



**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO  
THE APPROVED TUEN MUN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/TM/39  
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

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

- Item A1 – Rezoning of a site to the northwest of Light Rail Transit Goodview Garden Station from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group A)29” (“R(A)29”) with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item A2 – Rezoning of a site being part of the residential development ‘Oceania Heights’ from “G/IC” to “R(A)” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item B – Rezoning of a site to the east of Tuen Mun Town Plaza from “Green Belt” (“GB”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(A)30” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item C – Rezoning of a site to the west of Hing Fu Street from “GB” to “G/IC(5)” with stipulation of building height restriction.

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

- (a) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone to incorporate development restrictions for the “R(A)29” and “R(A)30” sub-areas.
- (b) Incorporation of a set of Notes for the “G/IC(5)” sub-area with development restrictions.
- (c) Incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1 of the Notes for the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone; and corresponding deletion of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 2 of the Notes for the “V” zone.
- (d) Incorporation of ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ under Column 2 of the Notes for the “V” zone.

《屯門分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/TM/40》  
Draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/40

申述人名單  
Index of Representations

申述編號 Representation No.	提交編號 Submission No.	申述人名稱 Name of Representer
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R001	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S001	Lee Hoi Yan
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R002	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S002	Wu Wai Hong
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R003	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S004	Chan Hong Ting
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R004	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S005	Chow Ching Han
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R005	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S006	Ling Yue Daphne So
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R006	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S007 TPB/R/S/TM/40-S009 TPB/R/S/TM/40-S011	海典軒業主委員會 (The Owner Committee of Oceania Heights)
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R007	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S012	Wong Ho Shan
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R008	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S027	Tsang Chun Ming
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R009	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S030	Leung Kai Cheong
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R010	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S039	馬燕薇
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R011	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S047	Leung Kai Lun
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R012	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S066	Wan Ho Yin
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R013	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S015	Wong Wai Yin
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R014	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S028	Tang Yiu Leung
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R015	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S029	Fong Shui Yee
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R016	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S044	Ng Lee Yu
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R017	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S071	何顯毅
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R018	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S075	Chan Yiu Fai
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R019	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S014	Pang Hoi Ling
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R020	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S025	Ng Ka Yan
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R021	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S038	Lee Sau Chun
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R022	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S058	Chan Lan Yan
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R023	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S059	袁果卿
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R024	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S060	Wan Ho Ming Alan
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R025	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S063	Chan Chi Ho Alex
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R026	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S067	Chan Ho Yin
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R027	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S050	Chan Ching Ngai 陳正毅
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R028	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S052	趙偉麟
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R029	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S053	樂詠敏
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R030	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S055	李煒琪 Li Wai Ki

申述編號 Representation No.	提交編號 Submission No.	申述人名稱 Name of Representer
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R031	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S076	Lam Sheung Kuen
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R032	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S077	Mak Kin Pan
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R033	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S074	Wong Yuen Kong
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R034	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S072	Chung Yee Ling
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R035	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S010	陳燕萍
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R036	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S003	陳智聰
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R037	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S042	Lui Ka To
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R038	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S056 TPB/R/S/TM/40-S061	Lee Lai Kuen Alice
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R039	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S064	周雅雯
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R040	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S073	Wong Ching Wai
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R041	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S065	Chan Lan Fung Mavis
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R042	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S057	陳明生
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R043	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S018	Chow Hoi Fei
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R044	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S019	Ng Hung Yu Amy
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R045	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S020	Lam Pui Man
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R046	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S032	許嘉妤
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R047	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S033	馬雙
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R048	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S034	許振盛
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R049	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S035	許思妤
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R050	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S022	Chow Fung Chi
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R051	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S078	Tsui Hiu Lam
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R052	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S026	Wong Sin Ping
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R053	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S041	葉少萍
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R054	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S016	Kwok Man Kit
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R055	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S013	Shum Yee Man
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R056	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S021	Sher Chun Fai Perray
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R057	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S024	Lam Yat Nam
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R058	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S045	李洪杰
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R059	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S031 TPB/R/S/TM/40-S079	Tong Yuen Ling 唐婉玲
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R060	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S023	Yu Shing Pang
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R061	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S048	Ng Ka Chun
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R062	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S054	馮耀華
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R063	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S069	Chan Kwok Wai
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R064	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S070	Chan Chun Po
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R065	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S068	黃俊銘



申述編號 Representation No.	提交編號 Submission No.	申述人名稱 Name of Representer
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R066	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S040	Lam Lok Pan
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R067	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S043	Wong Pik Kwan Polly
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R068	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S008	MTR Corporation Ltd
TPB/R/S/TM/40-R069	TPB/R/S/TM/40-S017	The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited

公眾可於規劃署的規劃資料查詢處及城市規劃委員會網頁  
[https://www.tpb.gov.hk/tc/plan\\_making/S\\_TM\\_40.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/tc/plan_making/S_TM_40.html) 查閱就《屯門分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/TM/40》提出的申述。

Representations in respect of the Draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/40 are available for public inspection at the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department and on the Town Planning Board's website at [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan\\_making/S\\_TM\\_40.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_TM_40.html).

submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

**Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District**

[Mr Raymond H.F. Au, District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW), Ms L.C. Cheung, Ms Carol K.L. Kan, Ms Kennie M.F. Liu, Mr Simon P.H. Chan and Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STPs/TMYLW), and Mr Chris S.M. Leung, Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 100**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/39  
(RNTPC Paper No. 5/24)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

73. Other than the Planning Department (PlanD)'s representatives as listed out before this paragraph, the following government representatives and consultants were also invited to the meeting at this point:

**Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)**

Mr Carl K.S. Ng - Senior Engineer

Mr Ray C.W. Choy - Engineer

**Consultants**

*Atkins China Limited*

Mr Louis N.K Lau

Mr Terry W.Y. Lam

Mr W.K. Chiu

Mr Joe C.H. Chiu

74. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms L.C. Cheung, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the approved Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TM/39, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. Amendment Item (Item) A1 was for a private residential development with a public transport terminus (PTT) and government, institution or community (GIC) facilities while Item A2 was to reflect a completed development and as-built conditions. Items B and C were to take forward two section 12A applications (s.12A applications) agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board). The proposed amendments included:

- (a) Item A1 – rezoning a site to the northwest of the Light Rail Transit (LRT) Goodview Garden Station from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group A)29” (“R(A)29”) with a maximum building height (BH) of 100mPD;
- (b) Item A2 – rezoning a site being part of the residential development ‘Oceania Heights’ from “G/IC” to “R(A)” with a maximum BH of 100mPD;
- (c) Item B – rezoning a site to the east of Tuen Mun Town Plaza from “Green Belt” (“GB”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A)30” (“R(A)30”) with a maximum BH of 100mPD; and
- (d) Item C – rezoning a site to the west of Hing Fu Street from “GB” to “G/IC(5)” with a maximum BH of 2 storeys.

75. As the presentation of PlanD’s representative had been completed, the

Chairperson invited questions from Members.

76. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

*Item A1*

- (a) noting that there were public concerns on how the mitigation measures recommended under the feasibility study could be implemented in the future residential development, what arrangement for the implementation would be;

*Item A2*

- (b) whether there was any remaining development potential under the lease, and whether the land owner could apply to the Lands Department (LandsD) for further development after the site was rezoned to “R(A)”;

*Item B*

- (c) the rationale for delineating the boundary of Item B site; and
- (d) whether the requirement for the provision of GIC facilities with a gross floor area (GFA) of not less than 315m<sup>2</sup> in the “R(A)30” zone was required and confirmed by the Social Welfare Department (SWD).

77. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides and a plan, made the following main points:

*Item A1*

- (a) the future development would be subject to development control as the development proceeded. Technical requirements and mitigation measures identified, where appropriate, would be stipulated under the lease and further scrutinised by relevant government departments. For instance, the Director of Environmental Protection had advised that the requirements on the



provision of adequate air buffer distance and submission of Noise Impact Assessment and Sewerage Impact Assessment by the future developer(s) would be required for incorporation into the lease at the land disposal stage;

*Item A2*

- (b) rezoning of Item A2 site was mainly to reflect the completed development named ‘Oceania Heights’ and its as-built conditions. The area proposed for rezoning had already been included in the existing lot boundary. While the development potential of the site under the lease had been fully utilised, should the land owner propose for further development, lease modification and relevant technical assessments to ascertain its technical feasibility would be required;

*Item B*

- (c) the boundary of Item B site followed the boundary of the lot owned by the applicant of the concerned s.12A application. The applicant had not proposed to include the adjoining government land in the application; and
- (d) prior to submitting the proposed amendments to the OZP for the Committee’s consideration, PlanD had consulted SWD and it was confirmed that the GFA requirement for the provision of GIC facilities at Item B site remained unchanged.

78. The Chairman remarked that the proposed amendments to the OZP were mainly to rezone a “G/IC” site to “R(A)29” for private residential development through land sale (Item A1), to reflect the lot boundary of a completed development (Item A2), and to take forward two s.12A applications previously agreed by the Committee (Items B and C). Should the Committee agree with the proposed amendments, the draft OZP would be gazetted for public inspection for two months and the representations received, if any, would be submitted to the Board for consideration.

79. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and that the draft Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/39A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/TM/40 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/39A at Attachment IV of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/TM/40 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings on the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP.”

80. 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 Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

[The Chairperson thanked the representatives from CEDD and the consultants for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 101**

##### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TM-SKW/128      Proposed Excavation of Land (for Ground Investigation Works for Natural Terrain Hazard Study) in “Green Belt” Zone, Government Land in Tai Lam Chung, Tuen Mun  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM-SKW/128)

---

81. The Secretary reported that the AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had declared an interest on the item for having current business dealings with AECOM. The Committee noted that Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Action

6. The Chairman stated that the Social Welfare and Housing Committee (SWHC) under the TMDC had consolidated specific recommendations regarding Item 2 and submitted a report to the TMDC for further discussion. The two key recommendations were “Transformation of Industrial Buildings” and “Accelerating the Pace of Revitalisation”. Similarly, the Secretariat had compiled the relevant information, with results detailed in the annex to the paper. The Chairman requested Members to review the consolidated recommendations listed in the annex.

7. Mr WAN Tin-chong expressed great concerns about the issue of transformation of industrial buildings and would visit and meet with industrial building owners to hear about the operational difficulties faced by small and medium enterprises, as well as their views on industrial building revitalisation. He welcomed interested Members to join him. After collecting relevant opinions and obtaining results, he would submit a paper for further discussion.

8. As no Members raised additional comments on the discussion results and Secretariat follow-up actions, the Chairman requested the Secretariat to forward the comments regarding Item 2 to relevant policy bureaux and departments for consideration.

[Post-meeting note: Relevant letters regarding the two items were sent to relevant policy bureaux and departments on 31 October 2024.]

**V. Discussion Items**

**(A) Proposed Amendments to the Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/39  
(TMDC Paper No. 42/2024)**

9. The Chairman welcomed Ms CHEUNG Ling-chi, Senior Town Planner, Tuen Mun 2, and Mr Chris LEUNG, Town Planner, Tuen Mun 2, of the Planning Department (PlanD); Mr Carl NG, Senior Engineer/10 (West), and Mr Ray CHOY, Engineer/24 (West), of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD); and Mr LAU Ngai-keung, Technical Director, Mr LAM Wai-yin, Associate Director, and Mr CHIU Chun-ho, Principal Engineer, of Atkins China Limited, to the meeting.

10. Ms CHEUNG Ling-chi of the PlanD briefly introduced the paper through PowerPoint slides (see annex 1).

11. Mr YIP Man-pan stated that suggestions regarding the land use had been provided more than a decade ago, but there had never been mention of residential

development. After receiving the captioned paper on 30 August 2024, he immediately consulted nearby housing estates and residents, receiving over 300 responses, with more than 90% opposing residential development. Objections included concern about blocked views and insufficient distance between buildings, especially for Oceania Heights, which was separated from the site by only a 1-metre-wide pedestrian path. He had previously suggested using the site for recreational purpose by expanding the adjacent park to provide a more pleasant living environment. Some residents also suggested building a smart car park. He felt the rezoning consultation period was too short and that the Government should provide information about ventilation and lighting. In addition, he stated that the Department should consider traffic impacts, as more residential development would only worsen congestion on Wong Chu Road. Moreover, given current market condition, he believed private residential sales would be poor.

12. Mr FUNG Pui-yin stated that most of the residents nearby hoped for the land to be used for recreational purpose, followed by car park construction, and opposed residential development. Residents' objections included concerns about ventilation, insufficient community resources, and traffic burden. He stated that congestion on Wong Chu Road was evident, and building residences before traffic improvement would affect both the new and existing residents' quality of life. Regarding the Department's statement that the proposed building height would not exceed 100 metres and would be about 20-storey tall, he noted this would affect views not only of adjacent buildings but also those opposite. He believed the Department should conduct proper consultation and exchange views with local stakeholders, otherwise residents would definitely not accept the plan.

13. Ms Pamela MAK reported receiving objections from Goodview Garden and Oceania Heights residents. Given the currently poor property market condition, there was no need for additional private housing. Residents' concerns included traffic, environmental issue, and blocked views, whereas existing facilities were insufficient to support the additional 500+ households after the proposed private residential development. Furthermore, she sought details about the types of social welfare facilities to be added after rezoning.

14. Mr IP Chun-yuen mentioned that when the land was rezoned in 2018 for the construction of Siu Tsui Court, residents of Oceania Heights and Nerine Cove had numerous concerns about facilities, traffic, and the environment. With current condition unimproved and insufficient traffic and community facilities, additional residential development would only worsen relevant problems. He pointed out that the Goodview Garden bus stop served as the last stop in the Tuen Mun District for all



Hong Kong Island and Kowloon-bound bus routes, where residents were always difficult to get on buses, and worried that building new private housing before Siu Tsui Court's occupancy would aggravate the situation. Unlike developments under the Home Ownership Scheme, such as Siu Tsui Court, the design of a private residential development would not consult with the District Council, causing more resident concern, especially regarding separation between buildings. He requested the Department to reconsider and increase communication with stakeholders.

15. Ms CHEUNG Ling-chi of the PlanD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The proposed amendments to the zoning plan mainly involved rezoning the site for private residential development. Consulting the TMDC was the first step in amending the Outline Zoning Plan, with the purpose to brief Members and collect opinions for collation and study before submission to the Development Bureau and relevant departments for review. The Department would submit opinions from local community and government departments to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for consideration;
- (ii) The Department strove to consider the TMDC and residents' concerns and needs while identifying land for housing development;
- (iii) The TPB's committee would consider the amendments, and if agreed, statutory public consultation process would begin. The public would have two months to make representations to the TPB, which would then hold hearing sessions to consider the valid representations received;
- (iv) The Government had been adopting a multi-pronged approach to meet housing and other development needs, including reviewing government land use. This site in Tuen Mun Area 16 was identified as having potential for private housing development. The CEDD had conducted an engineering feasibility study and a technical assessment to ensure the proposed development would not significantly impact the surrounding environment after implementing necessary mitigation measures. Also, the CEDD had conducted a traffic impact assessment to ensure the development would not significantly impact overall traffic;
- (v) Besides utilising land resources to meet society's private housing demands, this rezoning would allow for relocating outdoor bus stops and terminus to a ground-level public transport interchange, improving waiting environment; and

- (vi) The types and scale of proposed social welfare facilities were not yet determined, but the Department would continue consulting with relevant departments to provide appropriate facilities for local and district needs.

16. Mr YIP Man-pan stated that over 90% of resident feedback opposed private residential development. The land had been zoned for “Government, Institution or Community” (G/IC) use for many years, and residents who purchased properties nearby did not anticipate private residential development next door, which was unfair to the property owners.

17. Ms SO Ka-man stated that while Tuen Mun had development potential with the development of Tuen Mun South Extension, three sites were already planned for the Light Public Housing (LPH). With increasing population, G/IC lands should not be used to meet private housing needs, whereas G/IC lands should serve Tuen Mun residents’ needs, such as building a multi-purpose community facility of several storeys, a sports centre, or a library, rather than reserving only a small portion for social welfare facilities after private residential development.

18. Mr FUNG Pui-yin pointed out that relocating outdoor bus stops and terminus to a ground-level public transport interchange might not improve waiting environment, citing reports of poor air quality at several covered bus stops in the Tuen Mun District. Furthermore, G/IC lands were already insufficient and should not be further reduced.

19. Mr IP Chun-yuen noted that the site was smaller than the site of Siu Tsui Court, questioning the availability of adding 500+ units. Regarding building height, adjacent housing estates had varying heights, and the Hong Kong Housing Authority specifically lowered Siu Tsui Court’s height during design stage. He hoped the Department would consider this aspect. In addition, he mentioned that owners’ committee members of Oceania Heights were present at the meeting and hoped that the Department would have more communication with them, as well as residents, before submission to the TPB.

20. Ms CHEUNG Ling-chi of the PlanD acknowledged receiving Members’ opinions and concerns, stating the information would be collated and discussed with relevant departments to consider minor adjustments and improvements to the development proposal.

21. Ms SO Ka-man stated that while the Government's plan to develop LPH in Tuen Mun Area 54 at least helped those in need, she could not agree with rezoning the G/IC land for private residential use. She believed the Department should not just make "minor adjustments" and emphasised Tuen Mun's longstanding shortage of community land, with the need for multi-storey community facilities to benefit district residents.

22. Mr Mac CHAN stated that the captioned paper used only one paragraph to broadly address how the development plan would not create insurmountable technical problems regarding traffic, environment, sewerage, drainage, water supply, visual impact, landscape, and ventilation. He believed the Department should provide more detailed information and questioned how conclusions about visual impact, landscape, and ventilation could be reached without housing estate design. He hoped the Department would consider Tuen Mun residents' overall quality of life, including recreational facilities and community support.

23. Mr KAM Man-fung stated that feasibility study was just numbers and did not represent actual impacts after implementation. For example, adding 500+ housing units would inevitably impact traffic significantly. Therefore, it was essential to reflect residents' important opinions, which were based on their living experiences, at the TMDC meeting. He asked the Department to clarify the current stage, as their first response indicated collecting opinions for the TPB, while the second mentioned "minor adjustments".

24. Mr YIP Man-pan mentioned that he had previously raised subsidence concern during Regency Bay's construction and asked whether the feasibility study or technical assessment had considered such issue. Regarding bus stop renovation, he pointed out that only air-conditioned bus stops would be welcomed, but beautifying bus stops had no direct relation to private residential development. He believed housing supply should not be increased through developing private residential project by making use of every single space.

25. Ms CHEUNG Ling-chi of the PlanD reiterated that the Government had been taking a multi-pronged approach to meet housing and other development needs, and after review, identified this site in Tuen Mun Area 16 as having potential for private housing development, with a feasibility study and a technical assessment confirming its suitability. Therefore, the Department first consulted the TMDC as the first step in the amendment process and would shortly submit the amendments to the TPB for consideration. If the TPB considered it appropriate, the proposal would be gazetted

and the statutory public consultation process would begin, during which residents or others could make representations.

26. Mr LAU Ngai-keung of Atkins China Limited acknowledged Members' concern about traffic. Regarding the traffic condition on Wong Chu Road, considering the time needed from construction to occupancy, it was expected that the Tuen Mun Bypass, once completed, would significantly alleviate traffic congestion on Wong Chu Road.

27. The Chairman acknowledged that while identifying land for housing development was a top priority for the Government, Members had clearly reflected local residents' opinions and had raised views about the development on the land in various occasions during previous terms of the TMDC. The Chairman hoped the PlanD would carefully consider opinions raised in the past and current meetings and fully reflect the information in the paper submitted to the TPB.

**(B) Proposal to Revitalise Tuen Mun River**  
**(TMDC Paper No. 43/2024)**

28. The Chairman welcomed Mr Frankie LEUNG, Senior Engineer, Project Management 4, and Mr Eric CHAN, Engineer, Project Management 6, of the Drainage Services Department (DSD); Mr Roy TSANG, Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional West) 1 of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD); and Mr CHAN Chi-wai, Executive Director, and Mr LAU Tsin-hein, Project Engineer, of AECOM Asia Co. Ltd., to the meeting.


29. Mr Frankie LEUNG of the DSD gave a brief presentation through PowerPoint slides (see annex 2) on the latest development of the study on revitalising the middle Tuen Mun River channel.

30. Mr CHAN Yau-hoi, the first proposer of the paper, stated that the Department's presentation had addressed several major concerns, including illegal sewer connection, river water purification, and maintaining water flow. The paper mainly aimed to revitalise Tuen Mun River to provide a leisure and comfortable environment for Tuen Mun residents. Currently, Pui To Road served as the major traffic connection between both sides of Tuen Mun River. He hoped that the Department would consider widening Choi Yee Bridge to facilitate traffic and enhance connection between both sides of the river. Furthermore, he hoped the Department would consider allowing residents to conduct recreational activities along



擬議修訂《屯門分區計劃大綱核准圖編號 S/TM/39》

屯門區議會會議  
2024 年 9 月 9 日

 規 劃 署  
Planning Department

修訂項目A - 背景

修訂項目 (A)：  
一幅位於屯門第16區輕鐵豐景園站以北的用地作私營房屋發展

- 現時為巴士站、巴士總站及美化市容地帶的空置用地
- 經工程評估，用地作私營房屋發展在技術上可行



修訂項目A - 背景

- 由「政府、機構或社區」地帶改劃為「住宅（甲類）29」地帶
- 現有巴士站及巴士總站將會在原址重置
- 附近發展主要為高密度私人住宅、公園及學校等



修訂項目A - 初步發展參數

擬議改劃面積	約 0.43 公頃
擬議總地積比率	6 倍
擬議樓宇高度	不高於主水平基準上 100 米
擬建單位數目	約 525 個
其他設施	社會福利設施、巴士總站

\*發展參數只供參考，擬議尚待詳細規劃及設計



修訂項目A - 技術評估

經一系列技術評估，擬議發展計劃在技術上可行，並在實施所需的緩解措施後，不會對周邊環境帶來無法克服的技術問題

**交通及運輸**

- 已進行交通及運輸影響評估，以確保發展計劃不會對整體交通及運輸帶來重大影響

**噪音**

- 實行噪音緩解措施，包括建築物後移、建築簷片及封閉式巴士總站設計等，以確保發展計劃不會對周邊環境造成噪音影響

**視覺及空氣流通**

- 擬議建築物高度與鄰近住宅發展項目相約，可大致保持視覺通透性
- 可透過在佈局上作適當樓宇分隔，以促進空氣流通，並盡量減少視覺等影響
- 將提供適當的園林及建築設計，為居民提供理想生活環境



下一步工作

歡迎各位議員對上述擬議《大綱圖》修訂項目提出意見。

議員提出的意見，會與修訂項目和政府部門的意見一併提交城規會轄下的鄉郊及新市鎮規劃小組委員會考慮，如小組委員會同意有關擬議修訂項目，城規會將根據《城市規劃條例》第 5 條展示涵蓋有關修訂項目的分區計劃大綱草案作公眾諮詢，為期兩個月，屆時，公眾人士可對修訂項目提出申述。

謝謝

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

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	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>	57.84 ha	61.20 ha	90.50 ha	+32.66 ha
Local Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons <sup>#</sup>	57.84 ha	101.73 ha	116.83 ha	+58.99 ha
Sports Centre	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	8	6	8	0
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)	2	2	3	+1
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms)	1 per 660,000 persons	0	1	1	+1

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	Requirement based on OZP 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  (assessed on a district basis)	2	3	3	+1
Kindergarten/ Nursery	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to 6	346 classrooms	416 classrooms	442 classrooms	+96 classrooms
Primary School	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11  (assessed by EDB on a district/school network basis)	959 classrooms	958 classrooms	994 classrooms	+35 classrooms
Secondary School	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17  (assessed by EDB on a territory-wide basis)	721 classrooms	951 classrooms	981 classrooms	+260 classrooms
Hospital	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons  (assessed by Hospital Authority on a regional/cluster basis)	3,284 beds	3,769 beds	3,769 beds	+485 beds

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	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)	5	3	5	0
Child Care Centre	100 aided places per 25,000 persons#  (assessed by SWD on a local basis)	2,313	527	727	-1586~  (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#  (assessed by SWD on a local basis)	7	13	13	+6
Integrated Family Services Centre	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons#  (assessed by SWD on a service boundary basis)	3	4	4	+1
District Elderly Community Centres	One in each new development area with a population of around 170,000 or above#  (assessed by SWD)	N.A.	2	2	N.A.~

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	Requirement based on OZP planned population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against planned provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Neighbourhood Elderly Centres	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.	9	13	N.A.~
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)	3,061 places	905 places	1,365 places	-1,696 places~
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)	3,790 beds	2,049 beds	2,529 beds	-1,261 beds~
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)	518 places	469 places	589 places	+71 places
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)	1,141 places	1,240 places	1,520 places	+379 places~

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	Requirement based on OZP planned population	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall against planned provision
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
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)	1,786 places	2,082 places	2,292 places	+506 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)	1	1	1	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)	1	1	1	0

Note:

The planned resident population in TM OZP is about 578,400. If including transients, the overall planned population is about 597,100. 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 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.