

**Minutes of 1074th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on
27.11.2014, 11.12.2014, 18.12.2014 and 14.1.2015**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Professor S.C. Wong

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Dr C.P. Lau

Ms Julia M.K. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Dr W.K. Yau

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Planning)/ Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), Environmental Protection Department

Mr Victor W.T. Yeung/Mr Ken Y.K. Wong

Assistant Director/Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Eric K.S. Hui/Mr Frankie W.P. Chou/Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing

Ms Winnie M.W. Wong

Director of Lands/ Deputy Director of Lands (General)/Assistant Director/Regional 3, Lands Department

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn/Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam/Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Director of Planning

Mr K.K. Ling

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor P.P. Ho

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H. T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H. F. Leung

Dr Eugene K.K. Chan

Mr Francis T.K. Ip

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam (27.11.2014 , 11.12.2014 (pm), 18.12.2014(am) and 14.1.2015(am))

Mr Louis K.H. Kau (11.12.2014 (am) and 18.12.2014(am))

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng (27.11.2014)

Ms Doris S.Y. Ting (11.12.2014 (am))

Mr K.K. Lee (11.12.2014 (pm))

Mr Raymond Au (18.12.2014(am))

Mr T.C. Cheng (18.12.2014 (pm))

Mr J. J. Austin (14.1.2015)

1. The following members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 27.11.2014:

Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Dr C.P. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Dr W.K. Yau

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Director of Planning

Mr K.K. Ling

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Planning)

Environment Protection Department

Mr Victor W.T. Yeung

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

1. There was no matter arising to report.

Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TP/25

(TPB Paper No. 9796)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

2. The Chairman said that the Town Planning Board (the Board) had agreed that the representations and comments in respect of the Draft Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TP/25 would be heard in two groups. The meeting on the day was for the presentation and question sessions of the Group 1 hearing, and the deliberation session would be held after completion of the presentation and question sessions of both Groups 1 and 2.

Group 1 Hearing

(Representations No. R6 (part) to R1273 (part), R1274 to R1323, R1324 (part), R1326 (part), R1625 (part), R6322(part) and Comments No. C2 (part) to C79 (part))

3. The following Members had declared interests in the Group 1 hearing for having association with the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) (as the representations to be considered under Group 1 were in respect of the proposed public housing development by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of

the HKHA) and/or having business dealings with Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (Sun Hung Kai) which was the mother company of Honour More Limited that had submitted representation No. R1274:

- Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong - being a member of HKHA and Chairman of the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA

- Professor P.P. Ho - being a member of the Building Committee of HKHA

- Mr H.F. Leung - being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA and having business dealings with HKHA

- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - being a member of the Commercial Properties Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA; and having business dealings with Sun Hung Kai

- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam } having business dealings with HKHA and
Ms Janice W.M. Lai } Sun Hung Kai
Mr Patrick H.T. Lau }

- Mr K.K. Ling - being a member of the Strategic Planning
(*as Director of Planning*) Committee and the Building Committee of HKHA

- Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn - being a member of HKHA
(*as Director of Lands*)

- Mr Eric K.S. Hui - being a representative of the Director of
(*as Assistant Director,* Home Affairs who was a member of the
Home Affairs Strategic Planning Committee and

- Department)* Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA
- Miss Winnie M.W. Wong - being a representative of the Secretary for
(*as Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing*) Transport and Housing who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee of HKHA
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having business dealings with Sun Hung Kai
- Dr W.K. Yau - being the executive member of the Tai Po Rural Committee (TPRC) as the Chairman of TPRC had submitted representation No. R1326

These interests were direct.

4. In addition, the following Members had also declared interests. The interests of those Members owning properties in Tai Po were indirect as their properties were far from the representation site:

- Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong - owning a flat and car parking spaces at Deerhill Bay with his spouse
- Mr H.W. Cheung - owning a flat at Heung Sze Wui Street in Tai Po
- Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung - owning a flat in On Chee Road in Tai Po
- Dr W.K. Yau - owning a flat and a shop at Kwong Fuk Road and a house and land at Cheung Shue Tan in Tai Po; and being the Chairman of the Management Committee of the Fung Yuen Butterfly Reserve/Fung

Yuen Nature and Culture Education Centre as R17 had indicated that the housing development would affect the Fung Yuen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

Dr Eugene K.K. Chan - being Convenor (Dr Chan)/Secretary
Ms Christina M. Lee General (Ms Lee) of the Hong Kong Metropolitan Sports Event Association that had obtained sponsorship from Sun Hung Kai

[Mr K.K. Ling left the meeting temporarily and Dr W.K. Yau left the meeting at this point.]

5. Members noted that the above Members who had declared direct interests were not invited to the Group 1 hearing or had left the meeting. Members agreed that the above Members who had declared remote or indirect interests should be allowed to stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

Written Submission from Ms H.F. Cheng dated 26.11.2014

6. The Secretary reported that on 26.11.2014, the Secretariat received a written submission from Ms H.F. Cheng objecting to the Board's decision to rule that the comment she submitted (comment No. 440) was invalid.

7. On 24.10.2014, the Board considered the Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for the Consideration of Representations and Comments in relation to the Draft Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/25. At the meeting, the Board noted that C440 objected to designation of Block Government Lease land for any village type developments. As the comment was not related to any representation or the subject of amendment, the Board agreed that the comment should be considered as invalid and should be treated as not having been made.

8. In the written submission dated 26.11.2014, Ms Cheng claimed that the comment she submitted was relevant to all outline zoning plans where Block Government Lease land was involved and requested that her written submission be included in the minutes of this meeting. Her written submission dated 26.11.2014 covered points similar to those in the original comment, which the Board had ruled to be invalid. In particular, both submissions were concerned with details of the Block Government Lease and the alleged contradictions with the Small House Policy.

9. Members noted the written submission made by Ms Cheng on 26.11.2014 and agreed to maintain its decision that C440 should be considered as invalid.

10. As sufficient notice had been given to the representers/commenters to invite them to attend the meeting, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in the absence of the other representers/commenters who had indicated that they would not attend or had made no reply.

11. The following representatives of Planning Department (PlanD) and representers and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr C.K. Soh - District Planning Officer/Shai Tin, Tai Po and North, PlanD (DPO/STN)

Mr C.T. Lau - Senior Town Planner/Tai Po, PlanD

Mr K.L. Wong - Engineer/Tai Po, Transport Department (TD)

Mr K.T. Chan - Nature Conservation Officer/Tai Po, Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

R12 - Mary Mulvihill

- Representer

Ms Mary Mulvihill

R14 - Designing Hong Kong Limited

Mr Paul Zimmerman - Representers' representative

R1074 – Ho Ka Po

Ms Ho Ka Po - Representer

R1133 – Lee Shuk Fun

Ms Lee Shuk Fun - Representer

R1152 – Chris Siu

Mr Chris Siu - Representer

R1274 – Honour More Limited

Mr Robert H.K. Chan]
Ms Winnie W.Y. Wu] Representers' representatives
Mr P.L. Chu]
Mr K.W. Mok]

12. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. The Chairman said that the hearing would be conducted under two groups. The Group 1 hearing was to be held on the day and was for consideration of the representations relating to the public housing development at Tai Po Area 9 in respect of Amendment Items A1 to A5. The Group 2 hearing, for consideration of representations relating to sites rezoned for private residential developments, had been scheduled for other days.

13. The Chairman said that as a large number of representers and commenters had indicated that they would attend the hearing, it was necessary to limit the time for making oral submissions. The Board agreed on 24.10.2014 that each representer/commenter or their representatives should be allotted 10 minutes for their oral presentation. The representers and commenters had been informed about this arrangement before the meeting. There was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters and their representatives, 2

minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire, and when the allotted 10-minute time limit was up.

14. The Chairman said that after the oral submissions, there would be a question and answer session. If needed, there would be a short break in the morning session and/or lunch break. The Board would deliberate on the representations after completion of the presentation and question sessions for both Groups 1 and 2. He then invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the representations.

15. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr C.K. Soh (DPO/STN) made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

Background

- (a) on 11.4.2014, the Draft Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TP/25 (the Plan) was exhibited under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The amendments were mainly to rezone sites from “Green Belt” (“GB”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to residential uses for both public and private housing. During the exhibition of the Plan and publication of the representations, 6,322 valid representations and 439 valid comments were received;

Strategy in Increasing Land Supply

- (b) it was stated in the 2013 Policy Address that the Government would adopt a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply to meet the housing and other development needs of Hong Kong. The 2014 Policy Address reaffirmed that the Government would continue to review various land uses and rezone sites as appropriate for residential use;
- (c) the review of “GB” sites (“GB” review) comprised two stages. In the first stage “GB” review completed in 2012, PlanD mainly identified and reviewed areas zoned “GB” that were devegetated, deserted or formed.

The 2013 Policy Address announced that PlanD was conducting the next stage of “GB” review, with the purpose of releasing more sites for housing development. The second stage “GB” review considered those vegetated “GB” sites with a relatively lower buffer or conservation value and adjacent to existing transport and infrastructure facilities;

- (d) in reviewing the suitability of developing “GB” zones, relevant considerations including transport and infrastructure capacity, provision of community facilities and open space, appropriate development restrictions, local character and existing development intensity, potential environmental, visual and air ventilation impacts were taken into account;
- (e) concerned government departments would examine if the development would bring about significant adverse impacts on the surroundings and if necessary, technical assessments would be carried out to ascertain these impacts and devise mitigating measures to minimise the potential impacts;
- (f) six sites in Tai Po had been identified for rezoning from “GB” for private residential developments to provide about 4,175 flats and three sites at Chung Nga Road (CNR) and Tai Po Area 9 were identified for a comprehensive public housing development to provide about 6,350 flats. The total flat production was tentatively estimated to be 10,525 flats;
- (g) the 2014 Policy Address also announced that except for the north of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon Peninsula, which were more densely populated, the Government considered it feasible to generally increase the maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) currently permitted for the other “density zones” in the territory by up to 20% as planning terms allowed;
- (h) the maximum PR for most of Tai Po New Town fell within Density Zone 2 (i.e. PR of 5). As announced in the Policy Address, in general a PR of 6 for Tai Po was proposed for the high-density residential sites

identified. For the low-density zone with PR of less than 1, consideration could be given to increasing the PR by 100% subject to confirmation on traffic and infrastructural capacities and no adverse impact on local characteristics and the surrounding environment;

Local Consultation

- (i) prior to the submission of the proposed amendments to the Plan for consideration by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC), the Environment, Housing and Works Committee (EHWC) of Tai Po District Council (TPDC) was consulted on 8.1.2014 and 13.2.2014 on the proposed rezonings. For rezoning of the site at Lo Fai Road, PlanD also met with a Tai Po District Council (TPDC) member and joint representatives from the owners incorporations of the five residential estates at Lo Fai Road on 4.3.2014 to explain the amendments to the OZP;
- (j) during the exhibition period of the Plan, representatives of PlanD, TD, AFCD and District Office/Tai Po (DO/TP) attended a meeting with owners' incorporations of the five residential estates at Lo Fai Road on 3.5.2014 to exchange views on the proposed residential development under Amendment Item E and the potential impacts. The EHWC of TPDC was further consulted at its meeting held on 14.5.2014 on the gazetted amendments;

Representations to be considered under Group 1

- (k) the Group 1 hearing was for consideration of 1,322 representations (R6(Part) to R1273 (Part), R1274 to R1323, R1324 (Part), R1326 (Part), R1625(Part) and R6322 (Part)) and 78 comments (C2 (Part) to C79 (Part)). These representations were related to rezoning of three sites in Tai Po Area 9 and CNR for a public housing development (the Site);
- (l) the Site was located in the northern fringe of Tai Po New Town

composing of three portions, namely, the CNR east (CNRE) site and CNR west (CNRW) site on both sides of CNR as well as an area previously reserved for private hospital development and its adjacent vacant government land to the north of Tai Po Hospital in Tai Po Area 9. The Site, about 9.6 ha, was proposed for a comprehensive public housing development to provide a total of about 6,350 flats, two schools, retail and various social welfare facilities. The relevant amendment items were:

- (i) Amendment Items A1 and A2 to rezone two sites in Tai Po Area 9 and the CNRE site from “GB” and “G/IC” to “Residential (Group A)9” (“R(A)9”) (Sites A1 and A2 respectively);
 - (ii) Amendment Items A3 and A4 to rezone the CNRW site from “GB” and “G/IC” to “R(A)9” (Sites A3 and A4 respectively); and
 - (iii) Amendment Item A5 to rezone an area located between the CNRE site and CNRW site from “G/IC” to an area shown as ‘Road’;
- (m) the site context was as follows:
- (i) the Tai Po Area 9 site was previously a borrow area which had been reinstated and replanted thereafter. It was vacant and covered with shrubs and vegetations. Exotic trees and weedy plants were the dominant species such as *Acacia auriculiformis* (耳果相思), *Acacia confusa* (台灣相思), *Eucalyptus spp.* (桉屬) and *Leucaena leucocephala* (銀合歡);
 - (ii) the CNRE site was being used as a temporary cultivation area by Hong Chi Pinehill Village. Some tree groups were located at its northern periphery with species such as *Bridelia tomentosa* (土蜜樹), *Schefflera octophylla* (鵝掌柴) and *Ficus variegata* (青果榕);

- (iii) the CNRW site was located on a gentle slope partly vacant and partly covered with shrubs and tree groups with scattered temporary structures and a small Drainage Services Department works area in the southeast. The trees included exotic species such as *Acacia confusa* (台灣相思), and native species such as *Ficus variegata* (青果榕) and *Macaranga tanarius* (血桐);

- (iv) the CNRW site was the subject of a s.12A application (No. Y/TP/19) for rezoning from “GB” to “Residential (Group B)8” for private residential development. The application was considered by the RNTPC at the same meeting on 4.4.2014 at which the proposed zoning amendments to the OZP were also being considered. After assessing the merits of developing public or private housing on the site, the RNTPC considered that the site was more suitable for development of public housing than private housing and decided to reject the rezoning application;

- (n) the surrounding uses included the following:
 - (i) the Hong Chi Pinehill Integrated Vocational Training Centre was located to the north of the Site, and the Tai Po Hospital and the Nethersole Hospital were located to the south of the Site;

 - (ii) the Fung Yuen SSSI was located to the further north of the Site, with a distance of about 250m from the eastern boundary of Site A. Opposite to the eastern spur of the Site was a “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) development under construction at Fung Yuen. The permitted burial ground of Fung Yuen was located to the east of the Tai Po Area 9 site on a natural hill slope; and

 - (iii) to the south of the CNRW site were two subsidised housing developments, namely Chung Nga Court and Fu Heng Estate. To

the further west of the CNRW site was Nam Hang Village. To the north of CNRW site were the permitted burial grounds of Nam Hang Village;

Grounds of Representations and Responses

- (o) the major grounds of the adverse representations were summarised in paragraph 4.2 of the Paper. Concerned government bureaux/departments had been consulted on the representations and comments and their latest assessments were set out in the responses highlighted in paragraph 6.2 of the Paper. They were summarised below:

General Grounds of Representations

Government Policy

- (i) the “GB” areas that were rezoned were richly covered with vegetation. Hence, the rezoning was against the Policy Address which stated that only “GB” sites that were ‘devegetated, deserted or formed’ would be considered for rezoning for residential use. The Government should develop brownfield sites and consider redevelopment of under-utilised sites first. The rezoning amendments were contrary to public interest and public expectations that wooded landscapes were to be protected and valued. The amendments would create a bad precedent and cause cumulative adverse impacts;
- (ii) the responses to the above ground were that:
- planning was an on-going process and the Government would continue to review zonings of different sites from time to time so as to provide land to meet the economic and development needs of Hong Kong;

- the Government had been carrying out various land use reviews, including review on “G/IC” sites, review of government land currently left vacant, under short-term tenancies or different short-term or government uses and review of “GB” sites with a view to identifying suitable sites for residential use. Brownfield sites could also be considered; and
- it had been confirmed that the amendments would not cause insurmountable problems. Requirements for submission of tree preservation proposals/landscape master plan, where appropriate, would be included in the lease conditions of the housing sites;

Preservation of “GB” Zone, Tree Felling and Landscape Impacts

(iii) the main grounds were:

- the proposal would involve extensive clearance of vegetation and the cumulative impact had not been addressed;
- “GB” zones played an important role in maintaining the public’s quality of life and serving as a vital buffer between the urban area and Country Park. The proposed rezoning was against the planning intention of “GB” zone;
- the Government had failed to provide details about the ecological importance of the rezoning sites. Site visits and ecological surveys done by green groups revealed findings very different from those of the Government. The rezoning did not comply with the Convention of

Biological Diversity (CBD);

- (iv) the responses to the above grounds were that:
- the Site, though vegetated, had relatively less buffering effect and low conservation value, and was located in proximity to existing urbanised development and infrastructure;
 - if tree felling and substantial clearance of vegetation was necessary, the Government would conduct tree surveys to ascertain the condition and strive to minimise the impacts as appropriate by incorporating appropriate mitigation measures; and
 - the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) advised that there were no designated sites of conservation interest within or in close proximity to the Site and the trees on the Site were largely exotic or common species. No significant ecological issue or adverse impacts on biodiversity were anticipated. If appropriate mitigation measures, including preservation or transplanting of existing trees with conservation value, or compensatory planting were carried out, the rezonings would not contravene the objectives of the CBD;

Adverse Impacts

- (v) there was a lack of technical assessments, especially ecological impact assessment and tree survey, to support rezoning of the Site;
- (vi) the public housing development would create adverse impacts. There would be traffic impacts as the Site was distant from the railway station and there would be additional demand on public

transport and transport infrastructure; nuisance from construction works; air ventilation impacts; wall effect and adverse visual impacts; and insufficient community facilities to serve the new residents;

(vii) the responses to the above grounds were that:

- HD had undertaken relevant technical assessments on transport, drainage, sewerage, air ventilation, visual appraisal and environmental assessment. The preliminary findings revealed that there would be no significant environmental impacts;
- the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) considered that with suitable mitigation measures (including road junction improvement and provision of public transport terminus), there would be no adverse traffic impacts;
- construction impacts would be controlled under existing mechanisms;
- the air ventilation assessment (by expert evaluation) conducted by HD showed that there would be no adverse air ventilation impacts if good wind responsive measures (including building orientation, building separation, and openings at ground floor) were incorporated in the development;
- given the size of the Site, there was reasonable scope for good building design and layout disposition to avoid wall effect; and
- sufficient land had been reserved for open space, Government, institution and community (GIC) and other supporting facilities in the Tai Po District. There would be surplus of local and district open space within the area

covered by the Tai Po OZP. Two primary schools and various social welfare facilities would be provided in the public housing development;

Inadequate Public Consultation

(viii) the Government had extensively rezoned “GB” sites in Hong Kong, but had not undertaken comprehensive consultation on this change in policy. There had been no prior consultation and/or the consultation process with the Tai Po District Council (TPDC) was improper/misleading. The amendments should be withdrawn and the Government should carry out extensive public consultation afresh;

(ix) the responses to the above grounds were that:

- the EHWC of TPDC and local residents had been consulted prior to submission of the Plan to the RNTPC for its consideration. The EHWC of TPDC was consulted again after the Plan was exhibited under the Ordinance; and
- the statutory and administrative consultative procedures had been duly followed;

Specific Grounds on Amendment Items A1 and A2

Specific Environmental Impacts

(x) R17 (the Conservancy Association) had indicated that the proposed development might have negative impacts on nearby sensitive areas, including the Fung Yuen SSSI and Pat Sin Leng Country Park. The Site was considered not suitable for high-density housing development due to its high relief, potential impact of chimney emissions from the adjacent hospitals and lack of supporting facilities;

(xi) the responses to the above grounds were that:

- Sites A1 and A2 were about 250m from Fung Yuen SSSI and no significant direct ecological impact from the public housing development on the SSSI was anticipated. DAFC had no objection to rezoning the sites for residential use;
- technical assessments conducted by HD confirmed that the Site was suitable for public housing development. Assessment on chimney emission impact from Tai Po Hospital and Nethersole Hospital revealed that the predicted SO₂ and NO₂ and respirable suspended particulates concentrations at various assessment heights would comply with the relevant Air Quality Objectives;

Shading Effect

(xii) R14 (Designing Hong Kong Limited) indicated that the proposed development would bring shading effect on the Fung Yuen SSSI and farmland at the Site;

(xiii) the response to the above ground was that the farmland at the Site which was currently used by Hong Chi Association had been reserved for public housing development. The small farm would be reprovisioned within Hong Chi Pinehill Village and shading effect was not anticipated;

Impact on Fung Yuen Burial Ground

(xiv) R1625 indicated that Site A1 adjoined the Fung Yuen burial ground and a 30m-wide tree planting strip should be provided as a buffer;

- (xv) the response to the above ground was that the Fung Yuen burial ground was about 15m from the Site and the area in-between was covered with trees and dense vegetation. Provision of additional buffer was not necessary;

Retention of Site A2 for GIC use

- (xvi) R13 indicated that Site A2 should be retained under a “G/IC” zoning for specialist institutions and schools, such as the Hong Chi Pinehill Integrated Vocational Training Centre, which focused on rehabilitation;
- (xvii) the response to the above ground was that the area to the north of the Site, zoned “G/IC”, was currently occupied by the Hong Chi Pinehill Integrated Vocational Training Centre, and this 8 ha site was specifically intended for providing rehabilitation service. Redevelopment proposals on that site were being pursued by the Hong Chi Association. Hence, there was no need to reserve the site for rehabilitation uses;

[Mr Clarence W.C. Leung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Specific Grounds on Amendment Items A3 and A4

Zoning and Planning Intention of CNRW Site

- (xviii) the CNRW site should be rezoned “CDA” so as to exercise full planning control on the future residential development (R1274 – Honour More Limited, owners of private land in CNRW site);
- (xix) stating in the Notes of the “R(A)9” zone that the planning intention of the zone was specifically for public housing was against the Board’s practice of allowing sufficient flexibility under the OZP (R1274);

- (xx) the CNRW site should be for private housing as there were too many public housing in the area and provision of private housing would facilitate timely provision of flats (R1276 to R1323);
- (xxi) the responses to the above grounds were that:
- the “R(A)9” zone was subject to PR and building height restrictions. The proposed public housing development would be governed by a planning brief and there should be sufficient control under the present planning and land administration mechanisms to ensure that the proposed public housing development would be developed comprehensively. Hence, there was no need to rezone the site to “CDA” (R1274);
 - when the RNTPC previously considered the private residential development on a portion of the CNRW site under a section 12A application (No. Y/TP19), it was considered that the CNRW sites were more suitable for public housing purpose as it formed an integral part of a comprehensive public housing project. The section 12A application was rejected (R1276 to R1323);
 - spelling out the planning intention in the Notes and Explanatory Statement that the “R(A)9” zone was for public housing would give greater certainty and transparency (R1274);
 - according to the Long Term Housing Strategy, the Government advocated that public housing should account for a higher portion of new housing production and decided that the ratio between public and private housing should be 60:40. The provision of public housing at the

Site could help achieve a better housing mix of public and private housing within the Tai Po New Town from the current ratio of 52:48 to 53:47. From these figures, it was clear that public housing was not overwhelming in Tai Po; and

- in terms of building design, the CNRW site would be developed into a public housing block and a primary school with lower building height. This would create an open vista and create less visual impact on the surrounding developments as compared to a private residential development;

Nam Hang Village development

(R1275 and R1326 (Chairman of Tai Po Rural Committee))

- (xxii) the proposed development would affect the feng shui and burial ground of Nam Hang Village. Prior negotiation with the villagers to resolve the issues on feng shui and access to the burial grounds was required;
- (xxiii) the village development area, infrastructure and supporting facilities of Nam Hang Village and the peripheral areas should be included for comprehensive planning. Development restrictions on the “GB” zone of Nam Hang Village should be relaxed to release more land for Small House development;
- (xxiv) the responses to the above grounds were that:
 - feng shui issue was not a planning consideration of the Board. HD would co-ordinate with relevant government departments, including District Lands Officer/Tai Po and DO(TP), to discuss with villagers on the layout of the proposed development in future to ease their concerns on

feng shui and access to the burial ground;

- developments in Nam Hang Village could connect to the existing public drainage and sewerage systems. Relevant government departments would monitor and review the infrastructure provision. Minor improvement works would be considered and implemented by Home Affairs Department as necessary; and
- no village ‘environs’ or “Village Type Development” zone of Nam Hang was covered under any amendment items of the Plan. Applications for Small House development might be made under the “GB” zone;

Comments on Representations and Responses

- (p) the comments (C2(Part) to C79(Part)) submitted in the form of standard letters expressed support for part of R16 to R1273’s opposition to the rezoning of areas zoned “GB” to residential use on grounds similar to those of the adverse representations. The above responses to the grounds of representations were relevant; and
- (q) PlanD’s view - based on the planning considerations and assessment detailed in paragraph 6 of the Paper, PlanD did not support any of the representations considered under Group 1 (R6(part) to R1273(part), R1274 to R1323, R1324 (part), R1326(part), R1625(Part) and R6322(part) and considered that the Plan should not be amended to meet the representations.

16. The Chairman then invited the representers and their representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R12 – Mary Mulvihill

17. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) the role of the Board was to examine why government initiatives were not meeting the public's expectation. This would allow the Government to understand why they had failed to perform their duties to the public;
- (b) to use "GB" site as land bank for housing was contrary to the definitions and principles set out in the existing guidelines. However, the Government had not conducted any public consultation on this matter;
- (c) the Board had approved many applications for commercial/hotel developments and kindergarten uses on residential sites in the urban areas. The kindergartens were not for Hong Kong people; they were mainly to serve the needs of people from the Mainland. These residential sites that were converted to other uses were in mature neighbourhoods and supported by existing community facilities, had ample employment opportunities and were served by public transport facilities. By allowing alternative uses on the residential sites had deprived people of housing sites in convenient locations;
- (d) the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) had never built any affordable housing in their projects but the Board continued to approve their schemes. The URA should be urged to convert/redevelop the many dilapidated buildings in the urban areas to provide more affordable housing; and
- (e) the Government had taken an easy way out by rezoning "GB" sites for housing. This only meant that people would be forced to live very far away from the urban areas, the Government would have to spend a lot of money to provide infrastructure and facilities for the new areas, and there was a lack of employment opportunities in these new areas which might create social and family problems.

[Actual speaking time of R12: 6 minutes]

R14 – Designing Hong Kong Limited

18. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Paul Zimmerman made the following main points:

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

- (a) the Board should give due consideration to the ecological issues raised by other representers with such expertise and not only rely on information provided by the Government;
- (b) he was a member of the Steering Committee on CBD. The policy target set for implementation of CBD was to enhance biodiversity by halving the losses of our habitats. Hong Kong was a party to implementation of the CBD and had to comply with this target;
- (c) since the Second World War, biodiversity in Hong Kong had improved dramatically with the extensive reforestation programmes and protection of Country Park areas. On the other hand, new town and Small House developments had led to losses of habitats. It was necessary to consider what the next steps should be to achieve the target of halving the losses of our habitats;
- (d) the Board should not be asked to consider each rezoning on its own. The Board should be given a full picture of how the rezonings being proposed in different districts in Hong Kong would impact on the overall biodiversity and its implication for the CBD target. Such information was not made available to the Board;
- (e) PlanD should prepare an overall framework/strategy for all the rezonings in Hong Kong to demonstrate the overall impact on biodiversity and how such impacts could be minimised. This would allow the Board to gauge whether the rezonings would cumulatively affect the CBD target;

“Green Belt” Zones

- (f) according to the Board's guidelines, "GB" zones were for conserving existing landscape features, defining outer limits of urbanised districts and providing buffer, and providing outlets for passive recreational uses;
- (g) if "GB" zones were now proposed for development, the planning intention of "GB" zones had been changed. There should be consultation with the public about a review of planning intention for "GB" zones; and
- (h) the subject rezoning involved sites in the first stage in which only "GB" sites that were close to roads and existing developments and had lower ecological value were considered for rezoning. However, the "GB" sites involved in the next stage of rezoning would involve more sensitive areas. Nevertheless, the overall strategy for rezoning of "GB" sites was unclear to the public nor to the Board. The Board should ask for more information about the overall picture and should not only consider each case individually.

[Actual speaking time of R14: 7 minutes]

[Ms Anita W.T. Ma left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

R1074 – Ho Ka Po

19. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Ho Ka Po made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Tai Po for over 30 years;
- (b) there was a feature article in Ming Pao Daily News on 24.11.2014 about the rezoning of "GB" sites and tree preservation matters. In particular, the 100-year old banyan tree on the site under Amendment item C (Site C) was featured. Site C was originally considered for public housing development but HD would no longer pursue public housing there due to

technical difficulties. The site was now rezoned for a private residential development. That might imply a double-standard i.e. the Government had to follow certain guidelines on tree preservation which made public housing on the site not feasible, but a private developer could evade such requirements and develop private housing there. It would not be feasible to transplant the 100-year old banyan tree;

- (c) Government's announced policy was only to review "GB" sites with no ecological value and that were 'devegetated, deserted or formed' for housing purpose. As the DAFC had advised that the banyan tree on Site C should be preserved, the site should not fall within the scope of "GB" sites to be reviewed for housing use;
- (d) the Government's policy directives as promulgated in the 2014 Policy Address to increase development intensity of sites and increase the proportion of public housing stock were noted. However, the scale of the proposed public housing development on the Site needed to be put in context. The Fu Heng Estate and Chung Nga Court were the two subsidised housing developments closest to the Site. There were only 11 blocks with less than 4,000 flats in those two housing developments which were located on flatter terrain. In contrast, more than 6,000 flats would be provided on the Site that was on sloping ground. The scale and density of the proposed public housing development was excessive in the local context;
- (e) the layout of buildings in Tai Po were generally spacious and there was no 'walled-building'. However, the proposed public housing development would be dense and highly built-up and would create adverse impacts on the local community. It should also be noted that the Fung Yuen SSSI was located in proximity to the Site;
- (f) the living environment in Tai Po used to be very pleasant with natural features such as Tolo Harbour, Lam Tsuen River and mountain back-drops. In recent years, there had been a deterioration of the environment due to extensive tree felling for housing development and

road works;

- (g) as R14 had indicated, the Board should consider how the rezoning might impact on compliance with the CBD;
- (h) in view of the type of housing and development intensities proposed, she doubted whether all sites rezoned on the Plan was for addressing the imminent housing demand as claimed;
- (i) it was important to retain the “GB” area as natural buffers. The Government had previously cut down trees on the slopes to build noise barriers for the Tolo Harbour widening works. However, these man-made barriers could not replace the natural buffers with trees and vegetation;
- (j) the farmland of Hong Chi was located on the CNRE site. While it was noted that Hong Chi would re-provision the farmland elsewhere, it would be good planning to provide similar community farmland in the existing neighbourhood;
- (k) the Hong Chi Pinehill Village abutted the public housing development. Consideration should be given as to whether there would be interface problems. A tranquil environment would be more beneficial for rehabilitation;
- (l) the concern on insufficient public transport to cater for the new housing development needed to be addressed. Currently, there was only one bus route serving the area and the Site was at a 30 minute-walking distance from the railway station;
- (m) the impact of rezoning “GB” sites should be assessed on a district-wide or territory-wide basis. She doubted why the Government only consulted the district council about the rezoning proposals. A consultation meeting for the Lo Fai Road residents was only organised after the residents’ request had been made at the district council meeting. There was no consultation meeting with residents of Fu Heng Estate.

The Board's hearing process was not a forum for discussion; it only provided an opportunity for representers to express their views;

- (n) in 2012/2013, the Government had undertaken a consultation on how development land could be increased in Hong Kong. However, the issue about rezoning of "GB" sites was not a subject of that consultation;
- (o) rezoning of "GB" sites should not be considered on a case-by-case basis. It was inappropriate to separate the hearings for the representations related to private and public housing sites in two groups. She doubted whether public views would be given due consideration; and
- (p) the Government should rethink the current 'indiscriminate' approach to rezone land for housing as this approach was not sustainable.

[Actual speaking time of R1074: 15 minutes]

R1152 – Chris Siu

20. Mr Chris Siu made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident living in the Shuen Wan area, near the Lo Fai Road site. It was not appropriate for the Board to separate the hearing for representations related to the public and private housing sites in two separate groups;
- (b) although the initiative to rezone "G/IC" and "GB" sites for housing was advocated in the Policy Address, he doubted whether there was public support for these policy directions. Rezoning of "GB" sites should not be considered on a case-by-case basis;
- (c) Tai Po was a mature new town and the Government had developed a land use framework since the 1980's to set out which areas were intended for preservation and which areas intended for development. However, the Government suddenly changed this established land use framework by rezoning many sites in Tai Po for residential use;

- (d) there were existing traffic congestion problems on Ting Kok Road and Tolo Highway. The Government failed to resolve the current traffic problems and it was hard to believe that the traffic generated by the additional developments could be satisfactorily addressed in future;
- (e) it was understood that residents in Fu Heng Estate might be willing to accept the new public housing development in exchange for free bus routes to the railway station. Fu Heng Estate was poorly served by public transport and it was the Government's duty to improve the public transport service there and, it should not be a condition of exchange for new developments;
- (f) he had in the past objected to the proposal for a private housing development near Hong Chi Pinehill Village. He also objected to the public housing development at the Site now;
- (g) it might not be appropriate to relocate the Hong Chi rehabilitation facilities as it was well established and had strong bonds with the community in Tai Po. If the Hong Chi Pinehill Village was to be retained at its current location, the large-scale public housing development might have major impacts on it; and
- (h) the additional traffic generated by the public housing development would affect the capacity of CNR, and this would affect the existing users at Hong Chi, Tai Po Hospital and Fu Heng Estate. There was very limited scope for widening of CNR.

[Actual speaking time of R1152 – 9 minutes]

R1274 – Honour More Limited

21. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr Robert Chan made the following main points:

- (a) the representer, Honour More Limited, was the owner of private land in

Sites A3 and A4;

- (b) the Board had always made fair decisions that respected private property rights. Private property rights were protected under the Basic Law. The Government had well-established mechanisms for assembly of private land for development and the Government would not resume private land without a good reason. However, the zoning amendments related to Sites A3 and A4 were against the well-established principles and mechanisms;
- (c) seven sites were rezoned for housing on the Plan, and only Site A was specified for public housing and the other six sites were for private housing. He doubted why only Site A, the only rezoned site with private land, was designated for public housing. On the other hand, the other six sites on government land were to be sold for private housing;
- (d) the private land within Sites A3 and A4 were subject of four previous planning applications that were submitted in 1990, 1991, 2003 and the latest submission was made in December 2013. When PlanD consulted TPDC on 8.1.2014 about the housing sites, Sites A3 and A4 were not included within Site A for public housing. However, in a special TPDC meeting held on 13.2.2014, Sites A3 and A4 were incorporated into Site A and proposed for public housing. On 4.4.2014, RNTPC agreed to the amendments to the OZP and the Plan was gazetted one week after the RNTPC meeting; and
- (e) the site under Amendment Item F (Site F) was also suitable for public housing development as it was within 10 minute-walk from the railway station. There was public housing in the vicinity and there was good road infrastructure in that area. The representer's proposal was that the northern portion of Site F should be used for a public housing development and Sites A3 and A4 for a private housing development. It was estimated that the representer's proposal would result in about 1,000 additional public housing units and similar number of private flats. As Site F was on government land, it would expedite the public housing

development and avoid any possible litigation associated with private land in Sites A3 and A4.

[Actual speaking time of R1274: 9 minutes]

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break.]

22. As the representers had completed their presentations, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

23. The Chairman asked DPO/STN to respond to the following queries arising from the representers' presentations:

- (a) while the planning intention for a public housing development was specified for Site A in the Notes, whether the planning intention for private housing was specified in the Notes for the other rezoned sites;
- (b) whether a lot of "GB" sites would be rezoned and whether the sites were identified in the Stage 1 or Stage 2 "GB" reviews;
- (c) responses in respect of impacts on local traffic, demand on public transport and provision of community facilities to cater for the new public housing development;
- (d) responses to the ground of some representers that the public housing development might impact on Hong Chi Pinehill Village and whether the Hong Chi Pinehill Village would be relocated as mentioned by one of the representers;
- (e) the type of vegetation that would be affected by the rezoning and whether it involved any rare and valuable species;
- (f) response to the representer's statement that the Board had approved a lot of alternative uses, such as hotel, on residential sites; and
- (g) responses in respect of the grounds that the public consultation for the Plan was conducted in an inappropriate manner.

24. In response, Mr C.K. Soh (DPO/STN) made the following main points:
- (a) amongst all the sites rezoned, only Site A was intended for public housing. The other sites, that are on government land, were all intended for land sale for private housing. There was no specification in the Notes that the other sites were for private housing;
 - (b) the Tai Po OZP had a planning scheme area of 2,438 ha of which 1,260 ha (about half of the land area) was zoned “GB”. The amendment items on the Plan involved only 19 ha of the area zoned “GB”. Amendment Items F and H were identified in the Stage 1 “GB” review and the other sites were identified in the Stage 2 “GB” review;
 - (c) HD had conducted a traffic impact assessment (TIA) for the public housing development and C for T’s comments had been taken into account. A public transport terminus would be provided in the public housing development to ensure that there would be sufficient public transport services to the railway station. The TIA had assessed the capacity of CNR as well as all relevant road junctions and demonstrated that the public housing development would not have major adverse impact on the surrounding uses;
 - (d) Hong Chi Pinehill Village had been established in Tai Po for a long time and had provided important services to the local residents. The Hong Chi Association had no plan to relocate, and they had on-going discussion with the Government about their in-situ improvement/redevelopment plans. One of the amendment items in the Plan was to amend the building height restriction for a piece of land within the Hong Chi Pinehill Village from 4 storeys to 8 storeys to facilitate its redevelopment;
 - (e) the Tai Po Area 9 site (Sites A1 and A2) was previously a borrow area and the original vegetation and soil were removed. Site A2 was mostly covered with shrubs and grassland, and Site A1 at the northern fringe was

previously a cut slope. The trees on the cut slope were exotic species such as Acacia (相思) and Eucalyptus (桉樹) that were previously planted by Government for reforestation of the borrow area. These species were chosen as they grew fast and were good for slope stabilisation. These types of trees had a relatively short life-span and had to be replanted after 40 to 50 years. According to the tree survey conducted by HD, there was no rare or valuable species of trees on Site A. HD would avoid felling existing trees on the Site as far as possible and would provide appropriate greening and compensation if trees had to be felled;

- (f) in view of the policy to increase housing land supply, PlanD currently would not recommend approval of application for hotel uses on sites in predominantly residential neighbourhoods, unless under exceptional circumstances; and
- (g) the public consultation for the Plan was conducted in an open and transparent manner and in accordance with the established practice and statutory requirements.

25. A Member said that other than Site A, there was no specification on the type of housing on the other six sites on government land. In such context, the Member wondered if stating specifically that Site A was intended for public housing in the Notes of the Plan was appropriate. The Member also asked why the other six sites were not used for developing public housing.

26. Mr Soh said that a number of factors would be considered before designating a site for public housing. Public housing would generally involve a larger site for high-density and high-rise development and should be located in locations with similar type of developments and well served by public transport. In these regards, only Site A, the largest amongst the rezoned sites, was considered suitable for public housing and for the provision of supporting facilities. As RNTPC had clearly indicated that the planning intention was for public housing on Site A, it was considered appropriate to state that planning intention in the Notes. On the other hand, the other six sites were considered

not suitable for public housing developments as they were relatively small in size, in medium or low-density residential neighbourhoods, and in less convenient locations.

27. The same Member said that Site A had an elongated configuration with CNRW site in the southwest and at a distance from the main development area in Tai Po Area 9 in the northeast. According to HD's layout, there would only be two buildings on Sites A3 and A4. Given that the Hong Chi Pinehill Village abutted the northeast of Sites A3 and A4, this Member asked if a private residential development at lower development intensity on Sites A3 and A4 would be more desirable. The Chairman also asked DPO/STN to comment on whether additional residential development at Site A would be beneficial to enhance social integration with users/residents in the Hong Chi Pinehill Village.

28. With the aid of Plan H-5 of the Paper, Mr Soh explained HD's conceptual layout plan of the proposed public housing development. He said that there were two development areas in Site A, the site in Tai Po Area 9 was located uphill in the northeast and the CNRE and CNRW sites were located at a lower level in the southwest. HD was mindful of providing pedestrian connections between the two development areas so as to facilitate easy access to the retail and community facilities for future residents. Taking into account visual and air ventilation impacts on the surrounding developments, it was decided that an area within the CNRW site would be reserved for a low-rise primary school. This would allow spreading out of demand on public transport services at that location.

29. In addition, Mr Soh said that Hong Chi Pinehill Village had provided services for people with different rehabilitation needs. The Hong Chi Association had never raised objection to the proposed public housing development. Instead, they had undertaken to provide appropriate services to serve the needs of the new residents. In addition, there had been close liaison with the community service providers to ensure that local community services would be improved to address the needs of the additional population.

30. The Chairman asked DPO/STN to provide information on the following:

- (a) the proportion of “GB” sites in the whole of Hong Kong that were proposed to be rezoned for residential use in the “GB” review;
- (b) whether ecological surveys and tree surveys were conducted before “GB” sites were proposed to be rezoned;
- (c) why it was necessary to specify in the Notes that Site A was for public housing development while there was no specification that other rezoned sites were for private housing development; and
- (d) how the concerns raised by representers about impacts on the burial grounds would be addressed.

31. Mr Soh responded as follows:

- (a) for the whole of Hong Kong, some 150 sites were identified for rezoning to residential use and some 70 of them were sites zoned “GB”. The area of those “GB” sites would only constitute about 1% of land currently zoned “GB” in the whole of Hong Kong. The Government had carefully considered each piece of “GB” site before deciding whether they could be rezoned for residential use;
- (b) when the “GB” sites were long-listed for consideration for rezoning, advice from DAFC was sought and the more sensitive areas had been avoided. For the short-listed sites, the ecological value of the sites would be assessed based on advice from AFCD to ensure that the rezoning would not lead to major adverse ecological impacts;
- (c) tree survey would be carried out for sites with dense vegetation. HD had prepared a tree survey for Site A. The tree survey would provide information to ensure that the layout of the development would avoid tree felling as far as possible and form the basis for tree preservation proposals;
- (d) the specification in the Notes of the OZP that Site A was to be developed for public housing was to reflect RNTPC’s intention for the Site. The

other rezoned sites were on government land and it would be indicated in the land sale conditions that those sites were for private residential uses and it was not necessary to specify such intention in the Notes; and

- (e) the surrounding burial grounds were currently accessible by footpath and the main concerns raised by the representers were related to the burial ground to the north of CNRW site. HD would ensure that access to the burial ground would be maintained or improved.

32. In response to a Member's question, Mr Soh said that the area proposed for redevelopment in the Hong Chi Pinehill Village was located in an area to the north of the Tai Po Hospital. That area was currently occupied by low-rise buildings. According to Hong Chi's redevelopment scheme, some buildings within that area would be retained and some would be redeveloped up to a maximum building height of 8 storeys.

33. A Member asked the following questions:

- (a) noting the previous discussion that "GB" sites having 'less buffering effect' would be considered for rezoning, more elaboration was required on the meaning of 'less buffering effect';
- (b) whether there was precedent for specifying a site for public housing in the Notes; and
- (c) noting the public housing in Tai Po Area 9 was very close to the Fung Yuen SSSI and there were concerns on the potential impacts, whether it was feasible to swap the location of the primary school site with some housing blocks in Tai Po Area 9.

34. Mr Soh responded as follows:

- (a) the buffering effect of "GB" areas was relative to the existing uses in its vicinity. For areas with vast green areas or low-rise developments, the need for a buffer might not be as high. For areas with dense development, there would be a higher need for "GB" areas to be retained

to act as a buffer, and rezoning those “GB” sites would have higher impacts. Each site would be considered on a case-by-case basis;

- (b) it was common to indicate the intention for public housing on specific sites in the Explanatory Statement. The Tai Po OZP was the first time when the planning intention for public housing was specified in the Notes. Development schemes for both private and public housings on the Site had been considered at RNTPC which had decided that it was more appropriate to include the Site as part of the comprehensive public housing development. To convey a clear message to the public, the planning intention that the Site was for public housing was specified in the Notes; and
- (c) the Fung Yuen SSSI was not close to the Site, and there was a separation of some 250m. In addition, the slope at the northern fringe of Tai Po Area 9 would be retained, and this would further increase the separation distance between the building blocks and the SSSI. HD had considered a number of different layouts and it was considered that the latest scheme that concentrated the housing blocks in Tai Po Area 9 was the most efficient layout.

35. In response to the Chairman’s question, Mr Soh said that in hearing of the representations and comments, the Board was to consider the land use of the Site instead of the layout of the public housing development. Nevertheless, the Member’s comment to increase the buffer distance with the SSSI could be conveyed to HD for their consideration.

Sites A3 and A4

36. A Member asked the representatives of R1274 whether the previous applications involving Sites A3 and A4 for private residential developments were all rejected by the Board. Mr Robert Chan (R1274) said that four previous applications were submitted in Sites A3 and A4 in 1990, 1991, 2003 and December 2013. The applicant had made various amendments to their scheme to address comments from government departments and had provided technical assessments to support their scheme. In

response to the Member's further question about the specific reasons for rejection of the previous applications, Ms Winnie Wu (R1274) said that the first three previous applications (submitted between 1990 to 2003) were rejected mainly for the reason that there was at that time a presumption against development on the site. However, as the Board had now rezoned the site for residential use, the previous rejection reasons were no longer applicable.

37. The Chairman asked Mr Soh to explain the reasons for rejection of the latest application No. Y/TP/19 involving Sites A3 and A4. Mr Soh said that when comparing the indicative scheme in application No. Y/TP/19 with the current proposed public housing development, the development parameters were similar. In particular, the public rental housing at Sites A3 and A4 was proposed at a PR of 6 with about 950 public rental flats and a site reserved for school use. The scheme in application No. Y/TP/19 was at PR of around 6 (based on net development area) with about 1,144 flats. The private land in Sites A3 and A4 did not have direct access to CNR, and hence, the application site included some 4,000m² of government land mainly to provide access to the private land. If government land was not granted to the applicant, it might not be feasible to develop the private land in isolation. The private land in Sites A3 and A4 that had to be resumed for public housing development was about 8,000m². On 4.4.2014, RNTPC had considered all planning justifications put forward under application No. Y/TP/19 but considered that there were more merits to include the private land in Sites A3 and A4 for a comprehensive public housing development. Hence, RNTPC's intention for Site A to be developed as public housing was stated in the Notes of the "R(A)9" zone.

38. Mr Chan (R1274) clarified about the chronology of events pertaining to application No. Y/TP/19. That planning application was submitted in December 2013. When PlanD consulted the TPDC on 8.1.2014, Sites A3 and A4 were not included in the public housing development site. However, when PlanD consulted TPDC again in a special meeting on 13.2.2014, the public housing development site included Sites A3 and A4. On 4.4.2014, RNTPC agreed to the amendments to the Plan.

39. A Member asked whether it was common for Government to resume private land for public housing and whether resuming private land for the public housing project would affect the timing for implementation. In response, Mr Soh said that it was not

uncommon for Government to resume private land for public housing and roads to take forward new town developments. The Government would only resume private land after careful consideration, and the time needed for resumption would be a factor for consideration. Mr Chan (R1274) said that private land was resumed for new town developments as there was no other feasible choice in those cases. However, Sites A3 and A4 were not part of a new town development and they had explained in the presentation that there were alternatives to avoid the resumption. In response to the Chairman, Mr Soh said that resumption of private land was not confined to new town developments, and the Government had the authority to resume private land for public purpose.

40. A Member asked how the “CDA” zoning proposed in R1274’s written submission was related to their proposal presented in their oral submission at the meeting. Mr Chan (R1274) said that the representer’s main proposal was to ask the Board not to specify that the Sites A3 and A4 had to be developed for public housing, and they considered that both the “CDA” and “R(A)” zonings would be acceptable. The Chairman asked whether R1274 would consider it acceptable if the Site was zoned “CDA” but it would still be for subsidised housing development. In response, Ms Wu (R1274) said that R1274 considered that Sites A3 and A4 should be for private housing development and the “CDA” zone could provide the Board with more planning control on the future development.

41. The Chairman said that the private housing development scheme proposed in the section 12A application included some government land. If the government land was not granted to the developer, there would be no road access to the private land owned by R1274. Ms Wu (R1274) said that government land included in the development scheme submitted under the section 12A application was mainly for provision of access road for the development. It was not uncommon for land exchange to include a request for grant of some government land within the application site. The Chairman said that it would be a decision for the Government whether to approve a land exchange.

42. A Member asked for an indication of the location of the private land within Sites A3 and A4. By the aid of the location plan of the application site for the section 12A application, Mr Soh showed the location of the private land and government land.

He said that without the government land adjacent to CNR to provide access, it was doubtful the private land owned by R1274 could be developed as proposed.

43. With the aid of a slide on the powerpoint presentation, Mr Chan (R1274) showed the location of private land within Sites A3 and A4. He said that the government land was mainly abutting CNR. According to the established process, it was common to include government land in land exchange applications. In response to a Member's question, the Chairman said that there was no legislation governing the land exchange process. LandsD would consider each case based on its own merits in its capacity as the landlord.

44. A Member asked why there was a need to reserve two primary school sites within Site A. Mr Soh said that the two primary school sites reserved were both for satisfying the demand from the additional 6,000 odd flats in the proposed public housing development as well as the existing shortfall in the Tai Po New Town. A Member said that there was problem of inadequate students for secondary schools in Tai Po. Instead of building new primary schools, perhaps the Education Bureau could consider using some of the existing secondary school premises to satisfy the demand for primary school places. The Chairman said that the comment could be separately conveyed to the Education Bureau for consideration.

45. As the representer and representers' representatives had finished their presentations and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations in their absence after completion of the Group 2 hearing and would inform them of its decision in due course. The Chairman thanked them and the Government's representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

46. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:35am.