

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

TPB Paper No. 10899
For Consideration by the
Town Planning Board on 2.6.2023

DRAFT SO KWUN WAT OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/TM-SKW/14

CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO.
TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14 – R1 TO R841
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14 – C1 TO C3

**DRAFT SO KWUN WAT OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/TM-SKW/14
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO.
TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14 - R1 TO R841
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14 - C1 TO C3**

Subject of Representations (Amendment Item)	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14 -)	Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/TM-SKW/14 -)
<u>Item A</u> Rezonning 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.	Total: 841 <u>Oppose/Providing Adverse Views on Item A (840)</u> R1 to R291, R293 to R840: Individuals R292: Company <u>Providing Views on Item A (1)</u> R841: Organization (Siu Lam Integrated Rehabilitation Services Complex (IRSC))	Total: 3 <u>Oppose Item A (1)</u> C1 (also R832): Individual <u>Oppose Item A and Providing Views on R841 (2)</u> C2 and C3 (also R20): Individuals

Note: The names of all representers and commenters are attached at **Annex III**. Soft copy of their submissions is sent to Town Planning Board (the Board) Members via electronic means; and is also available for public inspection at the Board’s website at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/plan_making/S_TM-SKW_14.html and the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department (PlanD) in North Point and Sha Tin. A set of hard copy is deposited at the Board’s Secretariat for Members’ inspection.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 30.9.2022, the draft So Kwun Wat Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TM-SKW/14 (the Plan) at **Annex I** was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments incorporated into the Plan is at **Annex II** and the location of the amendment item is shown on **Plan H-1**.
- 1.2 During the two-month statutory exhibition period, a total of 841 valid representations were received. On 20.1.2023, the representations were published for three weeks for public comments. Upon expiry of the publication period, a total of three valid comments on the representations were received.
- 1.3 On 24.3.2023, the Board agreed to consider all the representations and comments collectively in one group.
- 1.4 This Paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations and comments. The list of representers and commenters is at **Annex III**. A summary of the representations and comments with responses are at **Annex IV**. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

2. Background

- 2.1 It is the Government's established policy to provide departmental quarters (DQs) for married disciplined services staff in order to maintain morale and facilitate retention in the disciplined services departments. Increasing the number of DQs and improving their living environment are important for improving the welfare of disciplined services staff and shortening their waiting time for allocation. In order to meet the demand for DQs for married staff and to enhance the overall site utilisation, the Correctional Services Department (CSD) proposed to redevelop the existing three to four-storey married quarters with additional adjoining land at Hong Fai Road, Siu Lam (Item A site) to a 21-storey DQs building. CSD commissioned a rezoning study with technical assessments and the study concluded that the proposed 21-storey DQs redevelopment with about 136 units is technically feasible. To facilitate the proposed redevelopment, Item A site has been rezoned from "G/IC" and "GB" to "G/IC(1)" with 'Flat (Government Staff Quarters only)' use under Column 1 which is always permitted, subject to a maximum building height (BH) of 90mPD (**Plans H-1 and H-2**).
- 2.2 On 9.9.2022, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC/the Committee) of the Board agreed that the proposed amendments to the approved So Kwun Wat OZP No. S/TM-SKW/13 were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance for public inspection. The relevant RNTPC Paper No. 7/22 is available at the Board's website (<https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/papers/papers.html#2022>) and the extract of the minutes of the said RNTPC meeting is at **Annex V**. The draft So Kwun Wat OZP renumbered as S/TM-SKW/14 was published on 30.9.2022.

3. **Local Consultation**

Prior to Submission of the Proposed Amendments to the Committee

- 3.1 Prior to the submission of the proposed OZP amendments for consideration by the Committee, the Planning Department (PlanD) and CSD consulted the Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) regarding the proposed amendments to the OZP in respect of Item A on 4.7.2022, while letters to the Tuen Mun Rural Committee (TMRC) were issued on 21.6.2022 inviting the TMRC chairman, vice-chairmen and members to provide comments on Item A.
- 3.2 No comment has been received from the TMRC. TMDC members generally support or have no objection to/no adverse comment on the proposed amendment item but urged the relevant government departments to minimise the potential impacts, particularly those possible traffic and visual impacts induced by the proposed redevelopment of CSD's staff quarters, and advised the project proponent to explore lowering the number of storeys by building more blocks to minimise the visual impact. Detailed views and comments of TMDC together with PlanD's responses are set out in the minutes of the TMDC meeting at **Annex VI**. Moreover, a number of standard letters primarily expressing concerns on the possible traffic, visual, drainage, sewerage and environmental impacts induced by the proposed redevelopment from residents living in Siu Lam and a letter from the Management Services Office of Grand Pacific Views/Heights (Palatial Coast) expressing the concerns of their residents and Owners' Committee were received after consultation with TMDC. All the above comments and PlanD's responses were set out in RNTPC Paper No. 7/22.

Upon Gazettal of the Draft OZP

- 3.3 On 30.9.2022, the draft OZP was published for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. TMDC and TMRC members were also notified that members of the public can submit representations on the amendments in writing to the Secretary of the Board during the exhibition period of the draft OZP. No representation from members of TMDC or TMRC was received.

4. **The Representation Site and Its Surrounding Area**

4.1 **The Representation Site and Its Surrounding Area (Plans H-1 to H-5)**

- 4.1.1 The Item A site (the Site), with an area of about 2,815m², is located in Siu Lam abutting Siu Lam Road to the north and west, Hong Fai Road to the south and a government, institution and community (GIC) cluster to the east. The Site is mostly occupied by the CSD's Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre Junior Staff Married Quarters with two 4-storey and one 3-storey DQs blocks with some areas currently used as a vehicular access from Siu Lam Road, an open-air car park for the existing quarters and geotechnical features (**Plans H-2, H-4a and H-4b**). It is accessible to Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam and Tuen Mun Road via Siu Lam Road and Hong Fai Road (**Plan H-3a**).

- 4.1.2 Major medium to low-density residential developments are found to the west and north of the Site (**Plan H-5**), including a high-rise residential development namely Palatial Coast (with BH restriction of 102mPD) to the immediate north and west; some existing and planned low-density residential developments such as Sea Garden, Peak Castle and Grandview Terrace located in a higher platform (with plot ratio (PR) restriction of 0.4 or 0.6 and existing BH of 53mPD to 108mPD) to the west about 500m to 750m away; and a “Residential (Group B)2” site subject to a maximum PR of 3.6 and a maximum BH of 80mPD to the further west about 800m away. A number of GIC facilities with BH restrictions of 1 to 6 storeys are located in the vicinity, namely Tai Lam Chung Fresh Water Service Reservoir, Siu Lam IRSC (existing BH of 98mPD), Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre (existing BH of 79mPD) and CSD’s Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre Senior Officers’/ Officers’ Married Quarters (existing BH of 107mPD) at a higher platform to the east; and CSD’s Married Staff Quarters, Tai Lam Marine Police Base Inspectorate Quarters, Marine Police West Divisional Headquarters, Hong Kong Observatory Terminal Doppler Weather Radar Station and Customs Detector Dog Division Headquarters cum Tai Lam Dog Base to the south across Tuen Mun Road (**Plans H-3b** and **H-5**).

Proposed DQs Redevelopment at the Site

- 4.1.3 The Site is proposed for CSD’s redevelopment of the existing low-rise DQs blocks into a 21-storey building with a 4-storey podium mainly for lobby, car parking spaces and recreational facilities for residents and 17 storeys of DQs above. The proposed vehicular access will be located at Siu Lam Road similar to the existing access arrangement. The conceptual development layout plan, indicative section plan and photomontages are at **Plans H-6a** to **H-6f**. The major development parameters of the indicative scheme are summarised as follows:

Item A Site Area	About 2,815m ² (all Government land)
Development Area	About 2,700m ²
GFA	9,700m ² [PR of about 3.6]
No. of Block	1
No. of Storeys	21 storeys (excluding 1 basement level for plant room)
Maximum BH	90mPD
No. of Units	136
Design Population	About 544
Ancillary Parking Facilities	
- Private Car	59
- Motorcycle	10
- Loading/Unloading Bay	1
- Pick-up/Drop-off Bay	1

Open Space Provision	Not less than 544m ²
Target Completion/ Intake Year	2028/2029

Notes:

- (i) The development area of 2,700m² is based on CSD's proposal.
- (ii) The development proposal is indicative in nature and subject to change at detailed design stage.

4.2 Planning Intention

The "G/IC(1)" zone is intended primarily for the provision of GIC facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organizations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.

5. The Representations and Comments on Representations

5.1 Subject of Representations

5.1.1 There are a total of 841 valid representations, with 840 representations (**R1** to **R840**) opposing/providing adverse views on Item A and one representation (**R841**) providing views on Item A. Among the 841 representations, one providing views on Item A is submitted by IRSC (**R841**), one opposing Item A by a company (**R292**), and the remaining 839 opposing/providing adverse views on Item A from individual members of the public.

5.1.2 The major grounds of representations as well as their comments/suggestions, and PlanD's responses, in consultation with the relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds), are at **Annex IV** and summarised in paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 below.

5.2 Major Grounds of and Responses to Adverse Representations (**R1** to **R840**)

5.2.1 *Need for Providing DQs*

Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions	
(1)	The Site is not suitable for redeveloping into a high-density DQs as it is small with uneven and sloping ground, and constrained by the steep and narrow Hong Fai Road with limited traffic capacity. No assessment on the availability of alternative site(s) has been conducted which violates the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Development within "GB" Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No.10).
(2)	CSD should explore alternative sites including sites near the Marine Police Tai Lam Chung Base, Tai Lam Correctional Institution and Tai Lam Centre for Women, Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre, Siu Lam Tsuen/

	Luen On San Tsuen, the vacant “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) site in Tai Lam Chung (Plan H-3b) and any other sites away from existing residential developments for DQs development.
(3)	CSD should not solely rely on the provision of DQs to maintain morale. There are various kinds of civil service housing benefits, and CSD could purchase residential units from the private market.
(4)	In view of the high cost of DQs development at Tin Wan, the proposed redevelopment will not be cost-effective in view of its small site area which could only generate less than 100 additional units.
(5)	The need for developing DQs could not be established based on the high vacancy rate of CSD staff quarters, the shortest waiting time for CSD staff quarters amongst all disciplined services staff quarters, and the much shorter waiting time for CSD staff quarters 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. The number of eligible staff and vacancy rate of DQs should be disclosed.
Responses	
	In response to (1) and (2):
(a)	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 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 BH restriction of 102mPD (Plan H-5), 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.
(b)	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 OZP. The Site comprises only a minor portion previously zoned “GB” (about 730m ² 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 (Plan H-2).
(c)	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. The Site, as explained in (a), is suitable for high-rise DQs redevelopment after considering the above factors. In respect of the proposed alternatives sites, they are being occupied/planned for other uses and not suitable for high-rise DQs

	<p>development due to various development constraints. More importantly, irrespective of whether there are other suitable sites, the Site is suitable for DQs redevelopment.</p> <p>Responses 5.2.2(a) on compatibility, 5.2.3(a) and (f) on traffic capacity and accessibility of public transport, and 5.2.6(d) on geotechnical feasibility below are also relevant.</p>
	<p>In response to (3), (4) and (5):</p> <p>(d) 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>(e) 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 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.</p> <p>(f) The estimated costs of design and construction works for the proposed DQs redevelopment will be formulated in the detailed design stage. The Architectural Services Department (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>

5.2.2 *Compatibility of Development Intensity and Comprehensive Planning*

Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions	
(1)	<p>High development intensity with PR of 3.6 and BH of 21 storeys is incompatible with the surrounding area which is semi-rural in nature. 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. The proposed redevelopment could be split into two to three blocks for lowering the BH. The proposed</p>

	<p>development contravenes the BH profile of the So Kwun Wat Planning Scheme Area as stated in Paragraphs 7.1, 7.3 and 7.5 of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP and will set an undesirable precedent which may lead to adverse cumulative impacts on the area.</p> <p>A representer, however, opines that the Site is not fully utilised as the proposed redevelopment would only lead to little PR gain, resulting in inefficiency and waste of land resource.</p>
(2)	<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. Some representers opine that suitable sites for DQs development should be identified in large-scale development projects such as the New Development Areas instead for a more comprehensive planning.</p>
	<p>Responses</p>
	<p>In response to (1) and (2):</p> <p>(a) Situated in an area of a number of 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 (Plan H-5). Responses in paragraph 5.2.1(b) on TPB PG-No.10 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) 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>(c) 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 ‘taking into account the nature of the planned use and high-rise residential development to its immediate northwest’. 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> <p>(d) 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</p>

	characteristics, development intensity of the surrounding area and various possible impacts of the proposed redevelopment on the area concerned.
(e)	The Site forms part of a larger “G/IC” site which is mostly developed and being occupied by various GIC facilities (Plan H-5). 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. 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.

5.2.3 *Traffic and Transport*

Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions	
(1)	The existing road network of the area has limited capacity and will be overloaded by additional traffic generated by the proposed redevelopment during construction and operation phases, the nearby soon-to-be-opened IRSC (about 1,700 beds and 1,000 staff) and high-rise residential developments in the So Kwun Wat and Gold Coast area. Increased traffic congestion is anticipated with the proposed redevelopment. The proposed redevelopment will likely block the sightline of roads and make traffic accidents more frequent. It is proposed to prohibit heavy vehicles from using Siu Lam Road.
(2)	Concerns are on pedestrian safety and footpath capacity of Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road as there are already many hikers to Tai Lam Country Park using these narrow footpaths and there are no proper pedestrian crossing facility and at least two blind spots along Hong Fai Road. It is recommended to widen and improve pedestrian facility of this area. Small redevelopment site, narrow streets, and prolonged closure of footpath during the construction period will pose danger on pedestrians.
(3)	There is deficiency in public transport services in the area. More public transport options should be made available in the area.
(4)	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. On the contrary, huge increase of private car parking spaces is not environmentally efficient and therefore the number of parking spaces should be reduced and point-to-point bus service should be provided.
(5)	The TIA is not comprehensive and fails to assess the following traffic conditions: (i) Underestimation of the traffic flows as trip pattern of family members of the disciplinary staff should be similar to that of the other nearby residents.

	<p>(ii) Reference of traffic flow to Kwai Chung Hospital is inappropriate as the number of beds in Kwai Chung Hospital is 25% fewer than that of the IRSC.</p> <p>(iii) Inaccurate figure of footway width has been used in the assessment as the effective footway 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 different key nodes have not been considered in the assessment.</p> <p>(iv) The traffic condition of Tuen Mun Road (Siu Lam Section and Sham Tseng Section) have been neglected in the assessment.</p> <p>(v) The date and time of traffic survey are not representative for traffic flow projection as the survey was conducted within the COVID-19/ near the Chinese Lunar New Year holiday/ neglecting the car ban period from 07:30 to 09:00 on weekdays morning.</p> <p>(vi) 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. $544/2535=21.5\%$). The predicted growth of population should refer to the Tertiary Planning Unit (TPU) 426 from the "Projections of Population Distribution 2021-2029" since So Kuwn Wat and Tuen Mun East is a rapidly growing area.</p> <p>(vii) 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.</p> <p>(viii) The TIA has not considered the exponential traffic growth brought by 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).</p>
	Responses
	In response to (1):
(a)	<p>The Site is accessible to Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam and Tuen Mun Road via Siu Lam Road and Hong Fai Road (Plan H-3a). 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>

(b)	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.
(c)	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.
(d)	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.
(e)	<p>In response to (2):</p> <p>The pedestrian impact assessment undertaken in the TIA indicates that all the concerned footpaths and crossings 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>
(f)	<p>In response to (3):</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> <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) (Plan H-6h). By making reference to the surveys carried out in 2022 and 2023, TD considers that the</p>

	bus routes observing the above-mentioned bus stops could cater for the additional passenger demand from the Site.
(g)	<p>In response to (4):</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>
(h)	<p>In response to (5):</p> <p>TD has no comment on the TIA submitted by CSD for the proposed DQs redevelopment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) 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. (ii) 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. (iii) The footpath widths along the pedestrian routes have been reviewed and verified by CSD's consultant. It is noted that localized narrow points (each about 1m in length) at the catch pits along Hong Fai Road are sufficient for pedestrians to pass through. Responses in paragraphs 5.2.3(c) and (e) on construction traffic and footpath capacity above are relevant. (iv) 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. (v) 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%)

	<p>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 Lam from 07:30 to 09:00 a.m. on weekday mornings, the traffic survey confirms that the AM peak hour occurs from 07:15 to 08:15 a.m.</p> <p>(vi) 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, 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. According to the “Projections of Population Distribution 2021-2029”, 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 the background traffic (i.e. after applying the adopted growth rate) in the traffic assessment.</p> <p>(vii) 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 in paragraph 5.2.3 (e) on the pedestrian impact assessment above are relevant.</p> <p>(viii) The planned development to be completed before the assessment year of 2032, i.e. the IRSC, has already been 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.</p>
--	---

5.2.4 *Environmental, Ecological and Landscape*

Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions	
(1)	The proposed redevelopment will bring about adverse environmental impacts. However, no comprehensive Environmental Assessment (EA) has been conducted for the proposed redevelopment.
(2)	Construction of the proposed DQs will induce adverse air, dust and noise impacts as well as land and water pollution, which will affect residents of the nearby residential development and patients of the rehabilitation complex who are in need of quiet environment for recovery.
(3)	<p><u><i>Traffic Noise</i></u> Wall effect as well as additional population and vehicles brought by the proposed redevelopment will cause significant noise impact. No sufficient noise buffer (50m required according to the HKPSG) from Tuen Mun Road 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-gasketed window.</p> <p><u><i>Aircraft Noise</i></u> The cumulative noise impact arising from the three-runway system (3RS) and traffic of Tuen Mun Road was not properly assessed. A study on aircraft noise should be conducted especially on days with southwestern wind where 3RS is more often used.</p> <p><u><i>Air Quality</i></u> The wall effect created by the proposed redevelopment will exacerbate air pollution of the area. Chimneys of the IRSC should be taken into consideration in the air quality impact assessment.</p> <p><u><i>Carbon Emission</i></u> The “GB” zone should be preserved and more trees should be planted in view of government’s initiative of promoting carbon emission reduction.</p> <p><u><i>Light Pollution and Natural Lighting</i></u> The proposed redevelopment will incur light pollution while it will prevent light from entering the nearby residential development.</p>
(4)	<p>The proposed redevelopment will cause adverse ecological impact on the area with the loss of “GB” zone. It is suggested to convert the concerned site and its surroundings to “GB” zone.</p> <p><u><i>Birds and Wildlife</i></u> The proposed redevelopment will cause a loss of essential habitats for fauna and flora such as Chinese Porcupine, Small Indian Civets and Barking Deer, damage the existing natural corridor for wildlife (provided by existing low-rise quarters buildings with vegetation at the concerned site), threaten 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, and affect the flight path</p>

Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions	
	<p>of night birds and migratory birds. As such, only minimal construction activity should be allowed in Siu Lam.</p> <p><u>Trees</u> Felling of at least 40 old trees will cause loss of homes of many birds, butterflies and wild animals, natural shading for pedestrians/hikers and noise buffer, affect the air quality of the area, and destroy the natural character of the site and its surrounding. Tree compensation should not be only in quantitative terms, but has to evaluate size and age of trees.</p>
Responses	
	In response to (1):
(a)	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.
	In response to (2):
(b)	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 (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. EPD has no objection in this regard.
	In response to (3):
(c)	<p><u>Traffic Noise</u> 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>
(d)	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

Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions	
	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.
(e)	<p><u>Aircraft Noise</u></p> <p>According to the findings of Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the Expansion of Hong Kong International Airport into a Three-Runway System, the Noise Exposure Forecast 25 contours predicted for different operation scenarios of the 3RS are 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>
(f)	<p><u>Air Quality</u></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 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 SWD.</p>
(g)	<p><u>Carbon Emission</u></p> <p>The Site comprises only a minor portion previously zoned “GB” (about 730m² or 26% of the Site) which is mainly formed and currently used as vehicular access and car parking area (Plan H-2). 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>
(h)	<p><u>Light Pollution and Natural Lighting</u></p> <p>There is ambient light emitted by the existing developments in the vicinity including the residential development of Palatial Coast and various G/IC 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>

Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions	
	In response to (4):
(i)	As the Site is already formed and disturbed and the proposed redevelopment involves only redevelopment of the existing DQs blocks, significant adverse ecological impact due to the proposed redevelopment is not anticipated. With only a 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.
(j)	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.
(k)	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.
(l)	The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) and Urban Design and Landscape Section of PlanD (UD&L, PlanD) have no adverse comment on the proposed redevelopment from nature conservation and landscape planning perspectives respectively.

5.2.5 Visual and Air Ventilation

Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions	
(1)	<p>The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) is not comprehensive as it does not consider view from the nearby residential development (Palatial Coast) as one of the viewpoints and visually sensitive receivers. There are concerns about the out-of-place design of the proposed development. The view from/to Maclehose Trail/Tai Lam Chung Reservoir, view from Hong Fai Road, view from across the harbour (e.g. Sunny Bay, Siu Ho Wan), views to the nearby ridgeline/coastline/skyline and the vista of future developments to the north and northeast of the Site will be affected by the proposed redevelopment.</p> <p>The visual impact of the proposed redevelopment is assessed as moderately</p>

	adverse, which 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.
(2)	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.
Responses	
	In response to (1):
(a)	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 (Plans H-6c to H-6f). Notwithstanding, the proposed redevelopment is considered to be generally compatible and acceptable within the existing visual context of Siu Lam. Appropriate visual mitigation 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 (Plan H-6g). UD&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 in paragraph 5.2.1(b) on TPB PG-No.10 above are also relevant.
	In response to (2):
(b)	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.

5.2.6 *Other Technical Aspects*

	Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions
(1)	The existing infrastructure does not have sufficient capacity to cater for the proposed redevelopment. The technical assessments conducted 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.
(2)	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.
(3)	The Sewerage Impact Assessment (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.
(4)	No comprehensive geological investigation has been conducted for the proposed redevelopment regarding the stability of the retaining structures for the nearby highways and residential developments. The foundation engineering works of the proposed redevelopment might induce leakage of the two swimming pools at Palatial Coast which are close to the Site.
(5)	While the Site falls within the 2km Consultation Zone of the Tai Lam Chung Chlorination Station (TLCCS) (Plan H-3b), no risk assessment has been conducted.
	Responses
	In response to (1) to (4):
(a)	Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) and SIA have been conducted by CSD for the proposed DQs redevelopment to assess the possible cumulative drainage and sewerage impacts on the area. All existing, planned and committed developments (including the IRSC) have been taken into consideration in the assessments.
(b)	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.
(c)	For the SIA, it concludes that unacceptable impact on the sewerage system resulting from the proposed redevelopment is not anticipated. In this regard, EPD and DSD have no adverse comment on the proposed

	<p>redevelopment.</p> <p>(d) 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>
	<p>In response to (5):</p> <p>(e) 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.</p>

5.2.7 *Provision of GIC, Open Space and Other Supporting Facilities*

	Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions
(1)	There is a lack of GIC facilities including kindergarten/nursery, child care centres, pre-school rehabilitation services and elderly community care facilities, and other supporting facilities including eating places, markets, restaurants and retail facilities in the So Kwun Wat area. The lack of kindergarten/nursery and child care centres contravenes with the principle of vicinity as the basis for school place allocation. 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.
(2)	Open space is limited and in poor quality in the area. As the open space at

	the ground level of the proposed redevelopment is mainly occupied by vehicular access and parking facilities, the actual open space at the podium level is limited (less than 1m ² per person).
	Responses
	In response to (1):
(a)	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.
(b)	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.
(c)	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 other supporting facilities in the area.
	In response to (2):
(d)	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 (Plan H-6g), not less than 544m ² open space at ground level and podium deck/mezzanine floor (i.e. 1m ² 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 spaces for residents of all ages and abilities.

5.2.8 Consultation

	Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions
(1)	There is lack of consultation for the proposed amendment. CSD did not consult residents from Siu Lam Tsuen and Palatial Coast. Relevant clans,

	Chairman of Rural Committee, Village Heads and Village Representatives should also be consulted regarding ancestral graves and Kam Taps near the Site, in terms of fengshui and relocation (if any) in Siu Lam.
	Responses
	In response to (1):
(a)	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.
(b)	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.
(c)	While it is noted that there are some existing graves to the northeast of the Site (Plan H-2), the proposed redevelopment at the Site would not affect those existing graves.

5.2.9 Others

	Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions
(1)	Traffic and construction impacts induced by the proposed redevelopment will increase maintenance cost of the access road to the proposed redevelopment (i.e. Siu Lam Road), which is maintained by Palatial Coast, and damage the residents' interest. Some propose to 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.
(2)	The existing staff quarters buildings have historical value and should be conserved for a tourist destination or used for providing Tai Lam Chung Reservoir Information Hub, pavilion and hiking facilities.
(3)	The proposed redevelopment will induce a drop in property prices of the nearby residential development.
(4)	The DQs type of accommodation encourages a "ghetto" mentality and it

	would be better for the officers to live within the community.
	Responses
	In response to (1):
(a)	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.
	In response to (2):
(b)	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 in 5.2.1(a) and (c) on site suitability and 5.2.1(d) on need for DQs development above are relevant.
	In response to (3):
(c)	Property price is not relevant planning consideration and is outside the scope of the OZP.
	In response to (4):
(d)	The proposed DQs redevelopment is considered compatible with the surroundings in land use term. Responses in 5.2.1(d) on need for DQs development above are relevant.

5.3 Major Grounds of and Responses to Representation Providing Views (R841)

	Major Grounds/Comments/Suggestions
(1)	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
	In response to (1):
(a)	Responses in paragraph 5.2.3(e) on footpath capacity and 5.2.3(f) on public transport provision above are relevant.
(b)	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 in paragraph 5.2.4(b) on construction noise above are relevant.

5.4 Comments on Representations

5.4.1 There are three comments submitted by individuals. Two of them (**C1** and **C3**) are also representers themselves (**R832** and **R20**). **C1** opposes Item A. **C2** and **C3** oppose Item A and do not agree with **R841**'s suggestions.

5.4.2 A detailed summary of the major grounds of the comments on representations and PlanD's responses, in consultation with relevant B/Ds, are at **Annex IV**. The major concerns raised in the comments are largely similar in nature to the grounds of objections as detailed in paragraph 5.2 above. The comments are summarised below:

	Major Grounds of Comments Opposing Item A /Providing Views	Comment No.
(1)	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.	C1 (C1 also R832)
(2)	R841 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.	C2
(3)	R841 proposed noise reduction engineering technology to mitigate construction noise. However, no technology can fully mitigate the noise impacts which would exploit the therapeutic environment for patients of the rehabilitation facilities.	C3 (C3 also R20)

	Responses
	In response to (1):
(a)	Responses in paragraphs 5.2.8(a) and (b) on consultation and 5.2.9(c) on property price above are relevant.
	In response to (2):
(b)	Responses in paragraph 5.2.3(a) on traffic capacity above are relevant.
	In response to (3):
(c)	Responses in paragraphs 5.2.4(b) on construction noise and 5.3(b) on relevant noise mitigation measures above are relevant.

6. Departmental Consultation

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

- Secretary for Security;
- Secretary for Education;
- District Lands Officer/Tuen Mun, Lands Department;
- Commissioner for Transport;
- Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department;
- Director of Environmental Protection;
- Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department;
- Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- CTP/UD&L, PlanD;
- Chief Project Manager 203, ArchSD;
- Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation;
- District Officer (Tuen Mun), Home Affairs Department;
- Executive Secretary (Antiquities & Monuments), Antiquities and Monuments Office;
- Director of Social Welfare; and
- Commissioner of Correctional Services.

6.2 The following government departments have no comment on the representations/comments:

- Director-General of Civil Aviation;
- Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD; and
- Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD).

7. Planning Department's Views

7.1 The views of **R841** are noted.

7.2 Based on the assessments in paragraph 5.2 above, PlanD does not support R1 to R840 and considers that the OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- (a) it is the Government's established policy to provide DQs for married disciplined services staff in order to maintain morale and facilitate retention in the disciplined services departments. There is a continuous demand for provision of more DQs in CSD. The Site is currently occupied by CSD's low-rise DQs blocks with car parking area and vehicular access. It is suitable for high-rise DQs development for meeting CSD's demand for DQs and better utilising the Site;
- (b) in view of the adjoining high-rise residential development with BH of 102mPD, the "GIC(1)" zone with a BH restriction of 90mPD for redevelopment of a 21-storey DQs block is considered suitable in terms of land use and BH compatibility taking into consideration the planning context of the area and findings of the relevant technical assessments;
- (c) a rezoning study with technical assessments on the potential impacts of various aspects, including traffic and transport, environmental, landscape, visual, drainage, sewerage and geotechnical, have been carried out for the proposed redevelopment and confirmed that there is no insurmountable technical problem of the proposed redevelopment at the Site. Relevant mitigation measures have also been proposed in the study to minimise the possible impacts of the proposed redevelopment. Regarding the concern on ecological impact, as the Site is already formed and disturbed and the proposal involves only redevelopment of the existing DQs blocks, significant adverse ecological impact due to the proposed redevelopment is not anticipated;
- (d) some GIC facilities do not meet the provision requirements under the HKPSG in the So Kwun Wat Planning Scheme Area. For kindergartens/nurseries and primary schools, the demand can be met by the surplus in the provision in Tuen Mun District. Regarding the provision of concerned social welfare facilities, 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. For the provision of open space, there is a surplus of district open space and local open space in the Tuen Mun District as a whole; and
- (e) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the zoning amendment have been duly followed. The views received have been duly considered and responded by concerned B/Ds.

8. Decision Sought

8.1 The Board is invited to give consideration to the representations and comments taking into consideration the points raised in the hearing session, and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet/partially meet the representations.

- 8.2 Should the Board decide that no amendment should be made to the Plan to meet the representations, Members are also invited to agree that the Plan, together with its respective Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

9. Attachments

Annex I	Draft So Kwun Wat OZP No. S/TM-SKW/14 (Reduced Size)
Annex II	Schedule of Amendments to the Approved So Kwun Wat OZP No. S/TM-SKW/13
Annex III	List of Representers and Commenters
Annex IV	Summary of Representations and Comments and Planning Department's Responses
Annex V	Extract of Minutes of RNTPC Meeting held on 9.9.2022
Annex VI	Extract of Minutes of TMDC Meeting held on 4.7.2022
Annex VII	Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in So Kwun Wat OZP
Annex VIII	Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Tuen Mun District
Plan H-1	Location Plan
Plan H-2	Site Plan
Plans H-3a to 3b	Aerial Photos
Plans H-4a to 4c	Site Photos
Plan H-5	Building Height Plan
Plans H-6a to 6g	Conceptual Layout Plan, Indicative Section Plan, Photomontages and Visual Mitigation Measures
Plans H-6h	Existing Public Transport Services

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
JUNE 2023**