the two alternative layout plans with the proposed private housing development integrated into the public housing development scheme. Moreover, one of the development options (Plan H-13e) proposed by R4 has a total PR of 7.3 with domestic PR of 6.8, which exceeds the PR restriction under the “R(A)” zone and is considered excessive.</p>

5.2.9 Others

	Major Grounds/ Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)	Rep. No.
(1)	The proposed development is not comprehensive and is bisected by low-rise developments (i.e. Villa Pinada (Plan H-2)) in between.	R13, R14, R47, R79 to R88, R111, R114, R154, R176, R179, R180, R196, R296, R364, R406, R417 and R418
(2)	The proposed development is in close proximity to a number of graves and permitted burial grounds. There is a concern on <i>fung shui</i> issue.	R2, R68, R238, R239, R243 to R247, R271 to R273, R392 to R397
(3)	During the clearance of squatters, some pets/animals might be abandoned by owners.	R130, R152, R417 and R418

	Responses
(a)	<p>In response to (1) and (2)</p> <p>The Government decided in 2017 to combine the SHR Site, SHR Site Extension and HPR Site into one single development site for integrated and comprehensive public housing development with GIC, retail, PTI and</p>

	Responses
	<p>supporting infrastructural facilities. The current development layout has taken in to account the adjoining developments and surrounding areas.</p> <p>During the planning of the proposed development, the local environment, greening, culture and history of the communities are respected and protected as far as possible. The development area for the proposed public housing development had avoided encroaching onto the nearby villages and burial grounds and minimised the clearance of existing graves.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the scope of the OZP is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the area. Detailed layout of the development would be formulated at the detailed design stage. Government departments would further consult stakeholders on the detailed layout as the development proceeds.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (3)</p> <p>Regarding the treatment of abandoned animals, it is outside the scope of the OZP and animal control matter is keeping track by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)⁹.</p>

Representation in respect of the Amendments to the Notes of the “CA” and “GB” zones for the ‘Exemption Clause’

5.2.10 The major grounds and views of the adverse representation (**R419**) are summarised below:

Major Ground	Rep. No.
The amendment undermines the statutory gatekeeping role of the Board in controlling and the statutory rights of the public under the Ordinance in knowing and commenting government works involving land filling and excavation operations in “CA” and “GB” zones.	R419

Responses
The ‘Exemption Clause’, i.e. exempting the diversion of stream/excavation/land filling works pertaining to public works co-ordinated or implemented by Government and minor works (i.e. maintenance, repair or rebuilding works) from the requirement of planning permission, under the “CA” and “GB” zones

⁹ With respect to the rural development in the New Territories, the prevailing AFCD policy is focusing on the animal welfare of the animals surrendered by their respective owners. For those surrendered animals, they will be transferred to AFCD’s 17 partnering Animal Welfare Organizations for temporary keeping and eventually rehoming, after passing the health and temperament assessments by the AFCD vets. Meanwhile, education leaflets are also distributed to the neighbourhood, empathizing the responsibility as animal owners. In any cases, if there is substantial proof that a person is involved in animal abandonment, AFCD will consider to prosecute the owner in accordance to the prevailing legislation.

Responses
<p>is in line with the latest revision of MSN, which was agreed by the Board on 6.8.2021 and subsequently promulgated on 24.8.2021.</p> <p>The objective of extending the ‘Exemption Clause’ to conservation-related zones is to streamline the planning application process/mechanism. Public works co-ordinated or implemented by government are under an established monitoring mechanism where proposed works have to be agreed by B/Ds concerned and in compliance with the relevant government requirements. Maintenance and repair works are small in scale and do not involve new development. Rebuilding works are also small in scale which are regarded as a respect of the rebuilding right of the owner/occupier of an existing permitted building/structure. In gist, the ‘Exemption Clause’ is only applicable to public works and minor works which no major adverse impacts are anticipated. It should also be noted that such works exempted from planning permission still have to conform to any other relevant legislation, the conditions of the government lease concerned, and other government requirements, as may be applicable.</p> <p>Besides, the ‘Exemption Clause’ only applies to the diversion of stream/excavation/land filling works. If a ‘use’ requires planning permission from the Board in terms of the Notes (i.e. a Column 2 use), the use itself still requires planning permission and its associated diversion of stream/excavation/land filling works would form part of the proposal. Planning permission for diversion of stream/excavation/land filling is also required for a permitted use/development (i.e. a Column 1 use or a use specified in the covering Notes) if the works are not exempted in the Remarks of the Notes. In this regard, statutory control over the developments in the “CA” and “GB” zones have not been undermined under the Ordinance.</p>

6. Comments on Representations

- 6.1 The major concerns raised in the comments, which have not been mentioned in the representations, are summarised below:

	Major Comments	Comment No.
(1)	There is a concern on construction vehicles of the proposed development which would impose further pressure to the already unsatisfactory traffic condition in the area.	C2
(2)	There is a concern on air quality, noise and environmental hygiene impacts to the areas nearby, in particular Yan Tin Estate, Tsz Tin Tsuen, San Hing Tsuen and Villa Pinada, during the construction phase.	C2

	Responses
(a)	<p>In response to (1)</p> <p>Construction traffic impact assessment had been conducted under the preliminary TTIA of the EFS. The construction traffic arising from the forecasted construction activities of the proposed public housing development would have manageable traffic impact on the local and nearby road links and junctions during the construction period of the proposed development. Nevertheless, the construction traffic impact assessment will be further reviewed in the investigation and design stage with a view to minimizing traffic impact during construction stage. Furthermore, construction vehicles management plan would be formulated before construction stage.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (2)</p> <p>The EIA has assessed the potential air quality and noise impacts arising from the proposed development for both construction and operation phases. With the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures such as appropriate phasing of works, dust suppression measures, use of Quality Powered Mechanical Equipment, use of movable noise barrier, noise enclosure and noise insulating fabric, no insurmountable environmental impact on air quality and noise arising from the construction of the proposed development is anticipated. Furthermore, construction site management plan would be formulated before construction stage.</p>

7. Departmental Consultation

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

- (a) Secretary for Development;
- (b) Secretary for Housing;
- (c) Secretary for Health;
- (d) Secretary for Education;
- (e) District Lands Officer (Tuen Mun), Lands Department (LandsD);
- (f) Chief Estate Surveyor (Acquisition Section), LandsD;
- (g) Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department;
- (h) DEP;
- (i) DAFC;
- (j) Commissioner for Transport;
- (k) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department;
- (l) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD;
- (m) Project Manager (West), CEDD;
- (n) Chief Engineer/Housing Projects 2, CEDD;
- (o) Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department;
- (p) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;

- (q) Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department;
- (r) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (s) District Officer (Tuen Mun), Home Affairs Department;
- (t) Director of Social Welfare;
- (u) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene;
- (v) Director of Fire Services;
- (w) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (x) Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments), Antiquities and Monuments Office;
- (y) Director of Housing;
- (z) Director of Health;
- (aa) Commissioner of Police;
- (bb) Chief Engineer/Cross-Boundary and Infrastructure and Development, PlanD;
- (cc) Chief Town Planner/Housing and Office Land Supply, PlanD; and
- (dd) CTP/UD&L, PlanD.

8. **Planning Department's Views**

Based on the assessments in paragraph 5 above, PlanD does not support representations **R1 to R421** and considers that the OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

Items A and B

- (a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase housing land supply, including carrying out various land use reviews on an on-going basis. The representation sites are located at the fringe of Tuen Mun New Town with existing public roads and supporting infrastructural facilities. Taking into account that there is no insurmountable technical problem identified for the proposed public housing development, it is considered suitable for rezoning the representation sites for residential use with a view to increasing housing land supply (**R1 to R418, R420 and R421**);
- (b) Engineering Feasibility Study with Environmental Impact Assessment under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance and other technical assessments on the potential impacts on various aspects, including traffic, environmental, landscape, visual, air ventilation and drainage, has been conducted and confirmed that there is no insurmountable technical problem in developing the representation sites for public housing development and the supporting infrastructural facilities. Detailed design of building block disposition, design and provision of local open space and GIC facilities, location of compensatory tree planting will be further considered at the detailed design stage (**R1 to R3, R9 to R20, R47, R51, R54, R61, R62, R66, R69 to R71, R74, R76, R77, R79 to R89, R97 to R100, R105, R107 to R110 to R112, R114 to R127, R129, R132 to R137, R140 to R169, R172 to R180, R185 to R190, R192, R196 to R203, R205 to R242, R245, R248 to R255, R257 to R262, R264 to R270, R274 to R294, R295 to R314, R316 to R361, R364, R367 to R385, R387 to R405 to R407, R417, R418, R420 and R421**);

- (c) land resumption and compensation and rehousing arrangements are outside the scope of the subject Outline Zoning Plan, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the area, and the ambit of the Town Planning Board. The concerns of the affected stakeholders would be dealt with separately by the Government in firming up the implementation arrangements **(R1, R2, R7, R8, R12 to R14, R21 to R23, R47 to R99, R101 to R104, R106, R107, R111, R113, R115, R116, R130, R141, R152, R177, R179, R181 to R184, R193 to R196, R256, R260, R266 to R270, R299, R328, R362 to R366, R390 and R408 to R418)**;
- (d) the “Residential (Group A)” zone is intended to facilitate comprehensive public housing development to meet acute demand for public housing, which is in-line with the current Government housing policy. The proposals to rezone parts of the Representation Sites for private residential development would induce a substantial review on the comprehensive development layout and associated technical assessments, resulting in a delay of the implementation programme of the proposed public housing development. There is no strong planning justification to rezone those parts of the “Residential (Group A)” zone to meet the representers’ proposals **(R4 and R5)**;
- (e) the planned GIC facilities are generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in the district in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and the assessments by of relevant Government bureaux/departments, except for hospital beds and some social welfare facilities. Appropriate GIC facilities will be provided in the proposed public housing development to serve the residents and locals. The provision of GIC facilities will be closely monitored by the relevant bureaux/departments **(R1, R2, R4, R9 and R10, R15 to R20, R47, R49, R61 to R64, R66, R68, R70, R71, R74 to R88, R107, R108, R112, R114 to R116, R118, R123, R131, R135, R141, R145, R147, R148, R152, R170, R171, R176 to R180, R185, R191, R192, R197, R200, R208, R219, R220, R222, R223, R234, R235, R241, R249, R254, R255, R259, R261 to R263, R265, R274, R279, R288, R290, R291, R294, R295, R301 to R304, R305, R307, R308, R312, R315, R317 to R319, R321 to R323, R326, R327, R331, R340, R351, R355, R356, R359, R361, R386, R389 to R391, R395, R407, R417, R418 and R421)**;

Amendment to the Notes of “CA” and “GB” zones

- (f) the amendment to the Notes to extend the exemption clause for diversion of stream, filling of land and excavation of land in relation to the “Conservation Area” and “Green Belt” zones is to streamline the planning application process/mechanism. The amendment is in line with the latest revision of the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans **(R419)**; and

Public Consultation

- (g) the statutory and administrative public consultation procedures were duly followed, including the exhibition of the Outline Zoning Plan for public inspection and consultation with the Tuen Mun Rural Committee and Tuen Mun

District Council on the proposed public housing development (**R5, R6, R47 to R49, R65, R67, R74, R300, R417 and R418**).

9. Decision Sought

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

10. Attachments

Annex I	Draft Lam Tei and Yick Yuen OZP No. S/TM-LTYT/11 (Reduced Size)
Annex II	Schedule of Amendments to the Approved Lam Tei and Yick Yuen OZP No. S/TM-LTYT/11
Annex III	List of Representers
Annex IV	List of Commenters
Annex V	Summary of Representations and Comments and the Government's responses
Annex VI	Major Development Parameters of Proposals under R4 and R5
Annex VII	Extract of Minutes of RNTPC Meeting held on 23.7.2021
Annex VIII	Extract of Minutes of TMRC Meeting held on 26.6.2021
Annexes IXa and IXb	Extract of Minutes of TMDC Meetings held on 6.7.2021 and 2.11.2021
Annex X	Provision of Major GIC Facilities and Open Space in Lam Tei and Yick Yuen Area
Annex XI	Provision of Major GIC Facilities and Open Space in Tuen Mun District
Plan H-1	Location Plan of Representation Sites
Plans H-2 to H-2b	Site Plans
Plans H-3 to H-3b	Aerial Photos
Plans H-4a to H-4e	Site Photos
Plan H-5	Conceptual Development Plan
Plan H-6	Preliminary Site Layout Plan
Plans H-7a to H-7d	Vehicular Access and Pedestrian Route, Road Links, Proposed Footbridge and Traffic Noise Mitigation Plans
Plan H-8	Outline Landscape Plan
Plan H-9	Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Plan
Plan H-10	Building Height Profile for Residential Sites in the Vicinity of the Proposed Public Housing Development
Plans H-11a to H-11f	Photomontages for the Proposed Public Housing Development
Plan H-12	Wind Corridors
Plan H-13a to H-13f	Plans and Proposals for Representation Site under R4
Plan H-14a to H-14f	Plans and Proposals for Representation Site under R5