



圖例  
NOTATION

ZONES		地帶
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	CDA	綜合發展區
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	R(B)	住宅 (乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	R(C)	住宅 (丙類)
VILLAGE TYPE DEVELOPMENT	V	鄉村式發展
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	GIC	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	O	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	OU	其他指定用途
GREEN BELT	GB	綠化地帶
COMMUNICATIONS		交通
MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION		主要道路及路口
ELEVATED ROAD		高架道路
MISCELLANEOUS		其他
BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME		規劃範圍界線
BUILDING HEIGHT CONTROL ZONE BOUNDARY		建築物高度管制區界線
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN METRES ABOVE PRINCIPAL DATUM)		最高建築物高度 (在主水平基準上若干米)
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT RESTRICTION AS STIPULATED ON THE NOTES		(註釋) 內訂明最高建築物高度限制
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN NUMBER OF STOREYS)		最高建築物高度 (樓層數目)
PETROL FILLING STATION	P F S	加油站

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

USES	大約面積及百分比 APPROXIMATE AREA & %		用途
	公頃 HECTARES	百分比 %	
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	6.45	1.36	綜合發展區
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	10.48	2.21	住宅 (乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	22.13	4.67	住宅 (丙類)
VILLAGE TYPE DEVELOPMENT	32.33	6.83	鄉村式發展
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	65.82	13.90	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	0.78	0.16	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	0.14	0.03	其他指定用途
GREEN BELT	304.71	64.34	綠化地帶
NULLAH	9.07	1.92	明渠
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	21.09	4.58	主要道路等
TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	473.58	100.00	規劃範圍總面積

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

核准圖編號 S/TM-SKW/13 的修訂  
AMENDMENT TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/TM-SKW/13

AMENDMENT EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5  
OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

按照城市規劃條例第 5 條  
展示的修訂

AMENDMENT ITEM A

(參看附表)  
(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

2022年9月30日 按照城市規劃條例第5條展示的  
核准圖編號 S/TM-SKW/13 的修訂  
AMENDMENT TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/TM-SKW/13 EXHIBITED  
UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON  
30 SEPTEMBER 2022

C.K.YIP 葉子季  
SECRETARY 城市規劃委員會秘書  
TOWN PLANNING BOARD

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的掃管笏分區計劃大綱圖  
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
SO KWUN WAT - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN

SCALE 1:7500 比例尺  
METRES 200 0 200 400 600 800 1,000 METRES 呎

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

圖則編號  
PLAN No. S/TM-SKW/14

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO  
THE APPROVED SO KWUN WAT OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/TM-SKW/13  
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

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

- Item A – Rezoning of a site at Hong Fai Road from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Government, Institution or Community(1)” (“G/IC(1)”) with stipulation of building height restriction.

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

- (a) Addition of ‘Flat (Government Staff Quarters only)(on land designated “G/IC(1)” only)’ under Column 1 and revision of ‘Flat’ to ‘Flat (not elsewhere specified)’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “G/IC” zone.
- (b) Deletion of ‘Market’ from Column 2 of the Notes for “Comprehensive Development Area”, “Residential (Group B)” and “Village Type Development” zones.
- (c) Revision of ‘Shop and Services’ to ‘Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “G/IC” zone.
- (d) Revision of ‘Government Use (not elsewhere specified)’ to ‘Government Use’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Petrol Filling Station” zone.
- (e) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for “GB” zone.

Town Planning Board

30 September 2022

**List of Representers and Commenters**  
**in respect of the Draft So Kwun Wat Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM-SKW/14**

**I. List of Representers**

<b>Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)</b>	<b>Name of Representer</b>
R1	Leong Ming Sau
R2	Law Bryan
R3	Wong Chiu Hing
R4	Tang Kwai Chuen Alan
R5	Law Polly
R6	Tse Chun Pun Benny
R7	Chak Mo Ling 翟慕玲
R8	Ho Kin San
R9	Cho Yee Mui
R10	Tai Mei Yee
R11	Cerio RoMelyn
R12	Im Man Ieng
R13	Chan Tsz Kin
R14	Ng Siu Wai
R15	Chow Kam Hung Vesta
R16	Rajat Bal
R17	Coman Anca Loana
R18	Ying Wing Hong
R19	Leung Sau Han
R20	Kong Man Wai
R21	Wu Hon Cheung
R22	Wu Juan Manwun
R23	Wu Nadia Hoyut
R24	陳鶯玲
R25	Tsui Yat Kun
R26	Ng Chun Hoi
R27	Chau Wai Fong
R28	Chan Wing Tak
R29	謝雯婷
R30	謝國基

R31	Wong Ka Lok
R32	Tse May Man Man
R33	Chung Ching Hon Johnathan
R34	Chung Yee Ching Beatrice
R35	Kowk Chi Tuen Jasmine
R36	Chung Hoi Ching Sarah
R37	Florence Pun
R38	Chung Wai
R39	Lam Kit Fun Kid
R40	Leung Ka Wah
R41	Law Sau Nang
R42	Hui Chun Fung
R43	Lau Tsan Yee
R44	Lui Mo Chi Samuel
R45	Chan Tat Wai 陳達威
R46	Pui Lan Lee 李佩蘭
R47	Wong Shuk Wai
R48	Moe Fang
R49	Wong Ping Sum
R50	Tai Wing Shing
R51	Lau Kwok Wing
R52	Lau Chung Ho Kelvin
R53	Lau Chung Hin Andy
R54	Choi Siu Sum
R55	陳錦明
R56	陳進業
R57	林秀英
R58	Wong Pong Chun James
R59	Lam Po Chun Jane
R60	Chan Chun Wei Michael
R61	陳泳聰
R62	洪玉芝
R63	陳詩恩
R64	陳雋昕
R65	蘇婉葵
R66	陳世珠
R67	陳樂恩



R68	Cheng Sui Kit
R69	Wong Kwok Cheung Michael
R70	Lai Yuen Mei Judy
R71	Chan Kin Ho
R72	Zhu Ze Zhong
R73	Chi San Cheung
R74	Priscilla Mo Wah Chan
R75	Wong Yeung Ho
R76	Ho Wai Cheung
R77	劉碧娟
R78	Wong Yuk Fan Patky
R79	Wong Mei Mei
R80	Wong Ching Man Ruby
R81	Choi Mow Sang
R82	Tsoi Ngai Hong
R83	Lee Chi Ying
R84	Ka Liu Yeung
R85	Yau Wai Ming
R86	Tsoi Chun Hei
R87	岑志義
R88	Leung Mok Kwan
R89	蔣小平
R90	楊頓濂
R91	Lui Kwan Ho
R92	Lam Wai Yip
R93	Lam Tsz Shun
R94	Lam Yuk Cheung
R95	Lam Fai Yu
R96	Tong Chun 唐峻
R97	梁美娜
R98	廖英偉
R99	Kong Tommy Ming Fung
R100	Chung Wai Yin
R101	Kong Lily Tsz Lam
R102	Hui Kwok Wah
R103	Leung Ophelia Bik Fung
R104	梁美瑩

R105	梁美儀
R106	葉青
R107	陳重華
R108	廖英傑
R109	Kwok Che Man Simon
R110	Yu Doi Wah Eva
R111	Lee Foon
R112	Andrada Amalia Sibal
R113	林燕
R114	Man Lai Ying
R115	Kong Chun Yin Andy
R116	Kong Chun Ming Kevin
R117	Kong Choi
R118	Wu Fei
R119	Chan Po
R120	Wu Tin Tung
R121	Ying Siu Kang
R122	Chan Ching Yi
R123	Helly Jean Raymond Marie Roger
R124	Helly Joanne Francoise
R125	Chim Yuk Ming
R126	Anna Bogushevskaya
R127	Alexey Shumkov
R128	Chan Wing Yee
R129	Ng Moon Hui
R130	Kong Yuet Mui
R131	Ng Che Chung
R132	Ng Wei Lam
R133	Kwok Fat Cheong
R134	Kwok Lam Yin Ming
R135	Cheng Shu Ting
R136	Kwok Cheuk Shun
R137	Liu Shun Chee
R138	Liu Chi Yung
R139	Tam Ka Hei
R140	Chan Wai Man
R141	Chan Yuet Tung

R142	Wong Dawn
R143	Chan Kit Chung
R144	Wan May Sheung Tracy
R145	Law Wai Shing Wilson
R146	Lee Wen Hao
R147	Yung Ho Ching
R148	Cheung Man Wai Mawin
R149	Li Sze Kit
R150	Hui Yuen Yu
R151	Wong Kit Man
R152	Lee Wing Chung
R153	Lee Ka Leung
R154	Chan Yiu Chu
R155	Yip See Ying
R156	Yung Sau Kuen
R157	Ng Ka Tai
R158	Chung Kit Ki
R159	Chung Po Chun
R160	Fung Cho Wai
R161	Lau Esther
R162	Yung Sau Hung
R163	Chiu Pak
R164	Chiu Pak Kin
R165	Chiu Kwok Keung
R166	Chung Chi Hung
R167	Pang Yuk Ying
R168	Chuang Wai Sam
R169	Au Yeung Sin
R170	Kwok Shek Yeung Aaron
R171	Kwok Shek Hung Jerome
R172	Lolita Suyat Reyes
R173	Quino Crystal Kay Suyat
R174	Wang Wai Lai Grace
R175	Liu Chun Shing
R176	Kwan Koon Yu
R177	Lui Wan Kuen
R178	Kwan Pui Chi

R179	Leung Tin Po Sammy
R180	Lee Kan Ying
R181	Leung Chun Wah
R182	Tai Wai Kit 戴偉傑
R183	譚源深
R184	Ang Kee Jok Donny
R185	Man Lai Fong
R186	Yip Yuk Mui
R187	Cheung Hing Cheong
R188	Hui Hon Cheung
R189	Tang Yu Chun
R190	Hui Cheuk Ying
R191	Hui Ka Long
R192	Ng Siu Chung
R193	Lam Lok Wai
R194	Liang Jing
R195	Michael Sze
R196	Tang Wing Po Joyce
R197	Pai Hung Wen
R198	Peter Michael Cloete
R199	Tseng Hsin Ying
R200	Ho Suk Ming
R201	Shih Pei Li
R202	Tam Ka Wai
R203	Ng Wai Kit Patrick
R204	Ling Sze Ka
R205	Ho Pak Lok
R206	Yau Kin Ping
R207	Law Yuk Ying
R208	Lin Hsiao Yun
R209	Tam Tung Ho
R210	Tam Tung Yu
R211	Anuevo Cecile Flores
R212	Wah Cheung Hing
R213	Wah Tsun Ning
R214	Mo Yuk Mei
R215	Wong Chun On

R216	Wong Kwok Hing
R217	Ma Lai Bing
R218	Ho Ka Yee
R219	Wong Yan Lung
R220	Wong Mok Ying
R221	Tang Wai Chun
R222	Cheung Sui Chun
R223	Yeung Po Yee
R224	Lo Yuk Sheung
R225	Man Lai Ching
R226	Pastor Gigi Farro
R227	Matthew Twomey
R228	Lin Suet Yu
R229	香雋彥
R230	楊思彥
R231	Lam Wai Fun
R232	Lin LiFen
R233	Yim Yuet Kairis
R234	譚卓欣
R235	Lee Kwok Kuen
R236	張家錡
R237	Chu Kit Yee
R238	高秀鶯
R239	Timothy Chan
R240	Ho Ching Yat
R241	Johawnes Liu
R242	陳廷翰
R243	Tse Tse Hin
R244	Aldric Lam
R245	Y W Li
R246	楊文如
R247	Fan Shu Fung Sandy
R248	Yeung Kwok Ki
R249	Chan Wai Yi
R250	Lai Nar
R251	Chan Yin Cheuk
R252	Chan Sze Cheuk

R253	Chau Tak Lam
R254	Lai Pui
R255	Chau Tsz Ying
R256	Chau Pui Chi
R257	Chau Chun Hei
R258	Yeung Kwok Ching
R259	Luk Shuk Yee
R260	Pun Kim Tat
R261	Koh Soo Lee
R262	Tang Yue Him Nicholas
R263	Ting Kathleen
R264	Ting Alexander
R265	Yeung Wing Mei
R266	Chau Chi Man
R267	Tang Kit Ming Francis
R268	Cheng King Yin Esther
R269	Sze Ho Yin
R270	Zhu Yuan Hau
R271	Lau Man Ling
R272	Choi Yuk Ting
R273	Kwan Yan Beatrice
R274	Yeung King Chung Spencer
R275	Yu Chor Sin
R276	Dia Rosanti Supriyono
R277	Chiu Mi Yee 趙美兒
R278	Lau May Chi Stella
R279	Lo Wing Han
R280	Yeung Chun Fung Edwin
R281	Yeung Chun Kiu Gilbert
R282	楊志偉
R283	Leung Chung Yin 梁仲賢
R284	Law Siu Lan Sanry 羅笑蘭
R285	Kaushik Ritu
R286	Ho Ming Wai
R287	Tse Chung Leung
R288	Tong Koon Wah
R289	Chan Ping Chung



R290	Gary Tsang Cheuk Lung
R291	Leung Ching Kwan Grace
R292	Winocean Development Ltd
R293	Cheung Cho Kit 張祖傑
R294	李寶賢
R295	Chau Randy
R296	Natasha Christine Rodrigo
R297	Paau Fong
R298	Chan Suet Ha
R299	Chung Kwok Wa 鍾國華
R300	So Kit Ching
R301	Lee Kin Man Allan
R302	Ching Po Han Helen
R303	Tang Kin Pong
R304	Lau Siu Ying
R305	Tang Chor Shing
R306	Kwok King Yin Ruby
R307	Tang Kai Yeung Danie
R308	李子豪
R309	Chung Sik Hong 鍾錫康
R310	Chu Ngar Yee 朱雅儀
R311	李成新
R312	Chan Choi Wan Irene
R313	Hui Ling Dai Tiffany
R314	容玉華
R315	Ling Ching 凌靜
R316	Chau Mui 周梅
R317	Sri Lestari
R318	Wong Raymond Lea Wune
R319	Leung Tsz Ling
R320	Tsang Pui Ching Mona
R321	Chen Li You
R322	Kwan Chi Ha
R323	Leung Suk Yee Rebecca 梁淑儀
R324	Ma Lai Ching 馬禮禎
R325	Findlay John Arthur
R326	Fung Ka Lok

R327	Leung Yee Lam Ella
R328	Fung Hui Fai
R329	梁志強
R330	Chan Mee Kuen Shirley 陳美娟
R331	冼娟明
R332	Suresh Rodrigo
R333	Hui Dik Shun Achevy 許迪舜
R334	Chan Yuk Ming Tracy
R335	Hui Yuk Kei
R336	Leung Kwok Chun
R337	潘瑞欣
R338	Lau Po Shan Gwen
R339	周欽枝
R340	Leung Wai Man
R341	Ip Ping Hong Antony
R342	Lai Ham 黎晗
R343	Tung Suk Ching 董淑貞
R344	Tse Ming Chun 謝名真
R345	Chu Tak Ming 朱德明
R346	Tse Ka Hei Karen
R347	Tse Hon Piu
R348	李銓慶
R349	Chan Siu Chi 陳兆治
R350	Lin Shun Heung Ophelia
R351	Chow On 周安
R352	Yuen Yee Fan
R353	吳錦儀
R354	Chan Ching Yung 陳青蓉
R355	Kwok Chi Kwong Danny 郭志光
R356	Tsang Hoi Ki
R357	Tsang Wai Kwong
R358	Mak Pik Shan Nancy 麥碧珊
R359	李澤光
R360	趙文霞
R361	Chu Mei Ling
R362	Chou Puing
R363	Leung Ching Han 梁靜嫻

R364	Shum Yuen Ching Rita 岑婉菁
R365	梁苑棋
R366	Leung Yuen Chong
R367	Lo Choi Lin
R368	Lai Ngai Fung
R369	Lai Ming Kwai
R370	謝高鋒
R371	Choi Kit Hing
R372	Coman Anica
R373	Lau Hoi Yan Ada
R374	薛苗英
R375	區鍾云
R376	Cheng Kwok Leung 鄭國良
R377	Yeung Kau Mui 楊九妹
R378	Wong Mei Yin
R379	Chan Hoi Hung
R380	Kuk Yi Tan Glory 曲怡丹
R381	Chan Siu Kuen
R382	黎仲桁
R383	Ng Chuen Hau 伍存孝
R384	李詠
R385	Chung Pui Wah
R386	陳詠欣
R387	Chung Duncan Kwan Yin
R388	Cheung Cho Kit
R389	Cheung Yat Tung
R390	Chan Hang Sheung
R391	Cheung Ho Tung
R392	Yong Kit Yin
R393	Jenny Fung
R394	David Wong
R395	Li Oi Wah 李愛華
R396	Shum Wing Cheung Alex 沈榮昌
R397	Fung Yee Mei
R398	Wu Lit Chun
R399	Jane Wu
R400	Fung Yuk Ting Clarice

R401	Tang Yim Ling
R402	陳恩恩
R403	Poon Kim Fong
R404	Su Man Li
R405	Wong Kwok Ho 黃國豪
R406	Tse Chiu Yin 謝招燕
R407	Lee Koon Lam 李冠霖
R408	Mui Chi Keung 梅志強
R409	關教芳
R410	Sze Ai Lai
R411	Tseng Yishem
R412	Wong Yiu Shing 黃耀成
R413	So Shiu Yun Nap 蘇兆殷
R414	Wong Kar Yin
R415	Chow Jin 周靜
R416	Chan Ka Yee
R417	Lo Chun Yip
R418	Chan Choi Ching
R419	Hung Ngok Lui
R420	Chau Sau Fun
R421	趙文娜
R422	Tang Ha Chi
R423	Wong Wai Sum
R424	Chow Sin Ying
R425	Chiu Shiu Fang
R426	Chan Tze Kei
R427	Ng Chung Tung
R428	So Ching
R429	陳華
R430	Tseng Yishium
R431	Tseng Yuming
R432	Tse Chun Sang 謝俊生
R433	尹松波
R434	陳詠權
R435	黃潔瑩
R436	Tse Yuk Fung 謝玉鳳
R437	Chan Chun Fai 陳鎮輝

R438	桂美為
R439	叶惠芝
R440	馮麗冰
R441	林佩詩
R442	單耀承
R443	吳承泓
R444	Tse Tsz Hin
R445	郑冠雄
R446	Chung Mei Ngan Marina
R447	Tsui Fung Yee 徐鳳儀
R448	Hui Hiu Ping
R449	Chan Siu Fung Elton
R450	尹嘉儀
R451	單煜文
R452	Lau Kwok Wa 劉國華
R453	陳嘉熙
R454	倪受貴
R455	Lee Po Chun
R456	Cheung Wai Chuen Jimmy 張偉泉
R457	吳惠蓮
R458	Cheung Kasin
R459	鄧依晨
R460	Cheung Chin Ki
R461	Lam Tsz Ki Stephenie
R462	Ng Siu Ching Margaret
R463	Sheng Bun
R464	Yung Kin Tak 容健德
R465	Leung Yau On
R466	Fok Kwan Dip Albert
R467	曾麟江
R468	駱如岱
R469	Sutari
R470	陳嘉宇
R471	喻淑華
R472	陳中衡
R473	Chou Li Mei
R474	于存輝

R475	于立光
R476	葉敏浩
R477	鍾倩嫻
R478	Kwok Woon King
R479	Li Fai 李輝
R480	Kong Po 江波
R481	Mui Yen Ching
R482	楊玉香
R483	許智傑
R484	Lam Deborah 林詠堃
R485	Ip Kam Hing
R486	Lau Chi Leung Ricky
R487	Ip Siu Yan
R488	Chan Siu Ching
R489	Au Leung Chak
R490	邱朗維
R491	Poon Sze Yuen Leo
R492	Lau Kam Sing
R493	Hui Shing Kwok
R494	Ying Oi Man Samantha
R495	Ying Oi Ka
R496	Hui Ka Lam Kevin
R497	Ho Choi Hung
R498	Lai Christie 黎瑋瑤
R499	Lee Kung Min 李功敏
R500	Yip Wai Ying 葉慧英
R501	鄧富成
R502	Cheung Wai Yee Kelly
R503	Kuk Yi Kwan Spring 曲怡琿
R504	Kuk Pui David 曲渤
R505	Lau Jaimie
R506	Lau Bond
R507	陳祉縈
R508	關敏貞
R509	陳韻縈
R510	施世倫
R511	Chan Tze Shing



R512	Yeh Chi Hin
R513	Luk Tze Ping Rita
R514	Chan Wai Man
R515	Lee Yin Yi 李彥誼
R516	Man Fung Lin
R517	Chiu Ka Pik
R518	Chiu Yu Hong
R519	Chiu Sin Nang
R520	Cheung Wai Man Iris 張緯雯
R521	Lai Kwok Fai Geoffrey 黎國輝
R522	Yeung Cheuk Ip 楊卓燁
R523	梁賜健
R524	Emmanuel Yip
R525	李秀蓮
R526	To Wai Kuen
R527	Tati bt sukadi ratim
R528	Ho Siu Tong
R529	Lam Kam Chuen
R530	Li Tin Sung Peter 李天送
R531	張美蓮
R532	張志華
R533	Andrew Law Wing Nin
R534	Poppe Bernardus Jeannes Theodorus
R535	Ruan Yiuen
R536	Charles Jerome Broquard Jr
R537	Leung Wing Yee
R538	Lee Wai Chu Linda 李惠珠
R539	Chan Naveen
R540	Nori Chan
R541	Leung Kwan Hung
R542	楊玉君
R543	Lau Kwo
R544	Betty Simpson
R545	Ki Lai Kuen
R546	Hui Chi Ho
R547	張詠紅
R548	周笑霞

R549	Susita
R550	Yim Chung Ming
R551	Lee Pui Lin
R552	陳樂豐
R553	Wong Kit Man
R554	Lau Yan Yuen 劉仁元
R555	Wong Ki Kwan
R556	Liu Chloe Hoi Yee
R557	Chan Lai Kwan
R558	Liu Kwok Chuen
R559	陳健輝
R560	伍翠芬
R561	吳國民
R562	Wan Hon Chung
R563	Chan Yuen Ying
R564	吳彩月
R565	Fung Yin Ping Linda
R566	Tsui Tak Chi Chime
R567	Si Tou Iok Mei
R568	Wong Tak Yuen Sonny
R569	Li Ka Man 李嘉敏
R570	Wong Kwok Keung 黃國強
R571	Garcia Jorelyn Segui
R572	馮興
R573	Chan Tai Wai David
R574	Tung Sau Ling
R575	Wong Leng Kat
R576	Shea Kiu
R577	Kwok Siu Lan 郭兆蘭
R578	Lai Ming Chung 黎明頌
R579	Meng Qiang 蒙強
R580	梁銘修
R581	林翠英
R582	Wong Chun Sum Felix
R583	陳健明
R584	林堅
R585	翟清金

R586	Ying Jo Wing
R587	Kim Ji Hyun
R588	Wajntal Michael King Tse Georges
R589	Yu Yee Hung
R590	Guy Wajntal
R591	Tuniah
R592	Lam Shiu Kwong 林兆光
R593	Wong Ngai Man
R594	徐鳳玲
R595	Lee Leong Ting Jeffrey
R596	Chan Sai Hing 陳世興
R597	Hung Kam Chuen Jacky
R598	Chan Kit Ha 陳潔霞
R599	Wong Shung Yee Kitty
R600	Helenban Calasagsag
R601	Ho Sau Har Adeline 何秀霞
R602	Cheung Karin Ka Fung
R603	Ng Tsz Kin
R604	Chong Ka Cheung
R605	Alexey Shumkov
R606	Anna Bogushevskaya
R607	Leung Tin Yan Tony
R608	Yan Pui Kiu Frankie
R609	Chen Liqun
R610	Liu Yu Zhu
R611	Jeevandeep Singh
R612	Wong Yee Ling
R613	Chau Shao Yee
R614	Chung Kai Hei
R615	Luk Jessica Yee Ting
R616	Nick Dearman
R617	Leung Ho Yin
R618	Dorbelle Bayubay Suminal
R619	Ricky Leung
R620	Rico Leung
R621	Ariwi Beatrice Anyango
R622	Ariwi John Odhiambo

R623	Chan Sze Wing
R624	Wenny Cheong
R625	Ng Ewan Marcus
R626	Wong Yee Man
R627	Wat Wah
R628	Chung Kam Hing
R629	Tam Kwong Wah
R630	Jessica Green
R631	Harry Tam
R632	Kit Ying Elsa Mau
R633	Anna Green
R634	楊楚真
R635	Ian Green
R636	Chung Chi Keung
R637	Ng Siu Kwan
R638	Thomas Green
R639	Wong Chun Sum
R640	Wong Shek Kei
R641	Si Tou Lok Mei
R642	Lui Wai Hee
R643	Li Shuk Kuen
R644	Yu Hung Min
R645	Wong Chun Fai
R646	Chiu San Ngai
R647	Chau Chuen
R648	To Kok Yin
R649	Hsih Chun Yat
R650	Kan Man Wai Betty
R651	Cheng Pok Yan
R652	Lam Yu Yan
R653	Ng Siu Ping
R654	Chan Mee Fong
R655	Chow Tai Tai
R656	Wong Mei Veii
R657	Lau Wai Chi
R658	Li Wai Yue
R659	Lee Yuk Shuen

R660	Li Kan Yu
R661	Li Lok Yee
R662	Li Wing Yee
R663	Li Wai Kwong
R664	Lo Ying Chun
R665	Li Pik Yan
R666	Ng Lai Mei
R667	Lee Chi Lung Mervyn
R668	Chan Sze Lai
R669	Lam Kam Shuen Claudia
R670	Wong Wing Cheong
R671	Wong Tin Kwan Alfred
R672	Suminih
R673	Yuen Po Ning
R674	Ho Yuk Kwan
R675	Luk Wai Ching
R676	Wong Steffi
R677	Wong Steven
R678	Phoebe Judkins
R679	陳佩貞
R680	Wong Wai Chiu
R681	Lam Kwong Yim
R682	Lam Wing Yan
R683	Jason Mok
R684	Kwan Chui Ling
R685	徐秋玲
R686	Bernard Tam Kwok Kwong
R687	Lee Wai Chi
R688	Quan Ho
R689	Anthony Wong
R690	Hui Chi Kit
R691	Cheung Wing Hing
R692	吳國才
R693	戴曙清
R694	Ngan Ting Kei
R695	Ma Kwok Keung
R696	Lun Yuen Ting

R697	Wong Trinity
R698	彭志聰
R699	陳佩賢
R700	王岳
R701	王瑞岩
R702	岳秀芝
R703	于美鶯
R704	于美嘉
R705	于美懿
R706	Yuen Yiu Ming
R707	Ip Wei Ai Choo
R708	Ip Shue Fai
R709	Debby Archambaud Chao
R710	蔣小平
R711	Tam Man Po
R712	Tou Lok Mei
R713	Szeto Ho Karen
R714	Lam Ching Lei
R715	Chan Kwan Shing
R716	Ester Ng Ka Lai
R717	Au Kwok Kay
R718	Choi Matthew Chun Tung
R719	Pang Yuk Yin Irena
R720	Choi Hin Lok
R721	Ng Yuen Ting
R722	Ng Ka Shing
R723	Lau Lai Sim
R724	Lam Pik Kwan
R725	Yeung Kwok Fung
R726	Siu Leung Cheung
R727	Wong Shing Fook
R728	Wong Tak On
R729	Ho Lai Sim
R730	Wong Yin
R731	Yip King Wai
R732	Evans Peter
R733	Ho Wai Kuen Betty



R734	陳羅彪
R735	Lee Yuk Wah
R736	Lee Yin Ling Stevie 李燕玲
R737	Li Pui Sang 李培生
R738	Wu Ho Sing
R739	Yuen Yiu Keung
R740	Chan Wan Fai Susanna
R741	Choi Sik Nam
R742	Kwong Hing Yuk
R743	Yik Hiu Tung
R744	Tam Tin Po
R745	Yuen Sharon Kit Yee
R746	Ng Ka Ho
R747	Ng Wing Sum
R748	Lee Fung Ping Priscilla
R749	Chan Wai Kwong
R750	譚慧妍
R751	Tam Chun Hin 譚駿軒
R752	黃麗儀
R753	Kan Shui Fun Ivy
R754	Wong Sui Yee Catherine 黃瑞儀
R755	卓宝璞
R756	Tsang Mei Wa Tami
R757	Tsang Yat Sing
R758	Wong Lai Ha
R759	Almina V Deloso
R760	葉瑞平
R761	Mallillin Lina
R762	李志明
R763	林少女
R764	Wong Lap Mui
R765	李偉麟
R766	Winda Cinatur Siyamtini
R767	Pang Wei Veng 龐偉運
R768	Chung Yin Chau
R769	Lin Fu Wah
R770	Hung Wai Ting

R771	Chan Wai Ho
R772	Wong Nancy
R773	Ting Margaret Zhi Wen 章誌文
R774	Yung Mei Sze Maisy
R775	Ting Po Paul 丁堡
R776	陳李建
R777	Maduro Maria Martina
R778	邵燕凌
R779	Chiu Lai Yuen
R780	賴麗菊
R781	Lam Kwai Fong
R782	齊道庸
R783	Lai Ting Chuk
R784	張巧仙
R785	韋少玲
R786	林華中
R787	Lam Man Chun
R788	Cheng Rachael Bui Yee
R789	Law Yat Sing Mongan
R790	Cheng Jia Fu Jeffrey
R791	Kwok Yau Wah 郭幼華
R792	Chow Yau Tak 周有德
R793	Li Yuk Fung
R794	Carine Ligaspi Lozada
R795	Maria Ervy Genciagan
R796	Juloya Gina Navarro
R797	Yau Tsz Mei
R798	Mak Ka Ping 麥家平
R799	Ko Peck Hoon 高伯壘
R800	張冬菇
R801	成億麟
R802	張馬騰
R803	Tsang Pui Lan 曾標蘭
R804	張衡鈞
R805	張皓鈞
R806	蘇美馨
R807	Fung Tak Hoi

R808	Yau Kwok Chiu
R809	劉來興
R810	陳轉好
R811	陳健文
R812	Lau Susan Ann
R813	Lau Queenly 劉鈞怡
R814	Tang Alex Ting Hin
R815	劉黃月英
R816	黃樹強
R817	劉學勤
R818	陳錦鳳
R819	劉寶賢
R820	陳美蓮
R821	刘天送
R822	Mui Roger 梅頌豪
R823	Yik Kam Keung
R824	Chan Siu Ha
R825	袁捷生
R826	李雪馨
R827	Liu Lai Kuen
R828	Wan Wai Kam
R829	Lam Chi Sum
R830	Lam Yip Ching Jaydon
R831	Li Tsz Fung Albert
R832	Mary Mulvihill
R833	陳洲
R834	Wong Lung Nui
R835	Chan Tim Lam
R836	Kwong Ling
R837	Chiu Hiu Fung Jennifer
R838	Cheng Ching Fu
R839	Yick Wai Yee
R840	Tse Sau Yu Fiona
R841	東華三院小欖綜合康復服務大樓胡日敬

## II. List of Commenters

<b>Comment No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)</b>	<b>Name of Commenter</b>
C1	Mary Mulvihill
C2	Lee Pui Lan
C3	Kong Man Wai

**Summary of Representations and Comments and Planning Department's (PlanD's) Responses  
in respect of the Draft So Kwun Wat Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM-SKW/14**

- (1) The grounds and views of the representations (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-R1 to R841), as well as the PlanD's responses are summarised below. There are a total of 841 valid representations, including 840 representations (R1 to R840) raising objection to/adverse views on the proposed amendment Item A and one representation (R841) providing views on Item A.

*(a) Adverse Representations (840)*

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<b>A. Need for Providing Departmental Quarters (DQs)</b>		
<b>R1, R3, R4, R7, R9 to R20, R22, R24, R25, R28, R30, R31, R35, R45, R47, R49, R55, R65, R67 to R72, R75, R78, R79, R85, R88, R91, R92, R94 to R96, R103, R112, R114 to R116, R119, R124, R126, R127, R136, R141, R149, R162, R166, R167, R169, R171, R182, R186 to R188, R190 to R192, R196 to R197, R200, R211, R215, R216, R219 to R222, R226, R228, R229, R231, R233 to R237, R240, R243, R247, R253, R256, R264 to R267, R276, R282 to R285, R296, R298, R300 to R304, R308, R314 to R316, R318, R323, R324, R326, R332, R334, R340, R343, R345 to R348, R350, R352</b>	(A1) <u><i>Inappropriate Site</i></u>  The Item A Site (the Site) is not suitable for redeveloping into a high-density DQs as it is small with uneven and sloping ground. The Site is also constrained by its only access road (i.e. Hong Fai Road) which is steep and narrow with limited traffic capacity for both the construction and operation stages. There are other more suitable and appropriate sites in Tai Lam or Tuen Mun for DQs development. However, no assessment on the availability of alternative site(s) has been conducted which violates the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Development within Green Belt ("GB") Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) (TPB PG-No.10).	The proposed rezoning does not involve any change in the land use of the Site, but only to facilitate redevelopment of the existing low-rise Correctional Services Department (CSD)'s staff quarters blocks for meeting the DQs demand for its married staff and better utilising the Site. With reference to the nearby high-rise residential development (i.e. Palatial Coast) with building height (BH) restriction of 102mPD ( <b>Plan H-5</b> ), the Site is suitable for high-rise DQs redevelopment in terms of land use and BH compatibility. Relevant technical assessments (including Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and Geotechnical Planning Review (GPR)) have concluded that the proposed redevelopment is technically feasible and relevant government departments have no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed redevelopment.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<p>to R353, R356, R359, R365 to R366, R368, R372, R376, R377, R382, R385 to R386, R388 to R391, R393, R394, R396, R405, R411 to R413, R419, R423, R432, R435 to R437, R443, R447, R448, R450, R454 to R457, R461, R463, R465, R467, R473 to R476, R480 to R482, R484, R494, R496, R502, R507, R509, R513, R515 to R521, R523, R532, R538, R544 to R547, R549 to R551, R554 to R558, R560, R562, R566 to R567, R569 to R571, R580, R582, R584, R586, R592 to R596, R602, R604, R607, R608, R610 to R614, R616 to R623, R625, R629 to R635, R638 to R640, R643 to R645, R648, R649, R651, R659, R661, R667 to R669, R674, R675, R679, R683 to R686, R688 to R693, R696 to R702, R706 to R708, R711 to R735, R737, R739 to R742, R750, R751, R754, R758, R762, R770, R774 to R779, R788, R793 to R795, R798, R799, R827 to R830, R833 and R840</p>		<p>TPB PG-No.10 is to set out the assessment criteria for considering s.16 planning applications for development within “GB” zone, which is not applicable to amendment to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The Site comprises only a minor portion previously zoned “GB” (about 730m<sup>2</sup> or 26% of the Site) which is mainly formed and currently used as a vehicular access, a car parking area and a cut-slope associated with Siu Lam Road (<b>Plan H-2</b>).</p> <p>CSD in consultation with relevant government departments has considered a number of factors including security concern, accessibility and convenience of sites, optimisation of existing under-utilised CSD sites, land use and BH compatibility, and technical feasibility when choosing a suitable site for DQs development. As explained above, the Site is suitable for high-rise DQs redevelopment after considering the above factors.</p> <p>Responses to A2 on alternative sites, B1 on compatibility, C1 on traffic capacity, C3 on accessibility of public transport and F4 on geotechnical feasibility below are relevant.</p>



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<p>R3, R9 to R18, R20, R22, R24, R25, R28, R33, R35, R36, R40, R41, R43 to R46, R49, R55, R65, R68, R87, R91, R95, R103, R112, R114 to R116, R124, R126, R127, R143, R149, R162, R166, R167, R169, R188, R190 to R192, R196, R215 to R216, R219 to R222, R226, R228, R231, R235 to R237, R240, R243, R265, R267, R276, R283 to R284, R290, R296, R300 to R302, R308, R314 to R316, R318, R326, R328, R332, R348, R350, R352, R353, R359, R365, R366, R368, R372, R382, R388 to R393, R396, R405, R439, R443, R457, R461, R465, R467, R473, R474, R476, R480 to R482, R496, R502, R509, R513, R516 to R521, R523, R532, R538, R544, R549 to R551, R554 to R558, R560, R569 to R571, R580, R582, R584, R592 to R595, R598, R602, R604, R607, R608, R618 to R623, R625, R629, R630, R632, R633, R638 to R640, R674, R698, R700, R701, R711 to R733, R735, R737, R741, R742, R750, R751, R754, R762, R765, R766, R769, R774, R776 to R779,</p>	<p>(A2) <u>Alternative Sites</u></p> <p>CSD should explore alternative sites for DQs development including those existing DQs sites near the Marine Police Tai Lam Chung Base, Tai Lam Correctional Institution, Tai Lam Centre for Women and Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre, Siu Lam Tsuen/ Luen On San Tsuen, and any other sites away from existing residential developments. Sites near Tai Lam should be selected for DQs development as staff living at these sites could support emergency situations occurred in those correctional services facilities in Tai Lam more swiftly and efficiently. It would also be more convenient for the staff and improve the security of these correctional services facilities. These sites are also much larger in site area and redevelopment of these sites would not affect their surrounding natural environment (<b>Plans H-3a &amp; 3b</b>).</p> <p>Redevelopment of the existing quarters buildings which are of only 40 years is a waste of public funds. Buildings of over 60 years should be redeveloped instead.</p> <p>Some suggest using the vacant "Comprehensive Development Area"</p>	<p>In respect of the proposed alternatives sites, they are being occupied/planned for other uses and not suitable for high-rise DQs development due to various development constraints. More importantly, irrespective of whether there are other suitable sites, the Site is suitable for DQs redevelopment.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<b>R785 to R787, R793 to R795, R798, R835 and R840</b>	("CDA") site in Tai Lam Chung ( <b>Plan H-3b</b> ) for DQs development as staff quarters use could be considered as a kind of residential development which could be incorporated well as part of a "CDA" development.	
<b>R18, R46, R77, R91, R104, R107, R110, R116, R118, R283, R284, R474, R475, R482, R545, R551 and R832</b>	<p>(A3) <u><i>Alternative Means to Substitute DQs</i></u></p> <p>CSD should not solely rely on the provision of DQs to maintain morale. DQs development is also not in line with the government's pledge to phase out the provision of accommodation for civil servants. There are various kinds of civil service housing benefits to substitute DQs development to maintain morale. For example, the Non-accountable Cash Allowance Scheme has been offered since June 2000 to eligible recruits to encourage civil servants to buy their own homes. Other alternative means to maintain morale include pay rise, promotion opportunity and improvement of working environment.</p> <p>With current decline of property prices and rise in vacancy rate of residential units, CSD could purchase residential units from the private market instead of constructing new DQs. Some suggest CSD to build new DQs</p>	<p>The Security Bureau (SB) confirmed that it is the Government's established policy to provide DQs to married disciplined services staff, subject to the availability of resources. According to CSD, the provision of DQs to staff is one of the staff welfare in CSD. It is also one of the initiatives to maintain staff morale. The provision of other kinds of civil service housing benefits is subject to the staff's terms of appointment and the terms and conditions of relevant housing schemes under Civil Service Regulations, thus not applicable to all disciplined services staff in CSD. CSD also advised that the vacancy rate and waiting time for DQs are floating every year. In addition, there is a continuous shortfall of DQs for eligible staff. As at 1 March 2023, a total of 274 CSD eligible staff are waiting to be allocated quarters. Therefore, there is a continuous demand for provision of more DQs in CSD.</p> <p>The Site, which is mainly on formed land of suitable size with established infrastructural support, is suitable for DQs redevelopment. As it is currently occupied by existing married quarters which have operated since 1977, the need</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	instead of redeveloping existing DQs in order to prevent high cost of redevelopment, production of construction waste and long construction period.	and cost for refurbishment and maintenance of these aging buildings have been continuously increasing. Thus, utilising the existing site and redeveloping these old quarters to increase the number of quarter units would be more beneficial.
<b>R9, R11, R27, R29, R34, R37, R41, R49, R51, R55, R58, R59, R63, R95, R104, R106 to R109, R114, R123, R124, R126, R127, R134, R145, R154, R155, R162, R165, R172, R187, R189, R190, R193, R196, R201, R224, R248, R251, R265, R268, R276, R286, R290, R300 to R303, R314, R316, R323, R324, R326 to R329, R331, R334, R340, R343, R344, R346, R347, R352, R376, R377, R380, R390, R392, R394, R405, R412, R419, R430, R434, R435, R437, R439, R441, R448, R451, R457, R463, R465 to R467, R474, R484, R485, R494, R504, R508, R514, R523, R552, R566, R569 to R571, R579, R580, R586, R590, R592, R594, R596, R597, R607, R619, R621, R622, R624, R625, R632, R646, R647, R666, R736, R752, R753, R762, R765, R766, R769, R770, R773, R774, R776 to R779,</b>	<p>(A4) <b><u>High Cost of DQs Development</u></b></p> <p>According to a previous response from the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) to a Legislative Council (LegCo) member's query on the high cost of DQs development at Tin Wan, Aberdeen, a small redevelopment site would increase the project's construction cost as the contractor needed to rent nearby sites for establishing site office and storing construction materials. Therefore, the proposed redevelopment will not be cost-effective in view of its small site area and generation of limited additional quarters (less than 100 units). Building of luxurious DQs is also contrary to the existing sluggish economy and expected fiscal deficit.</p> <p>It is not worthy to use huge public funds to redevelop the site for only 136 staff quarters in the expense of the residents of Palatial Coast with 850 units. The proposed redevelopment also contributes limited benefits to the society.</p>	<p>The estimated costs of design and construction works for the proposed DQs redevelopment will be formulated in the detailed design stage. The ArchSD, as the works agent of the project, advises that they will adopt 'fitness-for-purpose' and 'no frills design' principles in the design and construction of the proposed development while different options would be studied to enhance cost-effectiveness to the project.</p> <p>As announced in the 2014 Policy Address (please refer to paragraph 191), the Government would expedite eight DQs projects for the disciplined services departments. Six projects have been completed while the remaining two are in progress. Although some of these units would be allocated to CSD staff for shortening the staff's waiting time for quarters, CSD needs to continue identifying suitable sites for building quarters and take forward other DQs development projects proactively to meet its demand.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<p>R789, R790, R793, R794, R827 to R830, R835 and R836</p> <p>R27, R34, R42, R44, R46, R51, R56, R64, R88, R99, R110, R120, R134, R155, R157, R161, R162, R164, R165, R176, R189, R196, R218, R226, R228, R231, R235, R236, R248, R250 to R252, R256, R263 to R269, R290, R328, R352, R356, R380, R405, R418, R480, R496, R504, R521, R552, R555 to R557, R569, R570, R582, R593, R603, R604, R607, R610, R612, R618, R619, R623 to R625, R629, R631, R632, R639, R640, R644, R646 to R648, R651, R655, R656, R666, R674, R679, R683, R685, R687, R697, R699 to R702, R704, R706 to R708, R711 to R733, R739, R741, R765, R766, R769, R785 to R787, R832, R835 and R836</p>	<p>(A5) <u>Need for Developing DQs</u></p> <p>The need for developing DQs could not be established based on a number of recently published figures. The vacancy rates of CSD staff quarters are high (1.4% in 2019, 6.0% in 2020 and 1.6% in 2021), the waiting time for CSD staff quarters is the shortest (2.2 years) amongst all disciplined services staff quarters in 2021, and the waiting time for CSD staff quarters is much shorter as compared to that for public rental housing. CSD should first fully utilise their vacant staff quarters, such as those in Stanley and Hei Ling Chau or redevelop those much older DQs buildings prior to the Site to avoid wasting public funds. Some request CSD to disclose the numbers of eligible staff for DQs and vacancy rate of DQs.</p> <p>Besides, some claim that information given in the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) Paper No. 7/22 is inaccurate as there is no mentioning of a policy to expedite DQs projects for disciplined services departments in the 2014 Policy Address.</p>	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<b>B. Compatibility of Development Intensity and Comprehensive Planning</b>		
<p><b>R21, R28, R46, R81, R104, R105, R107, R113, R120, R122, R135, R139 to R141, R145, R168, R175, R195, R198, R208, R219, R226, R228, R231, R235 to R237, R239, R240, R243, R247 to R249, R253, R257, R263, R264, R266, R268, R271, R273, R278, R280, R294, R391, R408, R410, R413, R474, R482, R515, R555, R558, R578, R582, R590, R593, R603, R604, R607, R609, R610, R612 to R614, R618, R623, R624, R627, R629, R632, R634, R637, R639, R640, R642, R643, R645, R648, R650, R651, R657, R659, R660, R668, R672 to R675, R679, R680, R683, R685 to R687, R690, R693, R697 to R702, R707, R711 to R735, R737 to R739, R741, R742, R824, R836 and R837</b></p>	<p>(B1) <u><b>Incompatible Development Intensity</b></u></p> <p>High development intensity with BH of 21 storeys and plot ratio (PR) of 3.6 is incompatible with the surrounding area which is semi-rural in nature. Increase in development intensity would also reduce the attractiveness of the nearby Tai Lam Country Park. Moreover, there are inadequate justifications for adopting such a high PR which is nine times to the PR of 0.4 as set out under the TPB PG-No.10 for G/IC uses within the "GB" zone and 60% higher than the PR of 2.2 of the nearby residential development.</p> <p>The proposed redevelopment is not in line with or contravenes the BH profile of the So Kwun Wat Planning Scheme Area as stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP. According to paragraph 7.1 of the ES of the OZP, <i>'in order to provide better planning control on the development intensity and BH upon development/redevelopment, to address public demand for greater certainty and transparency in the statutory planning system, and to meet the growing community aspirations for a better living environment, a review of the SKW OZP has been taken in</i></p>	<p>Situated in an area of a number of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities and medium to low-density residential developments, the proposed DQs redevelopment with an intensity equivalent to PR of about 3.6 and a maximum BH of 90mPD is considered not incompatible with the adjoining medium-density residential development namely Palatial Coast to the immediate north and west of the Site with a PR of about 2.2 and a maximum BH of 102mPD (<b>Plan H-5</b>). Responses to A1 on TPB PG-No.10 above are relevant.</p> <p>As explained in paragraph 7.1 of the ES of the OZP, the imposition of BH restrictions for the development zones on the OZP is to prevent out-of-context buildings and to preserve some key urban design attributes. The proposed DQs redevelopment is considered not incompatible with the medium-density residential development in the vicinity. Paragraph 7.3 of the ES also explains that the site for this DQs redevelopment is restricted to a maximum BH of 90mPD <i>'taking into account the nature of the planned use and high-rise residential development to its immediate northwest'</i>. Paragraph 7.5 of the ES is to set out relevant criteria for considering s.16 planning applications for minor relaxation of BH, which is not applicable to amendment to the OZP.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	<p><i>2010 with a view to incorporating appropriate BH restrictions for various development zones to guide future development/redevelopment'. Paragraph 7.3 of the ES also states that 'facilities on land zoned "Government, institution or community" ("G/IC") are mainly low-rise with building heights ranging from 1 to 6 storeys. To maintain the low building height profile within the Area and the semi-rural character, the "G/IC" sites have been restricted to maximum building height ranging from 1 to 6 storeys to reflect their existing building height or the building height agreed amongst relevant Government departments'. Paragraph 7.5 of the ES also stipulates that planning merits such as better urban design, improvements to townscape of the locality, better streetscape/ good quality street level public urban space, provision of separation between buildings to enhance air and visual permeability and other factors should be taken into account in considering minor relaxation in respect of BH restriction. In this regard, the proposed amendment of increasing the BH of Item A Site will set an undesirable precedent which may lead to adverse cumulative impacts on the area.</i></p>	<p>Regarding the suggestion of lowering the number of storeys by building more blocks, as sufficient setback from roads has to be allowed for mitigating the potential air quality and noise impacts, and in view of the small size of the redevelopment site, it is not practical to split the 21-storey block into more lower-rise blocks.</p> <p>Regarding the comment on site utilisation, the development potential of the Site has already been optimised after duly considering factors such as traffic and infrastructural capacity, local land use context and characteristics, development intensity of the surrounding area and various possible impacts of the proposed redevelopment on the area concerned.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	<p>Some suggest that the proposed BH of the redevelopment should not be higher than that of the existing DQs buildings. As a government project, the proposed redevelopment should follow the BH stipulated on the OZP. Some also suggest that the proposed redevelopment could be split into two to three blocks for lowering the BH.</p> <p>A representer, however, opines that the Site is not fully utilised as the proposed redevelopment would only lead to little plot ratio gain, resulting in inefficiency and waste of land resource.</p>	
<b>R145, R226, R228, R231, R235 to R237, R256, R264, R266, R267, R555, R582, R593, R603, R604, R610, R612, R618, R623, R629, R631, R639, R640, R644, R648, R651, R656, R674, R679, R683, R685, R687, R697, R699 to R702, R706 to R708, R711 to R733 and R741</b>	<p>(B2) <b><u>Piecemeal Development</u></b></p> <p>The proposed single-block high-rise building is a piecemeal development and has very limited integration with adjacent potential developable areas. More comprehensive/ large-scale planning for the area should be conducted instead.</p> <p>Some representers opine that the need of DQs development and suitable sites should be identified in large-scale development projects such as the New Development Areas for a more comprehensive planning instead of</p>	<p>The Site forms part of a larger “G/IC” site which is mostly developed and being occupied by various GIC facilities (<b>Plan H-5</b>). There is no plan for comprehensive redevelopment of the “G/IC” site. If large-scale re-planning of the wider area is considered necessary, land use review could be conducted separately.</p> <p>CSD advises that the future provision of new DQs in CSD would be from both new development sites and redevelopment sites, subject to demand and supply.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	using the Site which is small in size for providing limited DQs only.	
<b>C. Traffic and Transport</b>		
<p><b>R1 to R7, R9, R12, R13, R15 to R19, R21 to R24, R26 to R28, R30, R31, R33, R35 to R37, R39 to R45, R47 to R50, R52, R54, R57 to R59, R62, R63, R65 to R80, R82 to R90, R92 to R99, R101, R102, R110, R111, R114, R117, R122 to R138, R140 to R142, R144, R146 to R162, R164 to R175, R177, R179 to R197, R199 to R202, R205 to R207, R210 to R225, R227, R229, R230, R232 to R234, R237 to R242, R244, R246, R249, R251, R254, R255, R258 to R263, R265 to R267, R270, R271, R273 to R276, R278, R279, R282 to R285, R288, R291 to R295, R297 to R307, R309 to R325, R327, R330, R332 to R335, R337 to R342, R344 to R353, R356 to R369, R371 to R388, R390, R393 to R405, R407, R409 to R418, R420, R422 to R427, R429 to R438, R440 to R443, R445 to R461, R463 to</b></p>	<p>(C1) <b><u>Insufficient Traffic Capacity</u></b></p> <p>The existing road network of the area (Siu Lam Road/ Siu Lam Tsuen Road and Hong Fai Road connecting to Castle Peak Road and Tuen Mun Road via the junction of Hong Fai Road/ Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam and Tai Lam Roundabout) has limited capacity and will be overloaded by additional traffic generated by the proposed redevelopment and the nearby soon-to-be-opened Integrated Rehabilitation Services Complex (IRSC) (about 1,700 beds and 1,000 staff) against the background that there are already several high-rise residential developments in the So Kwun Wat and Gold Coast area.</p> <p>The narrow Hong Fai Road, which is the major access to the residential development and GIC facilities in the area, is a traffic accident blackspot and often has ongoing roadworks. Increased traffic congestion is anticipated with the proposed redevelopment which will affect travel of private cars and shuttle buses of the nearby residential</p>	<p>The Site is accessible to Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam and Tuen Mun Road via Siu Lam Road and Hong Fai Road (<b>Plan H-3a</b>). A TIA has been carried out by CSD to assess the possible traffic impact of the proposed DQs redevelopment. The estimated trip generation from the IRSC has been taken into account in assessing the traffic impact. According to the TIA, as the amount of additional traffic to be generated by the proposed redevelopment (from about 97 additional units) is not significant, all of the key junctions and road links in the vicinity of the Site would be operating within their capacities during the AM and PM peak hours in the design year 2032. It could be concluded that the proposed redevelopment would not create significant traffic impact on the nearby road network.</p> <p>Regarding the concern on blocking the sightline of roads by the proposed redevelopment thus increasing the possibility of traffic accident, as the DQs block will be located at the northeastern part of the Site away from the Siu Lam Road/ Hong Fai Road junction located to the south of the Site and setbacks from roads are proposed, the proposed redevelopment will unlikely block the sightline to this junction.</p>



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<p>R473, R475 to R481, R483 to R491, R493 to R509, R511, R513, R515 to R524, R526 to R539, R541 to R550, R552 to R557, R559 to R571, R573 to R581, R583 to R586, R590 to R598, R601, R602, R605 to R609, R611, R615 to R617, R619 to R639, R641, R642, R645 to R650, R652, R654 to R657, R659 to R672, R676 to R678, R680 to R684, R686, R688, R689, R691 to R696, R703, R704, R706, R709, R710, R732 to R734, R737, R738, R740, R742, R746 to R750, R752 to R756, R758 to R760, R763, R764, R767, R770 to R773, R775, R782, R784 to R791, R793 to R799, R803 to R822, R824, R825, R827 to R830, R833 to R836 and R839</p>	<p>settlements (i.e. Palatial Coast and Siu Lam Village), custodial and/or staff vehicles of the nearby correctional services and rehabilitation facilities, school buses, food delivery vans, refuse collection vehicles and ambulances/emergency vehicles, which in turn causes inconvenience to nearby residents and affects operation/security of these GIC facilities. Some suggest to widen Hong Fai Road.</p> <p>The proposed redevelopment will likely block the sightline of roads and make traffic accidents more frequent.</p> <p>Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road are not planned for supporting heavy vehicle traffic. There are concerns about traffic safety (may easily cause traffic accident) and road capacity (may cause blocking and traffic jam) during the construction period of the proposed redevelopment due to heavy vehicle access. It is proposed to prohibit heavy vehicles from using Siu Lam Road.</p>	<p>As the proposed vehicular access to the Site will be located at Siu Lam Road similar to the existing access arrangement, no construction vehicle related to the proposed redevelopment will travel along the sloping section of Hong Fai Road abutting the southern boundary of the Site. Swept path analysis of heavy goods vehicles entering and leaving the proposed redevelopment via the vehicular access and a construction traffic impact assessment have been conducted in the TIA for the proposed redevelopment. The TIA concludes that as the construction site is small, the amount of construction traffic would not be significant (around 2 nos. of trucks and 2 nos. of staff car per hour) and would not cause significant traffic impact on the nearby road network over the construction period. Appropriate traffic safety measures would also be adopted to alert motorists on construction traffic.</p> <p>In light of the above, the Transport Department (TD) and Highways Department (HyD) have no in-principle objection to the proposed redevelopment from traffic engineering and highway maintenance perspectives.</p>
<p>R4 to R7, R11, R15, R19, R26, R27, R29 to R33, R35, R36, R39, R42, R44 to R46, R50, R52, R54, R56, R58, R60 to R62, R64 to</p>	<p>(C2) <u><i>Pedestrian Safety and Footpath Capacity</i></u></p> <p>There are concerns on pedestrian safety and footpath capacity of Hong Fai Road and Siu</p>	<p>The pedestrian impact assessment undertaken in the TIA indicates that all the concerned footpaths and crossings</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<p><b>R71, R73 to R78, R80, R85, R89, R90, R92, R93, R102, R105, R106, R114, R118, R123 to R128, R136, R137, R149, R152 to R155, R159, R161, R162, R166, R167, R171 to R173, R179, R182, R183, R187 to R195, R197, R199, R201, R202, R205, R206, R209 to R212, R214 to R216, R221, R222, R224, R230, R232, R234, R239, R244 to R246, R251, R255, R259, R261, R271, R282 to R285, R291, R294, R295, R297, R299, R304, R305, R309 to R311, R316, R320 to R325, R327, R330, R334, R335, R337, R341, R345 to R347, R350 to R352, R356, R357, R359 to R362, R373, R374, R380, R383 to R388, R390, R396 to R399, R401 to R404, R406 to R414, R417, R418, R424, R426, R427, R430, R431, R442, R445, R446, R450, R453 to R456, R459, R460, R462, R464 to R467, R469 to R473, R476 to R477, R479, R481, R483, R485 to R492, R494 to R506, R508, R509, R511, R513, R515 to R520, R522, R526 to R533, R535 to R537, R542 to R547, R549,</b></p>	<p>Lam Road. There are already many hikers to Tai Lam Country Park using the narrow footpath of Hong Fai Road. Increased pedestrians from the proposed redevelopment will overload the nearby pedestrian links. Moreover, there is no proper pedestrian crossing facility along Hong Fai Road. In addition, there is a sharp bend near the junction of Siu Lam Road and Hong Fai Road which causes at least two blind spots for pedestrians using Hong Fai Road. It is recommended to widen and improve pedestrian facility of this area.</p> <p>Small redevelopment site, narrow streets, and prolonged closure of footpath during the construction period will pose danger on pedestrians.</p>	<p>would perform satisfactorily with sufficient capacities with the proposed redevelopment. Notwithstanding, CSD stands ready to explore possible enhancement to the pedestrian crossing condition in the vicinity of the proposed redevelopment with relevant parties during the detailed design stage. Appropriate traffic safety measures would also be adopted to alert pedestrians on construction traffic.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<p>R550, R552 to R555, R559, R561, R562, R565 to R568, R570, R574, R576 to R578, R580, R584 to R586, R590, R591, R593, R594, R596 to R598, R601, R602, R605, R606, R609, R615, R617, R620, R623 to R629, R631 to R633, R635, R637 to R639, R641, R642, R645, R648 to R650, R652, R657, R659 to R661, R665 to R667, R670 to R672, R676 to R678, R680 to R684, R686, R688, R689, R691 to R696, R703, R709, R710, R732, R734, R747, R748, R750, R752, R754 to R756, R758, R764, R767, R771, R772, R782, R784, R788 to R791, R796 to R799, R804 to R810, R812 to R816, R819 to R822, R824, R827 to R830, R833, R835, R836 and R839</p>		
<p>R84, R135, R145, R146, R179, R282, R313, R365, R366, R368, R369, R382, R420, R422, R425, R431, R432, R447, R456, R527, R550, R586, R789 and R790</p>	<p>(C3) <u><i>Public Transport</i></u></p> <p>There is deficiency in public transport services in the area. There is only one minibus route operating every half an hour in the area, while the nearest bus stops are located 700m to 1.4km away from the</p>	<p>As advised by TD, the GMB Route 43B (Ho Pong Street – Tai Lam Chung (Circular)) at present provides sufficient carrying capacity for passengers along Hong Fai Road heading for Tuen Mun Town Centre.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	<p>proposed redevelopment site. Therefore, an upgrade of public transport services is required. More public transport options should be made available to residents in the area.</p>	<p>In addition to the GMB service, a number of bus routes to and from various parts of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon could be found in the vicinity of the Site, with the nearest bus stops located at Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam westbound (Siu Lam Stop for Tuen Mun bound) within about 350m walking distance (about 4 minutes walking time), Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam eastbound (Ching Lai Road Stop for Kowloon bound) within about 450m walking distance (about 7 minutes walking time), and Tuen Mun Road Bus-Bus Interchange (Kowloon bound) within about 650m walking distance (about 10 minutes walking time) (<b>Plan H-6h</b>). By making reference to the surveys carried out in 2022 and 2023, TD considers that the bus routes observing the above-mentioned bus stops could cater for the additional passenger demand from the Site.</p>
<p><b>R5 to R7, R10, R26, R38, R46, R62, R77, R99, R115, R117, R126, R127, R129, R131, R134, R136, R138, R143, R151, R153, R163, R203 to R204, R234, R245, R250, R252, R262, R263, R283, R284, R286, R326, R346, R352, R364, R370, R381, R392, R394, R400, R415, R421, R432, R447, R456, R504, R539, R548, R561, R576, R595, R600, R623, R629, R631, R632, R634, R635, R655, R705, R709, R733, R738, R760,</b></p>	<p>(C4) <b><u>Illegal Parking</u></b></p> <p>With the design population of 544, provision of only 59 parking spaces in the proposed redevelopment is insufficient to meet the parking needs of the residents. This might accelerate the existing illegal parking problem near the Site and increase the chances of traffic accident and traffic congestion.</p> <p>On the contrary, some opine that huge increase of private car parking spaces is not</p>	<p>A total of 54 residential and 5 visitor car parking spaces and 10 motorcycle parking spaces will be provided within the proposed redevelopment to cater for parking needs according to the relevant requirements for DQs and the HKPSG. Generally, the parking ratio for disciplined services quarters is higher than that for normal residential development, taking into full account the unique operational requirements of the disciplined services. TD has no objection to the proposed number of parking spaces for the proposed DQs redevelopment.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
R762 to R764, R770, R774, R776 to R779, R795, R812, R835 and R836	environmentally efficient and therefore the number of parking spaces should be reduced and point-to-point bus service should be provided.	
R3, R13, R25, R27, R32, R42, R45, R68, R70, R74, R76, R77, R125, R130, R135, R137, R138, R140, R141, R143, R148, R150, R151, R159, R162, R165 to R169, R173, R177, R179, R189, R194, R199, R200, R206, R207, R212, R216, R217, R220, R225, R237 to R239, R241, R246, R249, R254, R255, R258, R265, R271, R273, R283, R284, R287, R289, R309, R379, R404, R449, R467, R514, R515, R570, R593, R607, R609, R615, R624, R625, R627, R628, R631, R632, R636, R641, R642, R645, R647, R648, R652, R654, R657, R659 to R661, R663, R665, R667, R670, R672, R677, R680, R683, R686, R688, R689, R691 to R693, R696, R703, R710, R734, R740, R761, R768, R770, R800 to R802, R817, R831 and R834 to R837	<p>(C5) <u>TIA</u></p> <p>The TIA is not comprehensive and fails to assess the following traffic conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Family members of the disciplinary staff do not work on shift and have similar trip pattern with other nearby residents. Traffic flows at Hong Fai Road therefore will be largely increased due to similar trip pattern.</li> <li>Reference of traffic flow to Kwai Chung Hospital is inappropriate as the number of beds in Kwai Chung Hospital is 920, which is 25% fewer than the 1150 beds of the IRSC.</li> </ul>	<p>TD has no comment on the TIA submitted by CSD for the proposed DQs redevelopment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In estimating the amount of vehicular traffic induced by the proposed redevelopment, references have been made to the trip rates observed at various disciplinary staff quarters. As disciplinary services staff have to work on shift basis, the trip rates observed at the existing DQs sites are generally lower than the trip rate for private housing. To provide a more conservative estimate, the higher trip rate for private housing has been adopted in the TIA for the proposed redevelopment.</li> <li>It should be noted that the trip generation per bed per hour, instead of the observed traffic flows (i.e. number of vehicles/hour), of Kwai Chung Hospital has been adopted for estimating the peak hour trip generation induced by the IRSC (by multiplying the trip generation per bed per hour with the planned number of beds of the IRSC) in the TIA.</li> </ul>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inaccurate figure of footpath width has been used in the assessment. The effective footpath width of the narrowest section (for not less than 5m long) of Hong Fai Road is only 70-80cm. The situation during the construction period and the role of Hong Fai Road as the only pedestrian access linking between bus stops, the proposed redevelopment site, residential developments in Siu Lam and the future IRSC have not been considered in the assessment.</li> <li>• The traffic condition of Tuen Mun Road (Siu Lam Section and Sham Tseng Section) has been neglected in the assessment.</li> <li>• The date and time of traffic survey are not representative for traffic flow projection as the survey was conducted within the COVID-19 period and only 10 days after the Chinese Lunar New Year holiday with some businesses and schools may not be fully resumed. There are also more traffic flows during late morning instead of 07:00</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The footpath widths along the pedestrian routes have been reviewed and verified by CSD's consultant. It is noted that localized narrow points (each around 1m in length) at the catch pits along Hong Fai Road are sufficient for pedestrians to pass through. Responses to C1 on construction traffic and C2 on pedestrian impact assessment above are relevant.</li> <li>• In view of the relatively small scale of the proposed redevelopment and anticipated low additional traffic induced by the proposed redevelopment during construction and operation phases, the proposed TIA study area for the proposed redevelopment, as agreed by TD, has already included all the relevant key junctions and road links in the vicinity for assessment</li> <li>• The traffic survey was conducted in February 2021. To address the potential impact due to COVID-19, a comparison of the 2021 survey flows with the historical traffic flows recorded at the corresponding links before COVID-19 has been made and an adjustment factor (+3%) has been applied to the survey data to derive the baseline situation for the TIA. While there is prohibition of car entering Tuen Mun Road from Siu</li> </ul>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	<p>to 10:00 as cars are prohibited from entering Tuen Mun Road from Siu Lam from 07:30 to 09:00 on weekdays.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assumed annual growth factor of +1.74% adopted in the TIA is far below the percentage increase of population using Hong Fai Road (i.e. <math>544/2535=21.5\%</math>). The predicted growth of population should refer to the Tertiary Planning Unit (TPU) 426 (with annual average growth rate of 11.4%) from the "Projections of Population Distribution 2021-2029", instead of referencing the 2016-based Territorial Population and Employment Data Matrices (TPEDM) planning data (+1.53%) for Northwest New Territories since So Kuwn Wat and Tuen Mun East is a rapidly growing area.</li> </ul>	<p>Lam from 07:30 to 09:00a.m. on weekdays morning, the traffic survey confirms that the AM peak hour occurs from 07:15 to 08:15a.m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not appropriate to make a direct comparison of population increase of an individual site with the long-term traffic growth of the area. It should be noted that the sections of Tuen Mun Road and Castle Peak Road falling within the TIA Study Area are main roads serving the population and business hubs in the North West New Territories (NWNT) region (Tuen Mun, Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai), in which TPU426 (i.e. Castle Peak Bay area and part of So Kwun Wat) is included therein. Hence, it is considered more appropriate to make vehicular traffic growth rate reference to the population growth in NWNT which would have impact on these sections of Tuen Mun Road and Castle Peak Road. As shown in the table below, an average population growth rates of 1.39% and 0.86% per annum are anticipated for Tuen Mun and Yuen Long respectively between 2019 and 2029. Hence, the annual population growth rate of +1.74% with reference to the historical Annual Traffic Census data and +1.53% with reference to TPEDM planning data in the TIA Report are more conservative. To establish the worst-case scenario, the higher rate of +1.74% has been adopted in the TIA Report. Furthermore, the additional traffic to be generated by the IRSC and the proposed redevelopment have been taken into account on top of</li> </ul>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD’s Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned																	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The annual growth rate of 3% and additional 1% for the IRSC adopted in the pedestrian impact assessment are inconvincible as there will be more than 20% additional road users and staff from the IRSC.</li><li>The TIA was conducted 5 years ago which has not considered the exponential traffic</li></ul>	<p>the background traffic (i.e. after applying the adopted growth rate) in the traffic assessment.</p> <table><tr><th rowspan="2">Population</th><th rowspan="2">2019</th><th rowspan="2">2029</th><th colspan="2">2019-2029</th></tr><tr><th>Difference</th><th>Growth p.a.</th></tr><tr><td>Tuen Mun</td><td>503,100</td><td>577,400</td><td>74,300</td><td>+1.39%</td></tr><tr><td>Yuen Long</td><td>650,100</td><td>708,200</td><td>58,100</td><td>+0.86%</td></tr></table> <p>Source: Projections of Population Distribution 2021-2029</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>To estimate the amount of pedestrians to be generated by the proposed redevelopment, references have been made to the amount of walking trips recorded at several disciplinary staff quarters. Similar to the projection of vehicular traffic, an adjustment factor (+3%) has been applied to the surveyed pedestrian flows to address the potential impact due to COVID-19. As the IRSC is situated at a higher level, users/visitors/staff are expected to take vehicular transport for accessing the IRSC and hence the number of pedestrians using Hong Fai Road would be small. Nevertheless, an annual average pedestrian growth rate of +1% has been adopted for the IRSC as a conservative estimate in the TIA. Responses to C2 on pedestrian impact assessment above are relevant.</li><li>The planned development to be completed before the assessment year of 2032, i.e. the IRSC, has already been</li></ul>	Population	2019	2029	2019-2029		Difference	Growth p.a.	Tuen Mun	503,100	577,400	74,300	+1.39%	Yuen Long	650,100	708,200	58,100	+0.86%
Population	2019	2029				2019-2029													
			Difference	Growth p.a.															
Tuen Mun	503,100	577,400	74,300	+1.39%															
Yuen Long	650,100	708,200	58,100	+0.86%															



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	growth brought by some recent projects such as the IRSC and the potential developments under the 'Study for Developments of Tuen Mun East and Adjacent Green Belt Cluster – Feasibility Study' (the TME&GB Study). It is unreasonable to conclude that there will be limited traffic increase in view of the potential housing developments in So Kwun Wat and Tuen Mun East.	included in the TIA. Regarding the TME&GB Study, it has just been commenced in May 2023 and the resultant traffic impact on the area will be assessed under the TME&GB Study.
<b>D. Environmental, Ecological and Landscape</b>		
<b>R1, R21, R125, R203, R205, R304, R325, R332, R339, R340, R348, R378, R385, R401, R402, R566 and R631</b>	(D1) <b><u>Environmental Assessment</u></b>  The proposed redevelopment will bring about adverse environmental impacts. However, no comprehensive Environmental Assessment has been conducted for the proposed redevelopment.	A Preliminary Environmental Review (PER) assessing impacts on air quality, noise, water quality, waste management and land contamination from the proposed redevelopment has been conducted. The PER concluded that the proposed redevelopment is environmentally acceptable and feasible. The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) has no in-principle objection to the proposed redevelopment.
<b>R7, R12, R23, R24, R26, R31, R33, R34, R38, R40, R42, R45, R50, R54, R55, R57, R60, R66, R68, R77, R79, R80, R85, R87, R88, R92, R94, R96, R104, R108 to R110, R112, R118, R123, R126</b>	(D2) <b><u>Environmental Impact from Construction</u></b>  The construction of IRSC has already induced adverse air and noise pollution to residents nearby (Siu Lam Tsuen and Palatial Coast) in the past few years. The proposed	According to the PER, the project proponent of the proposed redevelopment will control construction noise and dust nuisances to within the established standards and guidelines under the Noise Control Ordinance and Air Pollution Control

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<p>to R128, R131 to R133, R135, R152, R154, R158 to R162, R164, R165, R167, R170, R184 to R186, R203, R205, R211, R242, R274, R276, R299, R300, R306 to R308, R313, R314, R318, R323, R325, R329, R335, R336, R385, R387 to R389, R391, R393, R400, R411, R417, R418, R421, R423, R427, R429, R432, R447, R448, R457, R467, R479, R483, R485, R489, R491, R495, R497, R502, R505, R506, R508, R512, R525, R527, R529, R531, R537, R538, R542, R543, R545, R546, R555, R556, R558 to R560, R571, R580, R582, R585, R587, R588, R593, R601, R619, R623, R625, R629, R631 to R633, R637, R639, R649, R664, R677, R694, R711 to R731, R733, R741, R743, R744, R748, R750, R751, R755, R757, R760, R763, R764, R767, R782, R784, R792, R796 to R798, R805, R807, R808, R815, R818, R823, R826 to R830, R834 and R836</p>	<p>redevelopment will further induce adverse air quality, dust and noise impacts as well as land and water pollution during the construction stage for additional years and lead to cumulative impacts. These adverse environmental impacts would affect staff and persons in the correctional services facilities and patients of the rehabilitation complex who are in need of quiet environment for recovery. The residents of Palatial Coast, especially elderly and chronic patients, would also be affected. Moreover, construction noise and air quality impacts would leave bad impression for foreign visitors visiting Tai Lam Country Park and affect the reputation of Hong Kong.</p>	<p>(Construction Dust) Regulation through the implementation of good site practices, such as the use of acoustic lining or shields for noisy construction activities, frequent cleaning and watering of the Site, provision of wheel-washing facilities, etc. Mitigation measures as specified in the Professional Persons Environmental Consultative Committee Practice Note (ProPECC PN) 1/94 for construction site drainage would also be strictly followed. The EPD has no objection in this regard.</p> <p>As the major construction activities of the IRSC have been completed, concurrent construction activities and cumulative construction environmental impacts are not anticipated.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<p>R8, R14, R28, R31, R42, R47, R57, R60, R72, R77, R81, R93, R95, R101, R104, R105, R108, R125 to R127, R132, R135, R142, R144, R145, R163, R183, R187, R202, R209, R230, R232, R275, R283, R284, R286, R289, R296, R300, R304, R309, R312, R315, R317 to R322, R326, R327, R331, R333, R336 to R339, R342, R349, R358, R361, R363, R371, R381, R387, R392 to R394, R396, R401 to R403, R407, R413, R417, R419, R429, R439, R440, R445, R458, R468, R469, R478, R483, R484, R487, R499, R500, R508, R509, R515, R521, R522, R524, R530, R533 to R535, R538, R539, R543, R551, R553, R555 to R557, R563, R565, R569, R573, R575, R582, R589, R593, R596, R599, R623, R629, R632, R639 to R640, R673, R674, R698, R701, R702, R711 to R726, R728 to R733, R735, R757, R762, R770, R774, R776 to R779, R785 to R788, R791, R823, R825, R826, R831 and R837</p>	<p>(D3) <u><i>Environmental Impact</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Traffic Noise</i></u> Additional population and vehicles brought by the proposed redevelopment will cause significant noise impact on the surrounding residential development and rehabilitation services complex and deprive the tranquil environment of the area. The wall effect of the proposed redevelopment will also reflect back traffic noise from Castle Peak Road and Tuen Mun Road to the nearby residential development and affect the well-being of the residents.</p> <p>No sufficient noise buffer from Tuen Mun Road (classified as Expressway according to the HKPSG which requires at least a 50m buffer) is planned in the proposed redevelopment. The unacceptable noise level generated from traffic of Tuen Mun Road might not be mitigated by installation of acoustic/well-gasketted window.</p> <p><u><i>Aircraft Noise</i></u> Future residents will be suffered from aircraft noise but the impact has not been mentioned</p>	<p>The TIA has demonstrated that the induced traffic is not significant. Road traffic noise caused by the proposed redevelopment to the surrounding areas shall therefore not be significant. The single block and cross-shaped building design of the proposed DQs redevelopment will unlikely form an effective sound reflection structure and therefore reflection of traffic noise from Castle Peak Road and Tuen Mun Road by the proposed redevelopment to the nearby residential development is not anticipated.</p> <p>A traffic noise impact assessment has been carried out under the PER for the proposed redevelopment. With implementation of the proposed noise mitigation measures such as architectural fins and acoustic windows, the predicted noise level at noise sensitive receivers of the proposed redevelopment shall comply with the traffic noise criterion of 70dB(A) as recommended in the HKPSG. Moreover, a Noise Impact Assessment report would be submitted by the project proponent at the detailed design stage to demonstrate 100% compliance of the proposed redevelopment incorporated with noise mitigation measures with the noise criterion to the satisfaction of EPD.</p> <p>According to the findings of Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") report for the <i>Expansion of Hong Kong</i></p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	<p>in the assessment. A study on aircraft noise should be conducted especially on days with southwestern wind where the three-runway system (3RS) is more often used. The cumulative noise impact arising from 3RS and traffic of Tuen Mun Road was not properly assessed.</p> <p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>The wall effect created by the proposed redevelopment will exacerbate air pollution of the area as it will trap smoke from burning of tree debris by villagers in Siu Lam and vehicle emission from Tuen Mun Road within the valley, and result in deteriorating the air quality of nearby residential development. Additional traffic flows induced by the proposed redevelopment will further exacerbate the air pollution. Chimneys of the IRSC should also be taken into consideration in the air quality impact assessment.</p>	<p><i>International Airport into a Three-Runway System</i>, the Noise Exposure Forecast 25 contours predicted for different operation scenarios of the 3RS would be about 1km away from the proposed redevelopment. Hence, direct or indirect mitigation measures shall not be required for the proposed redevelopment. Nevertheless, a review of the use of acoustic insulation in form of well-gasketed window to enhance the indoor living environment in the detailed design stage has been recommended in the PER. Aircraft noise and road traffic noise are different types of noise with different noise criteria. These two types of noise impacts shall be assessed separately.</p> <p>The proposed DQs will be a single block development and there will be sufficient separation between the nearest high-rise building (i.e. Palatial Coast Block 1) and the proposed redevelopment (around 60m). Wall effect is not likely to be caused by the proposed redevelopment. According to the PER conducted for the proposed redevelopment, there are no boiler and associated chimney in the IRSC as advised by Social Welfare Department.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	<p><u>Carbon Emission</u> Constructing multi-storey flats while reducing the size of "GB" zone contravene with government's initiative of promoting carbon neutral or carbon emission reduction. The "GB" zone should be preserved and more trees should be planted due to climate change and intensification of extreme weather.</p> <p><u>Light Pollution and Natural Lighting</u> The proposed redevelopment will incur light pollution while it will prevent light from entering the nearby residential development.</p>	<p>The Site comprises only a minor portion previously zoned "GB" (about 730m<sup>2</sup> or 26% of the Site) which is mainly formed and currently used as vehicular access and a car parking area (<b>Plan H-2</b>). The inclusion of the concerned "GB" area within the proposed redevelopment would not affect much greenery in the area. The proposed compensatory planting ratio for the proposed redevelopment will comply with the relevant circular of not less than 1:1 in terms of quantity</p> <p>There is ambient light emitted by the existing developments in the vicinity including the residential development of Palatial Coast and various GIC facilities in Siu Lam, and vehicles and lightings from Tuen Mun Road, Castle Peak Road, Siu Lam Road and Hong Fai Road. The additional light emitted by the proposed redevelopment will not represent a significant increase in ambient light to the neighbourhood. By virtue of the proposed setback of the DQs block, the distance between the DQs block and the closest building in the vicinity will be around 60m. Blocking of natural light by the proposed redevelopment is not anticipated.</p>
R3, R10, R20, R28, R36, R39, R43, R46, R53, R61, R67, R69, R71, R79, R84, R88, R89, R101, R104 to R106, R108 to R110,	(D4) <u>Ecological and Landscape Impact</u>  The proposed redevelopment will cause adverse ecological impact on the area. The	As the Site is already formed and disturbed and the proposed redevelopment involves only redevelopment of the existing

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<p><b>R113, R114, R119, R121, R125 to R127, R131 to R133, R137, R147, R149, R156, R157, R163, R176, R178, R183, R187, R198, R204, R213, R220, R250, R252, R254, R269, R276, R277, R281, R286, R287, R289, R292, R296, R303, R306, R307, R310, R312, R315, R318, R326, R327, R329, R331, R332, R336, R354, R355, R363, R370, R381, R385, R392, R393, R396, R404, R412, R414, R415, R417, R419, R427, R429 to R431, R433, R434, R438, R441, R445, R451, R452, R459, R460, R462, R463, R465, R468, R469, R473, R480, R487, R492, R495, R502, R503, R505, R506, R508, R514, R522, R525, R526, R531, R533, R538 to R540, R543, R548, R554, R555, R558, R560, R566, R568 to R571, R573, R574, R579, R582, R587 to R589, R592 to R594, R596, R599, R600, R623, R625, R629, R634, R635, R639, R640, R658, R662, R674, R698, R701, R702, R705, R711 to R733, R735, R736, R740, R742, R743, R745, R751 to R753, R755, R759, R761,</b></p>	<p>loss of “GB” zone is a great loss of natural resources for hikers visiting Tai Lam Country Park and the general public. It is also not sensible to sacrifice the natural environment for developing only 136 staff quarters.</p> <p>It is suggested to convert the concerned site and its surroundings to “GB” zone for the existing residents in the area.</p> <p><u><i>Birds and Wildlife</i></u></p> <p>The proposed redevelopment will cause a loss of essential habitats for fauna and flora. There are 60+ species of birds in Siu Lam. Chinese Porcupine, Small Indian Civets and Barking Deer are also observed in area near the proposed site. The existing low-rise quarters buildings with vegetation at the concerned site provides a nature corridor for wildlife. However, with the proposed high-rise quarters building, the persistence of avifauna roosting/nesting (including protected species such as White-bellied Sea Eagle, Crested Goshawk, Crested Serpent Eagle and Imperial Eagle) in the Tai Lam Chung Reservoir will be threatened and the flight path of night birds and migratory birds will be affected. The pollution from the future residents will also impose hardship on</p>	<p>DQs blocks, significant adverse ecological impact due to the proposed redevelopment is not anticipated. With only single building block and sufficient setback from nearby residential buildings, any flight path of night birds and migratory birds will unlikely be affected. The PER has also demonstrated that the proposed redevelopment will not cause adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The planning intention of “GB” zone is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features. As most of the Site is formed/disturbed and a large tract of area between the Site/Palatial Coast and Tai Lam Country Park is zoned “GB”, there is no strong ground to convert the Site and its surroundings which are zoned “G/IC” and have been developed for various GIC facilities to “GB” zone.</p> <p>As for tree preservation, a total number of 40 trees of common species of low to medium amenity value are identified to be affected by the proposed redevelopment, without any registered or potential Old and Valuable Tree, Tree of Particular Interest, rare or protected tree species. According to the landscape proposal for the proposed redevelopment, 40 new standard-size trees will be planted and form part of the amenity tree planting. A combination of appropriate native and exotic species has been proposed to enhance the sustainability, biodiversity and visual attractiveness of the Site and integrate the development with the surrounding environment.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<b>R767, R768, R770, R771, R774, R776 to R779, R781, R783, R792, R796, R798 to R802, R812, R816, R823 to R826, R835 and R836</b>	<p>the existence of avifauna. As such, minimal construction activity should be allowed in Siu Lam.</p> <p><u>Trees</u> At least 40 old trees will be felled which are homes of many birds, butterflies and wild animals. Tree felling will cause loss of natural shading for pedestrians/hikers and loss of noise buffer, affect the air quality of the area and destroy the natural character of the site and its surrounding. Compensating trees in the proposed redevelopment fails to preserve the existing woodland landscape. Tree compensation should not be only in quantitative terms, but has to evaluate size and age of trees.</p>	<p>The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) and Urban Design and Landscape Section of PlanD (UD&amp;L, PlanD) have no adverse comment on the proposed redevelopment from nature conservation and landscape planning perspectives respectively.</p>
<b>E. Visual and Air Ventilation</b>		
<b>R14, R17, R22, R23, R28, R31, R39, R43, R44, R46, R48, R52, R56, R57, R60, R72, R75, R81, R87, R90, R91, R95, R96, R98, R100, R112, R116, R121, R135, R139, R145 to R147, R168, R175, R183 to R185, R193 to R195, R199, R200, R202, R208 to R210, R214, R217 to R219, R223 to R225, R239, R240, R243, R245,</b>	<p>(E1) <u>Visual Impact</u></p> <p>The building block of the proposed redevelopment does not have sufficient setback from the nearby residential development, which will block the vista of and cause a feeling of space oppression to nearby residents. The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) is not comprehensive as it does not consider view from the nearby</p>	<p>According to the VIA conducted for the proposed redevelopment, from the six key public viewing points within the area of visual influence identified for assessment, the proposed redevelopment will result in some negative visual impacts in overall terms (<b>Plans H-6c to H-6f</b>). Notwithstanding, the proposed redevelopment is considered to be generally compatible and acceptable within the existing visual context of Siu Lam and appropriate visual mitigation</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<p>R248, R268 to R272, R274, R276, R278, R280, R288, R290, R294, R297, R298, R300 to R302, R304, R305, R308, R317, R318, R328, R330, R331, R351, R353 to R355, R362, R364, R378, R387, R389, R391, R393 to R396, R412, R413, R416, R419, R425, R433, R438, R454, R458, R467, R469, R475, R477, R479, R482, R484, R507 to R510, R524, R530, R534, R535, R552, R555, R556, R561, R563, R573, R574, R582, R587 to R589, R593, R608, R615, R623, R627, R629, R631, R637, R639, R640, R650, R653, R674, R698, R701, R703, R704, R711 to R737, R739, R741, R742, R765, R766, R769, R773, R775, R793, R794, R796, R803, R836 and R838</p>	<p>residential development (Palatial Coast) as one of the viewpoints and visually sensitive receivers.</p> <p>In view of the out-of-place design of the IRSC nearby, there are similar concerns on the design of the proposed redevelopment which will destroy the surrounding vista. The view from/to Maclehorse Trail/Tai Lam Chung Reservoir, view from Hong Fai Road to the surrounding seaview and landscape, view from across the harbour (e.g. Sunny Bay, Siu Ho Wan) as well as views to the nearby ridgeline/coastline/skyline will be affected. The vista of future developments to the north and northeast of the Site will also be affected by the proposed redevelopment.</p> <p>The visual impact of the proposed redevelopment is assessed as moderately adverse, resulting in some negative visual effects to most of the identified public viewing points in the VIA. This violates the TPB PG-No.10 which states that <i>'the development should not...cause any adverse visual impact on the surrounding environment'</i>. Visual mitigation measures proposed in the VIA could not alleviate the significant visual impacts.</p>	<p>measures such as alignment and arrangement of the proposed redevelopment with consideration to the surroundings, sensitive aesthetic architectural design and chromatic treatment of built structures, greening at-grade and along the podium building edges, and sensitive reinstatement of affected slope areas are proposed to help alleviate the visual impact (<b>Plan H-6g</b>). UD&amp;L, PlanD has no adverse comment on the proposed redevelopment. As for private views, according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41 on 'Submissions of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board' (TPB PG-No. 41), it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations in the highly developed context of Hong Kong. In the interest of the public, it is far more important to protect public views, particularly those easily accessible and popular to the public or tourists. Responses to A1 on TPB PG-No.10 above are relevant.</p>



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<b>R105, R125, R184, R185, R295 and R785 to R787</b>	(E2) <u><b>Air Ventilation</b></u>  There would be adverse air ventilation impact arising from the proposed redevelopment as it will block the passage of sea breeze. In addition, there is no Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) conducted for the proposed redevelopment.	The proposed redevelopment does not fall within any major wind corridors as identified in the Final Report of AVA Expert Evaluation for So Kwun Wat dated February 2015 nor within the criteria for AVA under the Technical Circular No. 1/06 – Air Ventilation Assessments jointly issued by the former Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau and Environment, Transport and Works Bureau, and therefore AVA is not required for the proposed OZP amendment. Considering the scale of the proposed redevelopment and its distance from the surrounding buildings, significant adverse air ventilation impact on the surrounding pedestrian environment is not anticipated.
<b>F. Other Technical Aspects</b>		
<b>R43, R77, R130, R138, R151, R167, R273, R283, R284, R287, R289, R344, R345, R374, R555, R740, R761, R768, R800 to R802 and R831</b>	(F1) <u><b>Technical Assessments</b></u>  The existing infrastructure does not have sufficient capacity to cater for the proposed redevelopment. The technical assessments conducted (i.e. transport and traffic, environmental, drainage, sewerage, visual and landscape) have not taken into account the scenario with full operation of IRSC. It is unfair for the nearby residents to suffer from cumulative impacts induced from the IRSC and proposed redevelopment, which would induce serious disruption to the nearby	Technical assessments including TIA, PER, Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA), VIA, GPR and Tree Preservation and Landscape Proposal have been conducted by CSD for the proposed DQs redevelopment on traffic, environmental, geotechnical, visual, landscape and infrastructural aspects. To assess the possible cumulative traffic, environmental, sewage and drainage impacts, all existing, planned and committed developments (including the IRSC) have been taken into account in the respective assessments. The technical assessments have been scrutinised by relevant government

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	residents.	departments and no insurmountable technical problem has been identified.
<b>R17, R26, R27, R46, R52, R53, R77, R100, R121, R127, R135, R169, R183, R195, R200, R207, R208, R218, R227, R230, R237, R240, R250, R251, R259, R260, R266, R267, R270 to R272, R276, R279, R282, R312, R319 to R322, R365, R366, R368, R369, R372, R382, R401 to R403, R414, R420, R422, R426, R428, R456, R459, R478, R484, R498, R510, R512, R528, R560, R572, R593, R600, R605, R608, R611, R616, R630, R631, R636, R646, R654, R655, R662, R676, R678, R681, R704, R710, R745, R759, R780, R792, R799, R804, R806, R811, R822 and R836</b>	<p>(F2) <u><b>Drainage</b></u></p> <p>There is no comprehensive drainage proposal for the proposed redevelopment. The proposed redevelopment will accelerate the flooding problem of the area, especially during rainy or typhoon seasons. The flooding problem of the area may also affect the operation of the correctional services facilities nearby.</p>	<p>According to the DIA, the existing stormwater system will have sufficient capacity to receive stormwater runoff from the proposed redevelopment and surrounding catchments. Parameter drains associated with sand traps are proposed to collect runoff from the Site and to minimise sand/silt go into the existing drainage system. No unacceptable drainage impact arising from the proposed redevelopment is anticipated. Detailed drainage proposal would be formulated by the project proponent in the detailed design stage to the satisfaction of the Drainage Services Department (DSD). DSD has no adverse comment on the proposed redevelopment from public drainage perspective.</p>
<b>R739</b>	<p>(F3) <u><b>Sewerage</b></u></p> <p>The SIA is not comprehensive as it fails to assess the cumulative sewerage impact arising from the existing population, the future population from the proposed redevelopment and the additional population from the soon-to-be-opened IRSC.</p>	<p>For the SIA, sewage generation estimated by the SIA report of the consultancy for the IRSC and sewage generated by Palatial Coast have already been taken into account in the SIA for the proposed redevelopment to assess the possible sewage impact. The assessment concludes that unacceptable impact on the sewerage system resulting from the proposed</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
		redevelopment is not anticipated. In this regard, EPD and DSD have no adverse comment on the proposed redevelopment.
<b>R7, R38, R43, R97, R111, R119, R122, R148, R150, R157, R163, R191, R192, R197, R215, R221, R250, R269, R273, R280, R281, R287, R289, R296, R312, R327, R329, R331, R332, R336, R370, R372, R374, R379, R419, R421, R460, R462, R537, R560, R595, R596, R636, R658, R705, R735 to R737, R743 to R746, R761, R768, R771, R783, R791, R798 to R802, R808, R825, R826 and R839</b>	<p>(F4) <u><b>Geology</b></u></p> <p>No comprehensive geological investigation has been conducted for the proposed redevelopment. Construction of the proposed redevelopment will change the geological structure and foundation of the nearby area. The stability of the retaining structures for the nearby highways and residential developments will also be affected. Permanent loss of large tract of trees would intensify soil erosion and increase the risk of land subsidence, affecting the structural safety of the area. Building of retaining wall may be required.</p> <p>The foundation engineering works of the proposed redevelopment might also induce leakage of the two swimming pools at Palatial Coast which are close to the Item A Site, which would lead to unreasonable maintenance costs and exploit residents' use of swimming pool.</p>	<p>According to the GPR carried out to assess the stability of the affected slopes and retaining walls, no significant geotechnical hazard/constraint is anticipated due to the proposed redevelopment. The proposed redevelopment at the Site is geotechnically feasible. The Geotechnical Engineering Office of Civil Engineering and Development Department ((GEO), CEDD) has no objection to the proposed redevelopment from geotechnical aspect and noted that detailed site investigation and natural terrain hazard study will be conducted to formulate details of the necessary terrain mitigation works for the proposed redevelopment.</p> <p>During the detailed design of the foundation works, the project proponent will duly consider any potential impact to the adjacent structures such as vibration and ground movement. The proposed foundation will be properly designed and the construction methods will also be carefully selected to ensure that any induced construction impacts will be tightly controlled within the allowable limits of the adjacent sensitive receivers. In addition, a comprehensive instrumentation and monitoring works will be implemented to closely monitor the impact on the adjacent structures during the course of construction, and proper precautionary measures will be adopted.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
R555, R582, R593, R623, R629, R639, R640, R673, R711 to R726, R728 to R733, R809, R810, R813 and R821	(F5) <u><i>Risk Assessment</i></u>  While the Item A Site falls within the 2km Consultation Zone of the Tai Lam Chung Chlorination Station (TLCCS) ( <b>Plan H-3b</b> ), no risk assessment has been conducted regarding the potential hazard. Additional population at the Site might lead to safety concerns.	The Water Supplies Department (WSD) advises that as there will be no On-site Chlorine Generation Plant (OSCG) at the TLCCS and liquid chlorine will be replaced by sodium hypochlorite solution either produced by OSCG from other water treatment works or local supplier, TLCCS will be delisted from Potentially Hazardous Installations in Q3 of 2024 tentatively. As the first population intake of the proposed redevelopment will be in 2029, risk assessment is not required in this regard. The delisting programme of the TLCCS and the implementation programme of the proposed redevelopment will be reviewed from time to time to confirm the necessity of risk assessment.
<b>G. Provision of GIC, Open Space and Other Supporting Facilities</b>		
R20, R51, R53, R61, R64, R103, R112, R135, R146, R147, R159, R189, R225, R238, R243, R258, R265, R341, R432, R447, R583, R615, R672, R706 and R836	(G1) <u><i>Supporting Facilities</i></u>  There is a lack of GIC facilities including kindergarten, nursery, child care centres, pre-school rehabilitation services and elderly community care facilities, and supporting facilities including eating places, markets, restaurants and retail facilities in the So Kwun Wat area, which leads to waste of time in travelling and induces additional traffic for getting these required facilities in other areas. The lack of kindergarten, nursery and child care centres contravenes with the principle of	Based on the HKPSG requirements, there will be deficits in school places of kindergarten/nursery and primary school in So Kwun Wat Planning Scheme Area. However, there are surplus in the provision of kindergarten/nursery and primary schools in Tuen Mun District and the demand in So Kwun Wat area can be met by the provision in the wider district. Under the prevailing mechanism, the Government will reserve space for kindergarten when planning for public housing developments, while the relevant demand from residents of private housing developments is market-driven.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
	<p>vicinity as the basis for school place allocation.</p> <p>Given the deficits in the provision of GIC facilities within the area, the site should be reserved for other supporting facilities such as restaurants, eating places, markets and retail facilities.</p>	<p>SWD has all along been adopting a multi-pronged approach with long-, medium- and short-term strategies and maintaining a close contact with relevant departments to identify suitable sites or premises in different types of development projects for the provision of welfare facilities to meet the needs of the community.</p> <p>The Site is currently occupied by DQ blocks and CSD intends to redevelop the existing DQs blocks for meeting the DQs demand and better utilising the Site. PlanD will continue to work closely with relevant government departments to explore the need for and feasibility of providing GIC or supporting facilities in the area.</p>
<b>R145, R484, R575 and R596</b>	<p>(G2) <u>Open Space</u></p> <p>There is limited open space in poor quality in the area. Open space at the ground level of the proposed redevelopment is mainly occupied by vehicular access and parking facilities, and the actual open space at the podium level is limited (less than 1m<sup>2</sup> per person). The small site area limits the possibility of providing open space for the well-being of family members of CSD staff.</p>	<p>While there will be deficits on the provision of district and local open space in the So Kwun Wat Planning Scheme Area, there is a surplus of about 23.29ha of district open space and about 59.74ha of local open space in the Tuen Mun District as a whole. As for open space provision within the Site, CSD has made reference to the HKPSG for providing appropriate local open space for the proposed redevelopment. According to the Indicative Landscape Proposal submitted by CSD (<b>Plan H-6g</b>), not less than 544m<sup>2</sup> open space at ground level and podium deck/mezzanine floor (i.e. 1m<sup>2</sup> per person) will be provided within the proposed DQs redevelopment. The two open spaces would be connected via two residential lifts and visually connected with level difference of less than 15m. Recreational facilities will be provided within the open</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
		spaces for residents of all ages and abilities.
<b>H. Consultation</b>		
<b>R50, R51, R56, R60, R70, R90, R95, R100, R103, R117, R121, R129, R133, R156, R183, R220, R254, R274, R276, R279, R280, R282, R292, R305, R327, R354, R355, R367, R373, R375, R390, R395, R400, R428, R467, R473, R477, R507, R510, R528, R529, R536, R561, R565, R572, R600, R626, R634, R658, R705, R727 to R733, R741, R742, R744, R746, R760, R763, R773, R780 to R783, R806, R811, R817 to R820 and R822</b>	<p>(H1)</p> <p>There is lack of consultation for the proposed amendment. CSD did not consult residents from Siu Lam Tsuen and Palatial Coast. CSD should negotiate with and ask for consent from residents of Palatial Coast as their interest and right have been infringed and their daily lives and livelihood have been affected by the proposed redevelopment.</p> <p>As there are many ancestral graves and Kam Taps near Item A Site, fengshui of indigenous inhabitants in Siu Lam will be affected. Relevant clans, Chairman of Rural Committee, Village Heads and Village Representatives should be consulted if relocation is required.</p>	<p>The statutory procedures in consulting the public for plan-making have been duly followed. The draft OZP incorporating the proposed amendment in relation to the Site was published for two months pursuant to section 5 of the Ordinance on 30.9.2022. Representations and comments regarding the amendment have been received during the respective statutory publication periods. All the representations and comments will be considered by the Board at this meeting and persons who made the representations and comments have been invited to attend the meeting to present their views to the Board.</p> <p>Apart from the statutory public consultation procedures, PlanD issued letters to the TMRC for inviting comments on Item A amendment on 21.6.2022. No comment has been received from TMRC. Subsequently, the amendments to the OZP were presented to the TMDC on 4.7.2022. Comments of TMDC members and responses from PlanD and CSD at the meeting have been summarised in the relevant RNTPC paper considered by the RNTPC on 9.9.2022.</p> <p>While it is noted that there are some existing graves to the northeast of the Site (<b>Plan H-2</b>), the proposed redevelopment at the Site would not affect those existing graves.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)	Grounds and Views of Representations	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<b>I. Others</b>		
<b>R29, R102, R115, R183, R274 to R276, R342, R373, R449, R488, R493, R568, R673, R698, R699, R724, R725, R728, R736, R737, R747 and R781</b>	<p>(I1)</p> <p>The access road to the proposed redevelopment (i.e. Siu Lam Road) is maintained by Palatial Coast. Increased traffic and heavy vehicle traffic during construction induced by the proposed redevelopment will increase maintenance cost and damage the residents' interest. The road is generally for Palatial Coast and Siu Lam Tsuen residents. Some representers propose that they will negotiate with LandsD for a lease modification to transfer the maintenance responsibility of Siu Lam Road back to the government and demolish the noise barrier outside the staff quarters as these are no longer for the use of Palatial Coast residents.</p>	<p>CSD advised that the Site has been occupied by its staff quarters since 1977 before the development of Palatial Coast. According to the lease of Tuen Mun Town Lot No. 400 (TMTL 400) where Palatial Coast is erected thereon, the Grantee of TMTL 400 is responsible to uphold, maintain and repair the vehicular access to/from the lot (now known as Siu Lam Road which is on Government land and the Government reserves the right to grant rights-of-way to other users including the general public), and erect noise barriers along Tuen Mun Road as traffic noise mitigation measures. That said, the maintenance and repair issues are land administrative matters and the future maintenance responsibility of the concerned road and noise barriers should be subject to the relevant lease conditions and negotiation between the residents of Palatial Coast, LandsD and relevant government departments, which would be handled separately.</p>
<b>R16, R32, R107, R119, R120, R122, R126, R127, R163, R191, R198, R204, R234, R280, R350, R408, R410, R442, R513, R538, R558, R567, R591, R599, R620, R621, R635, R637, R638, R758, R815 and R835</b>	<p>(I2)</p> <p>The existing staff quarters buildings have historical value and should be conserved for a tourist destination. The Site could also be used for providing Tai Lam Chung Reservoir Information Hub, pavilion and hiking facilities.</p>	<p>The existing Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre Junior Staff Married Quarters are neither declared monuments, graded buildings, nor new items pending grading assessment by the Antiquities Advisory Board. As such, there is no ground to preserve the building from the heritage point of view. Responses to A1 on site suitability and A5 on need for DQs development above are relevant.</p>

<b>Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)</b>	<b>Grounds and Views of Representations</b>	<b>PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned</b>
<b>R98, R218, R223, R290, R328, R354, R355, R395, R412, R482, R552, R637, R765, R766, R769, R773 and R775</b>	(I3) The proposed redevelopment will induce a drop in property prices of the nearby residential development, which will affect reverse mortgage programme for elderly and cause economic loss of current residents and their next generation.	Property price is not relevant planning consideration and is outside the scope of the OZP.
<b>R832</b>	(I4) The DQs type of accommodation encourages a "ghetto" mentality and it would be better for the officers to live within the community for better understanding of citizens.	The proposed DQs redevelopment is considered compatible with the surroundings in land use term. Responses to A5 on need for DQs development above are relevant.

*(b) Representation Providing Views (1)*

<b>Representation No. (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-)</b>	<b>Grounds and Views of Representation</b>	<b>PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned</b>
<b>R841</b>	(J1) It is recommended to widen the pavement of Hong Fai Road and upgrade public transport services of the area to alleviate the pressure on traffic induced by the proposed redevelopment. Besides, the proposed redevelopment should adopt noise reduction engineering technology to mitigate construction noise for preventing nuisance to nearby residents/patients.	Responses to C2 on footpath capacity and C3 on public transport provision above are relevant.  In order to minimise the noise impact during construction phase, ArchSD advises that quieter construction methods, such as silent piling by press-in method would be used instead of percussive piling. The noise control requirements given in the Recommended Pollution Control Clauses for Construction Contracts will also be incorporated in the construction contracts and be enforced accordingly. Responses to D2 on construction noise and J1 on relevant noise mitigation measures above are relevant.



(2) The grounds and views of the three comments (TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14-C1 to C3) are summarised below.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/ TM-SKW/14-)	Related Representation	Grounds and Views of Comments	PlanD's Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/Departments Concerned
<b>C1</b>  (C1 also R832)	N/A	<b>Oppose Item A</b>  The Town Planning Board should consider the views of residents from the nearby residential developments. The proposed redevelopment will induce a drop in property prices and affect their quality of life.	Responses to <b>H1</b> and <b>I3</b> on consultation and property prices above are relevant.
<b>C2</b>	R841	<b>Oppose Item A and Oppose to R841's Proposal</b>  <b>R841</b> proposed an upgrade of public transport services. However, the existing road network of the area will be overloaded by additional traffic generated by the proposed redevelopment and the nearby soon-to-be-opened IRSC. Upgrade of public transport services will further aggravate traffic congestion which will affect travel of ambulances/emergency vehicles and affect operation of the rehabilitation facilities.	Responses to <b>C1</b> on traffic capacity above are relevant.
<b>C3</b>  (C3 also R20)	R841	<b>Oppose Item A and Oppose to R841's Proposal</b>  <b>R841</b> proposes noise reduction engineering technology to mitigate construction noise. However, no technology can fully mitigate the noise impacts. This would exploit the therapeutic environment for patients of the rehabilitation facilities.	Responses to <b>D2</b> on environmental impact from construction above are relevant.

applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Wallace W.K. Tang and Ms Christine C.M. Cheung, STPs/FSYLE, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

### **Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District**

[Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen, District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW), Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu and Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STPs/TMYLW), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 50**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved So Kwun Wat Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM-SKW/13  
(RNTPC Paper No. 7/22)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

135. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), the technical considerations, consultations conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments were mainly to rezone a site at Hong Fai Road (the Site) from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") and "Green Belt" to "G/IC(1)" with a maximum building height (BH) of 90mPD (Amendment Item A) to facilitate a 21-storey departmental quarters development proposed by the Correctional Services Department.

136. As the presentation by PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions and views from Members.

137. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen, DPO/TMYLW said that the BH restriction of 90mPD for the Site would be stipulated on the OZP whereas other proposed building design measures, for example setbacks, are subject to review in the detailed design stage and could be dealt with through the future land allocation exercise under the land administration regime as appropriate.

138. Members had no questions regarding other proposed amendments to the OZP.

139. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved So Kwun Wat Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TM-SKW/13 and that the draft So Kwun Wat OZP No. S/TM-SKW/13A at Attachment II (to be renumbered as S/TM-SKW/14 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the RNTPC Paper No. 7/22 were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the RNTPC Paper No. 7/22 for the draft So Kwun Wat OZP No. S/TM-SKW/13A (to be renumbered as S/TM-SKW/14) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zones on the OZP and agree that the revised ES was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP.”

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

---

[The Chairman thanked Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen, DPO/TMYLW and Ms Janet K.K. Cheung,

## **I. 歡迎詞**

主席歡迎各位議員出席屯門區議會第十七次會議，並歡迎各政府部門代表列席會議。

2. 主席表示，由於會議過程的錄音將會上載至屯門區議會網頁，他請各位發言前先舉手，待他指示後才發言。會議將會依議程的次序進行，如一切順利，估計可於中午 12 時左右完結。他會盡量控制時間，請議員發言盡量精簡，避免重複已提過的觀點。

3. 主席續表示，為降低病毒在社區傳播的風險，屯門民政事務處（下稱「民政處」）會在區議會及其轄下委員會或工作小組會議進行期間實施以下措施：(i) 與會者、新聞界人士及公眾人士（限額十名）進入會議室前，必須佩戴其自備的外科口罩，並由秘書處職員協助量度體溫，公眾人士名額先到先得；(ii) 與會者、新聞界人士及公眾人士（限額十名）進入會議室前，必須填寫健康申報表；(iii) 與會者、新聞界人士及公眾人士（限額十名）的個人資料（如姓名、所屬傳媒機構及職員編號等）會被妥善記錄，以便衛生部門有需要時可追蹤所有曾進入會議室的人士；以及 (iv) 會議的茶水服務暫停供應，請與會者自備食水和飲用器皿。

4. 主席接着表示，如議員發現會議討論的事項涉及其個人利益，應在討論該事項前申報。他會根據《屯門區議會會議常規》第 38(11) 條，決定曾就某事項申報利益關係的議員可否就該事項發言或參與表決，可否留在席上旁聽，或應否避席。所有申報利益的個案均會記錄在會議記錄內。

## **II. 區議員請假事宜**

5. 秘書表示，秘書處沒有收到議員的缺席申請。

## **III. 通過 2022 年 5 月 16 日舉行的第十五及第十六次合併會議的會議記錄**

6. 主席表示，秘書處於 2022 年 6 月 28 日把題述會議的會議記錄初稿發送予各與會者參閱，其後並沒有收到任何修訂建議。沒有議員於席上對會議記錄提出修改建議，主席遂宣布通過有關會議記錄。

## **IV. 討論事項**

### **(A) 擬議修訂《掃管笏分區計劃大綱核准圖編號 S/TM-SKW/13》 (屯門區議會文件 2022 年第 14 號)**

7. 主席歡迎規劃署高級城市規劃師/屯門 1 張嘉琪女士、懲教署高級監督(人力資源)周俊傑先生、高級懲教主任(監獄發展)廖敬德先生、雅邦規劃設計有限公司副董事葉倩雯女士、交通顧問公司董事張麗容女士及瑞峰工程顧問有限公司副總監吳國強先生出席是次會議。主席

先請規劃署張女士就文件作出介紹。

8. 規劃署張女士透過投影片(見附件一)向屯門區議會介紹題述文件內容。

9. 劉業強議員表示，政府的政策是在資源許可情況下為紀律部隊已婚人員提供部門宿舍，藉此維持紀律部隊士氣及挽留紀律部隊人手。隨着新入職及在職的已婚人員的人數持續增加，預計合資格入住部門宿舍的人員也會增加，因此懲教署建議將小欖現時三幢樓高三至四層的懲教署初級職員已婚宿舍及其毗連土地，重建為一幢 21 層高的部門宿舍。劉議員對此建議表示不反對，但指出在發展及興建工程期間，周邊地方在交通運輸、環境、排污排水及視覺景觀等方面可能受影響，而該址附近現時有不少市民居住，希望城市規劃委員會(下稱「城規會」)就這些方面謹慎考慮。

10. 林頌鎧議員表示支持有關計劃，認為現有宿舍的地積比率或發展規模未能盡用土地，重新規劃發展是一件好事，也可為紀律部隊人員提供安樂的居所。他認同劉議員提出的問題，認為署方在設計上應協調交通及配合整體環境，避免對周邊居民造成影響。

11. 屯門及元朗西規劃專員就議員提出的意見作出以下回應：

- (i) 已就重建計劃進行一系列的技術可行性研究，評估了擬議發展對附近地區的交通、環境、排水、排污及視覺景觀等方面的潛在影響，評估結果顯示發展不會帶來無法克服的技術問題；
- (ii) 交通方面，擬建宿舍伙數不多，只有約 136 戶，而懲教署人員與一般上班族的出行時間不同，因此對交通影響不大，即使以最壞情況評估(即假設出行時間與一般私人住宅出行時間相同)，亦無負面交通影響；
- (iii) 視覺方面，署方曾參考附近帝濤灣的發展高度，大綱圖顯示其高度限制為主水平基準上 102 米，而擬建宿舍的主水平基準只有 90 米，比帝濤灣矮，與附近環境並非不協調，而在設計、布局方面，已盡量配合間距等各種因素，因此不會對景觀造成無法接受的影響。署方亦有考慮如何地盡其用，因應環境設定地積比，在平衡各方面後提出本方案；以及
- (iv) 署方會將議員對修訂項目的意見提交城規會考慮。

12. 主席表示整體上支持有關建議，但希望就設計提出一些意見作為參考。他指出，宿舍位置臨海，估計將來小欖一帶會再建樓宇，如

重建的宿舍太高，可能會遮擋後期落成的樓宇，因此提議增加宿舍座數並減低高度。此外，有關位置有非常陡斜的斜坡，建議稍微剷平一部分斜坡，以興建宿舍。他另表示，青山公路的公共交通以巴士為主，雖然巴士數量逐漸增多，但整體而言，該區仍較為僻靜，附近居民有駕車代步的需要，希望設計方案能提供足夠車位。

13. 屯門及元朗西規劃專員就主席提出的意見作出以下回應：

- (i) 由於地盤本身的面積不大，只有約 2 700 平方米，而周邊主要為綠化地帶，希望盡量利用原有宿舍位置，並計劃使用路邊的綠化地帶，將影響減至最低，因此一棟樓宇已經基本用盡地盤可以發展的面積；
- (ii) 有關景觀、視覺及通透性方面的元素，會於詳細設計階段由設計團隊詳細考慮；以及
- (iii) 車位方面，重建計劃會為懲教署員工提供充足車位，並根據《香港規劃標準與準則》及相關指引與運輸署等相關部門商討後，於詳細設計階段落實數目。

**(B) 有關屯門區內地下水管情況的幾項查詢及相關建議**  
**(屯門區議會文件 2022 年第 15 號)**  
**(水務署的書面回應)**

14. 主席表示，秘書處就上述文件收到水務署的書面回應，並已於會前將有關文件以電郵分發予各議員參閱。主席歡迎水務署工程師/新界西區(分配 2)姚嘉立先生出席是次會議。

15. 文件提交人梁灝文議員表示，在署方提供的書面回覆中，部分資料摘取自審計署的審計報告，包括水管滲漏個案。然而，大部分相關個案未有納入更換及維修水管計劃當中，導致觀感不佳，故希望署方解釋未有將相關個案納入更換及維修水管計劃的原因，並建議署方全面檢視屯門區內的水管狀況，以找出損壞風險高的水管，及時處理。此外，他希望署方交代風險水平的評估準則。

16. 水務署姚先生表示，更換及維修水管計劃於 2015 年完成後，出現滲漏的水管數量大幅下降，不過仍有部分個案因水管腐蝕而出現滲漏，令議員擔心是否該計劃覆蓋不全所致。事實上，上述計劃歷時逾 15 年，因此部分原先運作正常的水管或於計劃進行期間出現腐蝕情況。此外，水管修復屬長期工作，故署方的水管管理策略是以風險為本，透過水管年齡、滲漏記錄及爆裂情況等因素評估風險，從而檢視需要修復的水管範圍。署方會根據上述風險評估分配修復工作的優次，並適時與顧問公司檢討各水管的實際情況，再調整修復工作。

17. 江鳳儀議員表示，安定邨的車輛入口位置每隔數年便發生水管

**Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in So Kwun Wat OZP**

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) Requirements	Requirement based on OZP Planned Population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against Planned Provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
District Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons <sup>#</sup>	2.01 ha	0.00 ha	0.78 ha	-1.23 ha
Local Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons <sup>#</sup>	2.01 ha	0.34 ha	1.52 ha	-0.50 ha
Sports Centre	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	0	0	0	0
Sports Ground/ Sport Complex	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	0	0	0	0
Swimming Pool Complex – standard	1 complex per 287,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	0	0	0	0
District Police Station	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons  (assessed on a regional basis)	0	0	0	0
Divisional Police Station	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons  (assessed on a regional basis)	0	0	0	0
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms)	1 per 660,000 persons  (assessed on a regional basis)	0	0	0	0

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) Requirements	Requirement based on OZP Planned Population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against Planned Provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Community Hall	No set standard	N.A	0	0	N.A.
Library	1 district library for every 200,000 persons  (assessed on a district basis)	0	0	0	0
Kindergarten/ Nursery	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to 6 <sup>#</sup>	23 classrooms	0 classroom	0 classroom	-23 classrooms
Primary School	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by EDB on a district/ school network basis)	36 classrooms	0 classroom	0 classroom	-36 classrooms  (Sufficient on a district basis)
Secondary School	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by EDB on a territory-wide basis)	17 classrooms	0 classroom	30 classroom	+13 classrooms
Hospital	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons  (assessed by Hospital Authority on a regional/ cluster basis)	113 beds	0 bed	0 bed	-113 beds  (Will be catered for in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Ten-year Hospital Development Plan based on Hospital Authority's assessment on a regional/ cluster basis <sup>^</sup> )



Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) Requirements	Requirement based on OZP Planned Population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against Planned Provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Clinic/Health Centre	1 per 100,000 persons  (assessed on a district basis)	0	0	0	0
Child Care Centre	100 aided places per 25,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a local basis)	80 places	0 place	0 place	-80 places~  (A long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD~)
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a local basis)	0	0	0	0
Integrated Family Services Centre	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a service boundary basis)	0	0	0	0
District Elderly Community Centre	One in each new development area with a population of around 170,000 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD)	N.A.	0	0	N.A.
Neighbourhood Elderly Centre	One in a cluster of new and redeveloped housing areas with a population of 15,000 to 20,000 persons, including both public and private housing <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD)	N.A.	0	0	N.A.

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) Requirements	Requirement based on OZP Planned Population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against Planned Provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Community Care Services (CCS) Facilities	17.2 subsidised places per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	28 places	8 places	8 places	-20 places~  (A long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD~)
Residential Care Homes for the Elderly	21.3 subsidised beds per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a cluster basis)	35 beds	0 beds	0 beds	-35 beds~  (A long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD~)
Pre-school Rehabilitation Services	23 subvented service places for every 1 000 children aged 0-6 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	35 places	0 places	0 places	-35 places~  (A long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD~)
Day Rehabilitation Services	23 subvented service places for every 10 000 persons aged 15 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	33 places	0 places	160 places	+127 places~
Residential Care Services	36 subvented service places for every 10 000 persons aged 15 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a cluster basis)	51 places	0 places	1,150 places	+1,099 places~

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) Requirements	Requirement based on OZP Planned Population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against Planned Provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Community Rehabilitation Day Centre	1 centre for every 420 000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	0	0	0	0
District Support Centre for Persons with Disabilities	1 centre for every 280 000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	0	0	0	0
Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness	1 standard scale centre for every 310 000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	0	0	0	0

Note :

The planned resident population in SKW OZP is about 20,137. If including transients, the overall planned population is about 20,585. All population figures have been adjusted to the nearest hundred.

Remark :

- # The requirements exclude planned population of transients.
- ^ The deficit in provision is based on OZP planned population while the Hospital Authority plans its services on a cluster basis, and takes into account a number of factors in planning and developing various public healthcare services. The New Territories West Cluster provides services for residents in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long districts. There are a number of hospital redevelopment projects planned in the Second Ten-year Hospital Development Plan (HDP), which will provide additional beds for serving the population in the New Territories West Cluster. The projected service demand will be catered for in the Second Ten-year HDP.
- ~ The deficit in provision is based on OZP planned population while Social Welfare Department (SWD) adopts a wider spatial context/cluster in the assessment of provision of such facility. In applying the population-based planning standards, the distribution of welfare facilities, supply in different districts, service demand as a result of the population growth and demographic changes as well as the provision of different welfare facilities have to be considered. As the HKPSG requirements for these facilities are a long-term goal, the actual provision will be subject to consideration of the SWD in the planning and development process as appropriate. The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach with long-, medium- and short-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services which are in acute demand.

**June 2023**

**Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Tuen Mun District**

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	Requirement based on Planned Population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against Planned Provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (Including Existing Provision)	
District Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons <sup>#</sup>	68.71 ha	61.91 ha	92 ha	+23.29 ha
Local Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons <sup>#</sup>	68.71 ha	104.23 ha	128.45 ha	+59.74 ha
Sports Centre	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	10	6	8	-2
Sports Ground/ Sport Complex	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	2	1	2	0
Swimming Pool Complex – standard	1 complex per 287,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	2	2	2	0
District Police Station	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons  (assessed on a regional basis)	1	1	1	0
Divisional Police Station	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons  (assessed on a regional basis)	3	2	3	0
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms)	1 per 660,000 persons	1	1	1	0

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	Requirement based on Planned Population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against Planned Provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (Including Existing Provision)	
	(assessed on a regional basis)				
Community Hall	No set standard	N.A	11	12	N.A.
Library	1 district library for every 200,000 persons <sup>#π</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	3	3	3	0
Kindergarten/ Nursery	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to 6 <sup>#</sup>	422 classrooms	451 classrooms	516 classrooms	+94 classrooms
Primary School	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by EDB on a district/school network basis)	1,134 classrooms	956 classrooms	1,166 classrooms	+32 classrooms
Secondary School	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by EDB on a territory-wide basis)	845 classrooms	978 classrooms	1,068 classrooms	+223 classrooms
Hospital	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons <sup>^</sup>  (assessed by Hospital Authority on a regional/cluster	3,889 beds	3,712 beds	3,712 beds	-177 beds

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	Requirement based on Planned Population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against Planned Provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (Including Existing Provision)	
	basis)				
Clinic/Health Centre	1 per 100,000 persons  (assessed on a district basis)	7	3	5	-2
Child Care Centre	100 aided places per 25,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a local basis)	2,748	586	1,046	-1,702~  (a long-term target assessed on a wider context spatial context)
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a local basis)	8	13	15	+7
Integrated Family Services Centre	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a service boundary basis)	4	4	4	0
District Elderly Community Centres	One in each new development area with a population of around 170,000 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD)	N.A.	2	2	N.A.~
Neighbourhood Elderly Centres	One in a cluster of new and	N.A.	8	15	N.A.~

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	Requirement based on Planned Population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against Planned Provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (Including Existing Provision)	
	redeveloped housing areas with a population of 15,000 to 20,000 persons, including both public and private housing <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD)				
Community Care Services (CCS) Facilities	17.2 subsidised places per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above <sup>**</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	3,527 places	874 places	1,224 places	-2,303 Places~ (A long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD)
Residential Care Homes for the Elderly	21.3 subsidised beds per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a cluster basis)	4,368 beds	2,072 beds	4,187 beds	-181 beds~ (A long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD)
Pre-school Rehabilitation Services	23 subvented service places for every 1 000 children aged 0-6 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	687 places	373 places	583 places	-104 places
Day Rehabilitation Services	23 subvented service places for every 10 000	1,348 places	1,240 places	1,680 places	+332 places~

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	Requirement based on Planned Population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against Planned Provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (Including Existing Provision)	
	persons aged 15 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)				
Residential Care Services	36 subvented service places for every 10 000 persons aged 15 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a cluster basis)	2,110 places	2,110 places	3,470 places	+1,360 places <sup>~</sup>
Community Rehabilitation Day Centre	1 centre for every 420 000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	1	1	1	0
District Support Centre for Persons with Disabilities	1 centre for every 280 000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	2	1	1	-1
Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness	1 standard scale centre for every 310 000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	2	1	1	-1

Note:

The planned resident population in TM District is about 687,100. If including transients, the overall planned population is about 707,100. All population figures have been adjusted to the nearest hundred.



Remark :

- # The requirements exclude planned population of transients.
- ~ The deficit in provision is based on TM District planned population while Social Welfare Department (SWD) adopts a wider spatial context/cluster in the assessment of provision of such facility. In applying the population-based planning standards, the distribution of welfare facilities, supply in different districts, service demand as a result of the population growth and demographic changes as well as the provision of different welfare facilities have to be considered. As the HKPSG requirements for these facilities are a long-term goal, the actual provision will be subject to consideration of the SWD in the planning and development process as appropriate. The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach with long-, medium- and short-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services which are in acute demand.
- $\pi$  Small libraries are counted towards meeting the HKPSG requirement.
- \* Consisting of 40% centre-based CCS and 60% home-based CCS.
- ^ The deficit in provision is based on TM District planned population while the Hospital Authority plans its services on a cluster basis, and takes into account a number of factors in planning and developing various public healthcare services. The New Territories West Cluster provides services for residents in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long districts. There are a number of hospital redevelopment projects planned in the Second Ten-year Hospital Development Plan (HDP), which will provide additional beds for serving the population in the New Territories West Cluster. The projected service demand will be catered for in the Second Ten-year HDP.

**June 2023**