

**CONFIDENTIAL**

(downgraded on 17.9.2010)

**Minutes of 424<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Rural and New Town Planning Committee held on 27.8.2010**

**Tuen Mun & Yuen Long District**

[Ms. Amy Y.M. Cheung, District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long (DPO/TMYL), and Mr. C.C. Lau, Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long (STP/TMYL), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 26**

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the  
Draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/26  
(RNTPC Paper No. 8/10)

---

1. The Secretary reported that Mr. Rock C.N. Chen and Dr. C.P. Lau had declared interests in this item as they owned properties in Tuen Mun area. The Committee noted that Mr. Chen had tendered apology for not attending the meeting. Since the property of Dr. Lau would not be affected by the proposed amendments to the Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

2. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. C.C. Lau, STP/TMYL, presented the proposed amendments to the Tuen Mun OZP as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

(a) as detailed in paragraph 4.1 and Appendix B of the Paper, proposed amendments to the OZP were summarised as follows:

(i) Amendment Item A – a review had been undertaken to examine the existing free-standing purpose-designed public utility facilities which were subsumed within the residential zones and with their own land

allocation/grant. To accord with the current planning practice of zoning existing uses individually which were previously included in some broad zoning and aligning with the land allocation/grant boundaries, it was proposed to rezone the Tsun Wen Road electricity substation (ESS), Tai Hing ESS and Electricity Rectifier Station to the northwest of West Rail Siu Hong Station from “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) to “Other Specified Use” (“OU”) annotated “ESS”, stipulating with building height (BH) restrictions of one to two storeys (excluding basements) to reflect the existing as-built conditions. Moreover, the telephone exchange at the junction of Shek Pai Tau Road/Ming Kum Road was proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)” to “OU (Telephone Exchange)” with a BH restriction of four storeys (excluding basements) to reflect the existing as-built conditions;

- (ii) Amendment Item B – various zoning amendments were proposed to reflect the existing public open spaces and GIC facilities in Tuen Mun New Town in accordance with the land allocation boundaries and existing situations. Relevant BH restrictions were also stipulated for those sites rezoned to “Government, Institution or Community” mainly to reflect the as-built conditions;
- (iii) Amendment Item C – zoning amendments were proposed consequential to the incorporation of road schemes for the ‘Traffic Improvements to Tuen Mun Road Town Centre Section’ and the ‘Reconstruction and Improvement of Tuen Mun Road’, which were authorized by the Chief Executive in Council under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance on 31.3.2009 and 15.1.2008 respectively. The projects mainly involved re-alignment of Tuen Mun Road to current expressway standard, provision of hard shoulders/verges and installation of noise barriers. As a result of the re-alignment, corresponding zoning adjustments to the abutting land uses were required;

- (b) as detailed in paragraph 4.2 and Appendix C of the Paper, proposed amendments to the Notes of the Plan were summarised as follows:

Revision to the plot ratio (PR) restriction for the “OU (Power Station)” zone

- the Castle Peak Power Station (CPPS), which fell within the “OU (Power Station)” zone, was subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 141 903m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BH of 85 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) on the current OZP. During the exhibition period of the current OZP No. S/TM/26, the Castle Peak Power Company Limited submitted a representation against, among others, the GFA restriction for the “OU (Power Station)” zone mainly for the reason that the stipulated maximum GFA did not reflect the existing buildings and could not accommodate the planned projects for the CPPS. On 4.6.2010, the Town Planning Board agreed to the Planning Department (PlanD)’s request to defer the hearing of the representation as more time was required for PlanD to review the restriction on the development intensity of the subject site, in association with relevant bureaux and departments, including the Environment Bureau (ENB), regarding the PRs for existing and committed building structures and planned projects related to the CPPS;
- the GFA restriction for the “OU (Power Station)” zone on the current OZP was based on the latest draft Master Layout Plan (MLP) for the CPPS as required under the lease of the site, reflecting both existing developments and committed developments with recent building plans approval. In view of the fact that records on the existing buildings/ structures were incomplete and the floor area indicated on the MLP was meant for premium calculation which did not fully tally with the assessment of floor area by the Buildings Department (BD), the Authorized Person had recently verified the existing floor area for CPPS on which BD had no objection. The PR for the existing and committed developments was about 0.9;
- according to the ENB, some planned facilities were required to be

provided in the CPPS for possible additional emission abatement measures in a timely manner for future improvement in emission performance of CPPS as regards air pollutants and greenhouse gas. The PR for these planned facilities was 1.0. ENB had provided a planning assessment and justification for the expansion of CPPS which concluded that the planned facilities were acceptable in environmental, traffic and visual impact terms, and would represent an optimal use of the site;

- in view of the above, the current development restriction of the “OU (Power Station)” zone at a maximum GFA of 141 903m<sup>2</sup> was proposed to be revised to a maximum PR of 1.9. Other restrictions on the current OZP for the subject zone, including BH, remained unchanged;

Incorporation of a set of Notes for the “OU (Telephone Exchange)” zone

- a set of new Notes for the “OU (Telephone Exchange)” zone with BH restriction and minor relaxation clause was proposed;
- (c) opportunity was taken to revise the Explanatory Statement of the OZP as detailed in Appendix D of the Paper to take into account the proposed amendments and reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP; and
- (d) comments of the concerned Government bureaux and departments had been incorporated into the proposed amendments as appropriate. To avoid pre-mature release of the development control information, the Tuen Mun District Council would be consulted on the amendments to the OZP during the exhibition period of the draft Tuen Mun OZP under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance.

3. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TM/26 and that Amendment Plan No. S/TM/26A at Appendix B (to be renumbered as S/TM/27 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Appendix C of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance;
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Appendix D of the Paper as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for the various land use zonings of the OZP and to be issued under the name of the Board; and
- (c) agree that the revised ES was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP and its Notes.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Amy Y.M. Cheung, DPO/TMYL, and Mr. C.C. Lau, STP/TMYL, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms. Cheung and Mr. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

**Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District**

[Mr. W.K. Hui, District Planning Officer/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), Ms. Lisa L.S. Cheng, Senior Town Planner/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (STP/STN), Mr. William W.T. Wong, Town Planner/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (TP/STN), and Ms. Una Wang, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 27**

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the  
Approved Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TP/21  
(RNTPC Paper No. 9/10)

---

4. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) involved public housing sites and the following Members had declared interests for this item :

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Mr. Jimmy Leung<br>as the Director of Planning                               | – being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) of Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA); |
| Mr. Alan Lo<br>as the Assistant Director of the Lands Department             | – being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA;                   |
| Mr. Andrew Tsang<br>as the Assistant Director of the Home Affairs Department | – being an alternate member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC of HKHA; |
| Professor Edwin H.W. Chan,<br>Dr. W.K. Lo                                    | – being members of the Building Committee of HKHA; and  |
| Mr. Y.K. Cheng   | – spouse was a Chief Architect of Housing Department.   |

5. The Committee noted that Mr. Andrew Tsang and Professor Edwin H.W. Chan had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting. As this item was for the consideration of proposed amendments to an OZP and related to the plan-making process, the Committee agreed that in accordance with the Town Planning Board (the Board)'s established practice,

the Chairman and the other Members with interests declared could stay at the meeting and participate in the discussion. However, if representations on the proposed amendments to public housing sites were received, Members having declared interests with HKHA would need to withdraw from the meeting during the consideration of representations.

6. The Secretary also reported that Dr. W.K. Lo and Dr. W.K. Yau had owned properties in Tai Po which were subject to the proposed amendments. The Committee considered their interests direct and should withdraw from the meeting for this item.

[Dr. W.K. Lo and Dr. W.K. Yau left the meeting at this point.]

7. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation and a fly-through simulation, Ms. Lisa L.S. Cheng, STP/STN, briefed Members on the proposed amendments to the draft Tai Po OZP as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points :

Imposition of Plot Ratio/Gross Floor Area (PR/GFA) Restrictions

*Coverage of PR/GFA restrictions:*

- (a) it was proposed to impose PR/GFA restrictions on all the development zones currently without such restrictions in the OZP with the following exceptions :
  - (i) the “Village Type Development” zone as New Territories Exempted Houses were already restricted to 3 storeys (8.23m) and a maximum area of 65.03m<sup>2</sup> under the Buildings Ordinance (Application to the New Territories) Ordinance;
  - (ii) the “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) zones pertaining to recreational facilities and utility installations, such as petrol filling station, sewage/leachate treatment works, bus depot and public golf course, as such developments were mainly purpose-designed public projects agreed by the Board when the zone was designated and the scope for increasing development intensity without changing the BH was

limited;

- (iii) the historical sites because all alteration or addition works would require planning permission from the Board. However, for “OU” zones related to residential/business developments and industrial estates, PR/GFA restrictions would be imposed as for other development zones; and
- (iv) the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone as the developments mainly involved low-density purpose-designed buildings of different scale. However, recognising their urban design and air ventilation benefits, building height (BH) restrictions for the “G/IC” zone were proposed;

*Proposed PR/GFA restrictions for “Residential” zones:*

- (b) proposed PR/GFA restrictions for the “Residential” zones were detailed in paragraphs 5.3 to 5.10 of the Paper;
- (c) in general, the administrative PR control of 5 for domestic and 9.5 for non-domestic (5/9.5) was proposed for the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone, which followed the density standard for new towns in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, except for certain scheme-specific cases such as those developments approved by the Board through planning applications. For this type of scheme, a sub-zone specifying the GFA restrictions would be made. Moreover, in order to avoid further increase in development intensity and building bulk, for those existing developments with PR less than 5/9.5, their existing PR would be taken as the maximum PR for the subject sub-zones;
- (d) while the proposed maximum PR restriction of 5/9.5 for those public housing sites under the “R(A)” zoning was higher than their existing PRs, the PR restriction represented the maximum permissible density for the public housing sites and the actual development intensity would be guided



by planning brief taking account of local circumstances, infrastructure capacity, air ventilation and urban design considerations. As most of the public housing sites were quite sizeable, the PR should be calculated on the basis of the net site area;

- (e) a PR restriction of 3.3 was proposed for the “R(B)” zone. For those existing developments with PR less than 3.3, their PR would be restricted to the existing PR as specified in the respective sub-zones, except for the Richwood Park in Area 30 (to be rezoned to “R(B)7”) which would be stipulated with GFA restrictions to accord with the scheme previously approved by the Board;
- (f) PR/GFA restrictions had already imposed on the “R(C)” and “R(C)1” to “R(C)5” zones which generally reflected the restrictions laid down in the departmental layout plans. It was proposed to retain the current PR/GFA restrictions on the OZP for these zones;

*Proposed PR/GFA restrictions for “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) zone:*

- (g) the “CDA(1)” zone covered a site to the south of the Fung Yuen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Apart from retaining the current PR restriction of 0.64 for this zone under the current OZP, BH restrictions and non-building areas (NBAs) were proposed to reflect the scheme previously approved by the Board;

*Proposed PR/GFA restrictions for “OU (Business)” and “OU (Industrial Estate)” zones:*

- (h) a PR restriction of 9.5 was proposed for the “OU (Business)” zone. For the “OU (Industrial Estate)” zone covering Tai Po Industrial Estate, a maximum total GFA of 2 023 274m<sup>2</sup> (which generally accorded with the lease restrictions) was proposed;

*Proposed PR/GFA restrictions for “Recreation Priority Area” (“RPA”) zone:*

- (i) the “RPA” zone covered a site in Tai Po Kau which had been developed into Kerry Lake Egret Nature Park (KLENP) and a residential development (known as Constellation Cove). The Constellation Cove was subsequently rezoned to “R(C)” subject to a PR of 0.6. As the KLENP was subject to a maximum GFA of 3 300m<sup>2</sup> under the lease, it was proposed to incorporate the same GFA restriction in the Notes for the “RPA” zone. Apart from GFA restriction, NBA was also proposed for the area covering the existing playground and open landscaped area of the KLENP. A maximum BH of 2 storeys was proposed for the boat club and recreation buildings;
- (j) the zoning boundary of the “RPA” zone was proposed to be adjusted to cover only the portion granted to the operator of KLENP under a short term tenancy. For the existing Tai Po Kau Park, it was proposed to be rezoned from “RPA” to “Open Space” to tally with its current use and allocation boundary. The area taken up by the pond and the surrounding vegetated slopes were proposed to be rezoned from “RPA” to “Green Belt”;

*The Restrictions and Minor Relaxation Clause:*

- (k) in case the existing development intensity had exceeded the proposed PR/GFA restrictions, the existing development intensity would be respected. A clause would be incorporated in the Notes of the OZP stating that upon redevelopment, the existing PR/GFAs could be retained if the lot was redeveloped for the same type of building as the existing building. Hence, it was envisaged that there would be no loss of existing PR/GFAs for existing developments as a result of the imposition of development intensity restrictions in the OZP. Since the existing development intensity had already exceeded the optimal intensity proposed, there was a general presumption against application for minor relaxation except under exceptional circumstances;

## Imposition of BH Restrictions

### *The Need for BH control:*

- (l) the majority of areas in the OZP were not subject to statutory height controls. With the growing community concern on the quality of the built-environment, the stipulation of BH restrictions on the OZP was considered a more effective measure to regulate the development height profile of an area and to set out the planning intention clearly and transparent for public scrutiny;

### *Local wind environment and AVA:*

- (m) an AVA by expert evaluation (EE) for the Tai Po OZP area (the Area) was undertaken (the AVA report was at Attachment V of the Paper) to assess the likely impacts of the proposed BH and PR restrictions of development sites within the Area on the pedestrian wind environment;
- (n) the annual prevailing wind of the Area mainly came from the east and north directions, and the summer wind from the east and the south. For most of the time, the Area was dominated by the prevailing wind coming from the east. Two valley wind systems could also be identified from the north and the south;
- (o) recommendations of the AVA were detailed in paragraph 6.4.4 of the Paper. The study results indicated that, with careful design and disposition of buildings, the proposed BH and PR restrictions would not result in adverse air ventilation issue for the Area. To enhance the air path network for better air ventilation, a number of breezeways and non-building areas/ low-rise building areas were suggested;

### *Guiding principles for formulating BH restrictions:*

- (p) apart from relevant considerations such as PR restrictions, existing

topography, the settings, local character/attractions, existing land uses and BHs, local wind environment and ventilation improvement measures, and broad urban design principles set out in Chapter 11 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the following guiding principles had been considered in formulating the BH restrictions :

- the proposed height profile should respect the existing land uses, townscape and character of the New Town and the BH of individual developments approved by the TPB;
  - adopting stepped height profile descending from the Urban Core to the peripheral areas;
  - introduce height gradation and/or variation in Tai Po Hui and Central Area to reflect the focal point character of the two town centres;
  - maintaining the low-rise profile of “G/IC” sites in various part of the New Town as visual and spatial relief as well as breathing space;
  - preserving the existing green belt and open space buffers and enhance them with new air paths or view corridors where appropriate; and
  - compatibility with the character of the neighbourhood and to allow variations in BHs;
- (q) to provide certainty and clarity, the proposed BH restrictions for residential development sites zoned “R(A)”, “CDA(1)” and “OU” zone were specified in terms of metres above Principal Datum (mPD). For the majority of “R(B)” and “R(C)” sites which covered mainly low-rise residential developments, number of storeys would be applied to preserve the local character and existing BH profile;
- (r) the “G/IC” and “OU” developments would be subject to BH restrictions in terms of number of storeys to allow more design flexibility. However, for those GIC facilities located at visually prominent locations, a more stringent height control in terms of mPD was proposed to minimize their visual impact to the scenic areas;

- (s) for development zones with BH restriction to be introduced for the purpose of air ventilation and visual impact, basement floor(s) might be disregarded in determining the number of storeys for BH;
- (t) for those existing developments with height exceeding the proposed BH restrictions, their existing BH would be respected. Minor relaxation of the restrictions would be allowed on individual merits to cater for design flexibility and site constraints through the planning permission system. However, for any existing building with BH already exceeding the BH restrictions, there was a general presumption against such application for minor relaxation except under exceptional circumstances;

#### Overall BH Concept

- (u) the overall BH height concept for the new town was illustrated in Plan 14 of the Paper. It reflected the existing predominant BH profile stepping down from the Urban Core towards the Urban Fringe and lower hillslope areas, with varying BHs in Tai Po Hui and Central Area along the river channel. The low-rise character of developments in the peripheral areas was to be preserved and to integrate with the natural terrain and topography.

#### Proposed BH Restrictions for “Residential”, “OU (Industrial Estate)” and “OU (Business)” Zones

- (v) the proposed BH restrictions for the “Residential”, “OU (Industrial Estate)” and “OU (Business)” zones were shown at Plans 15a to 15d of the Paper. The effects of the proposed BH restrictions were demonstrated by photomontages at Plans 17a to 17e of the Paper. In general, the proposed height restrictions reflected the majority of the existing buildings/committed proposals. The proposed height restrictions for the four sub-areas in Tai Po were detailed in paragraphs 6.12 to 6.23 of the Paper and highlighted below:

*Urban Core:*

- for this sub-area located at the centre of the New Town, a stepped-down BH profile would be adopted with BHs descending from the highest ceiling of 110mPD to the Urban Fringe areas. For Tai Po Kau Hui, a maximum BH of 80mPD was proposed to reflect the predominant existing BH of developments and provide height variation along the periphery of the Urban Core;
- variation in height bands was proposed for the Central Area where major shopping facilities were found. A maximum BH of 110mPD was proposed for Tai Po Plaza, descending to 60mPD to the west and 70mPD to the east;

*Industrial Estate:*

- being the entrance for the prevailing east wind, two height bands of 70mPD and 40mPD were proposed;

*Urban Fringe:*

- the Urban Fringe sub-area covered mainly the “R(B)” and “R(C)” sites. The proposed maximum BH restrictions for “R(B)” sites were detailed in paragraph 6.20 of the Paper, ranging from 5 to 13 storeys (excluding basements), except a maximum BH of 70mPD for Serenity Park of which the existing BHs were 22 to 23 storeys;
- the current BH restrictions for “R(C)2” to “R(C)5” zones in terms of number of storeys were proposed to be retained. As for other “R(C)” sites without BH restrictions, BH restrictions ranging from 2 to 10 storeys (excluding basements) were proposed, which were detailed in paragraph 6.21 of the Paper;
- the “R(A)” site for Riviera Lodge, the “OU (Business)” site for industrial buildings and the “CDA(1)” site for Fung Yuen comprehensive development were also within this sub-area. They

were proposed to be subject to maximum BHs of 110mPD, 70mPD and 17 to 28 storeys (excluding basements) respectively;

*Rural Hinterland and Upland Hill Areas:*

- only two “R(C)” sites and rural settlements zoned “V” fell within this sub-area. A maximum BH of 4 storeys (excluding basements) was proposed for the “R(C)” sites;

Proposed BH Restrictions for “G/IC” and Other “OU” Zones

- (w) the proposed BH restrictions for the “G/IC” and other “OU” zones were detailed in paragraphs 6.24 to 6.28 of the Paper, stipulated either in terms of number of storeys or mPD based on the scale of developments;

Designation of NBAs on the OZP

- (x) the proposed NBAs, which were illustrated on Plan A-1 of the Paper, included the following:
  - a 20m-wide strip of NBA across the northern part of Fu Shin Estate connecting to On Po Road;
  - one-storey BH restriction for a 20m-wide strip of land in Tai Yuen Estate; and
  - 3-storey BH restriction for a 15m-wide strip of land in Kwong Fuk Estate.
- (y) the above BH restrictions and NBA requirements would not apply to underground developments. Moreover, a minor relaxation clause for BH and NBA restrictions would be incorporated in the Notes of the relevant zones to allow flexibility under exceptional circumstances;

Land Use Review of the “Commercial/Residential” (“C/R”) Zone

- (z) the two “C/R” zones in the Town Centre, namely, Tai Po Hui and Uptown Plaza (a residential development to the immediate south of Tai Po Market Station), were proposed to be rezoned as detailed in paragraphs 8.2.1(i)-(o) and 8.2.2 of the Paper, which was in line with the principles recommended in the Metroplan Review;

*Tai Po Hui:*

- (i) noting that the characteristics of most of the developments in Tai Po Hui were similar to “R(A)” type development, the area was proposed to be rezoned from “C/R” to “R(A)”, except those sites currently occupied by open spaces or free-standing GIC facilities. The proposed “R(A)” zoning for Tai Po Hui would still preserve the traditional shopping/market street characters of the area as commercial uses were always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building;
- (ii) to take forward the planning intention of the layout plan for Tai Po Hui, a PR restriction of 5/9.5 was proposed for all the “R(A)” sites in this area. For those sites with existing PR lower than 5, increase in development intensity up to the maximum PR of 5/9.5 upon their redevelopment would be permitted. The possible increase in development intensity would not have adverse impact on the infrastructural support which had already been catered for under the layout plan. For those sites with existing PR higher than 5/9.5, their existing development intensity would be respected. The existing PR could be retained if the site was redeveloped for the same type of building as the existing building;
- (iii) taking into account recommendations of the AVA, existing and maximum BHs permitted under the leases and the proposed PR/GFA restrictions, three height bands in a range of 55mPD, 65mPD and



80mPD were proposed for the Tai Po Hui;

*Uptown Plaza:*

- (iv) the site had been developed in the form of an “R(A)” type development containing six residential towers above a commercial podium and public transport interchange (PTI) at ground level. It was proposed to rezone the site from “C/R” to “R(A)8” subject to a maximum domestic PR of 4.4 and a maximum non-domestic PR of 1.82 based on the lease conditions and as-built situation. The PTI at the site had been included in the non-domestic PR calculation;

Rezoning of Free-standing GIC Facilities within Public Housing Sites

- (aa) it was proposed to rezone free-standing GIC facilities (e.g. schools, community centres/halls) within the public housing estates from “R(A)” to “G/IC”, where appropriate, to truly reflect the planning intention of keeping them for GIC uses in future. The rezoning proposals were detailed in paragraph 9.1 of the Paper;
- (bb) there were some free-standing GIC buildings located in the middle of the housing estates. Rezoning was not proposed for these buildings to provide flexibility in planning upon the redevelopment of the estates. However, sites occupied by these free-standing GIC buildings should be excluded from the PR calculation;

Rezoning of a Site at Po Heung Street for Public Housing Development

- (cc) a site at Po Heung Street (about 0.54 ha) was proposed to be rezoned from “G/IC”, “C/R” and “OU (Kowloon Canton Railway)” to “R(A)1” for public housing development subject to a maximum domestic GFA of 25 220m<sup>2</sup>, a maximum non-domestic GFA of 8 000m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BH of 80mPD;

### Other Rezoning Proposals

- (dd) other rezoning proposals were mainly to reflect development proposals, existing/committed uses, provide clearer planning intention and rationalize zoning boundaries, which were detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper. One of the major proposals was to rezone Island House from “OU (Open Space, Existing Building to be Preserved for GIC Use)” to “OU (Historical Sites Preserved for GIC Uses)” stipulating with a maximum BH of 2 storeys to reflect the existing use and as-built condition. The site was a declared monument currently occupied by WWF Hong Kong as a Conservation Studies Centre. To better preserve the monument, a set of Notes had been prepared for the subject “OU” zone to stipulate that any new development, except alteration and/or modification to the existing and new structure(s) for facilities that were ancillary and directly related to the always permitted uses, required permission from the Board;

### Major Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (ee) the proposed amendments to the Notes were summarized in Attachment X of the Paper, including the incorporation of PR/GFA and BH restrictions in various development zones; deletion of the Notes for the “C/R” zone; and incorporation of Notes for the new zones;
- (ff) the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP had been revised to take into account the proposed amendments to the OZP and to include a set of criteria for the consideration of minor relaxation in BH restrictions. Opportunity had also been taken to update the general information for the various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP. The object of the OZP had also been revised to set out clearly the principle that slopes and access roads with no building rights should be excluded from PR and site coverage calculations. Details of the amendments were given in Attachment III of the Paper; and

Public Consultation

(gg) to avoid pre-mature release of the development control information, the Tai Po District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft Tai Po OZP under section 5 of the Ordinance.

8. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. W.K. Hui, DPO/STN, said that the AVA undertaken for the proposed PR/GFA/BH restrictions was in the form of Expert Evaluation (EE) which was a kind of qualitative assessment. This Member asked whether quantitative assessment by wind tunnel test or Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) study would be undertaken at a later stage. Ms. Una Wang of AVA Consultants pointed out that wind tunnel test was more suitable for small-scale development proposals whereas CFD study was not technically reliable. The Secretary supplemented that this issue of whether CFD was suitable for area-wide study had been previously considered in connection with the OZP review exercise. As the area covered by an OZP was very large, and the proposed BH restrictions mostly in the form of height bands were broad-brush in nature, to conduct an AVA by CFD study was neither practical nor desirable.

9. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TP/21 and that Amendment Plan No. S/TP/21A at Attachment I (to be renumbered as S/TP/22 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance;
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment III of the Paper as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for the various land use zonings of the OZP and to be issued under the name of the Board ; and
- (c) agree that the revised ES was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP and its Notes.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. W.K. Hui, DPO/STN, Ms. Lisa L.S. Cheng, STP/STN, Mr. William W.T. Wong, TP/STN and Ms. Una Wang, AVA Consultant, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They all left the meeting at this point.]