

**Minutes of the 1110<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 17.6.2016**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Ms Sandy H. Y. Wong

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transports)  
Transport and Housing Bureau  
Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)  
Mr C.W. Tse

Assistant Director of Lands (Regional 3)  
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

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

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr T.Y. Ip

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr K.K. Ling  
Director of Planning

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan  
Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board (Atg.)  
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Louis K.H. Kau

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr T.C. Cheng

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open meeting]

**Confirmation of Minutes of the 1110<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 20.5.2016**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1110<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 20.5.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matters Arising**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

- (i) Amendments to the Confirmed Minutes of the 1110<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 21.4.2016 and 26.4.2016
- 

2. The Secretary reported that the minutes of the 1110<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21.4.2016 and 26.4.2016 were confirmed by the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 20.5.2016, and had been uploaded to the Board's website. On 31.5.2016 and 15.6.2016, two emails in respect of the concerned confirmed minutes from a group of representers/commenters (R751, R757, R758, R907, R919/C185, C184 and C186) represented by R919/C185 and a representer/commenter (R637/C176) were received. They proposed a number of amendments to paragraph 41 of the minutes of 21.4.2016, paragraphs 25, 48 and 53 of the minutes of 26.4.2016. The proposed amendments were mainly related to details of their presentation and responses from government representatives.

3. As the minutes were not recorded in verbatim, but a summary of the points discussed, the Board considered that the proposed amendments by the representers/commenters to include details of the presentation and responses were not necessary.

[Ms Christina M. Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

4. The Board also agreed to rectify some typographical errors identified by the representers/commenters regarding some figures quoted in paragraphs 25(f) and 25(l) of the minutes of 26.4.2016 and to include two Members that had been left out inadvertently in the list of Members present at the 1110<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 21.4.2016 and 26.4.2016. The proposed revisions to the minutes were tabled for Members' consideration and the meeting agreed that page 1 of the minutes of 1110<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 21.4.2016 and 26.4.2016 and paragraphs 25(f) and 25(l) of the minutes of 26.4.2016 should be amended in the following manners :

*Page 1 of the Minutes of 1110<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Town Planning Board held on 21.4.2016 and 26.4.2016*

**Present**

....

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

***Ms Christina M. Lee***

***Mr Stephen H.B. Yau***

Dr F.C. Chan

....”

*Paragraphs 25(f) and 25(l) of the Minutes of 1110<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Town Planning Board held on 26.4.2016*

“(f) the TIA estimated that the operational performance of the three road junctions would range from about **57%** to 79% during AM peak hours . . . . ;”

“(l) . . . . Taking into account people's choice of routes and the additional population from the Site, Ching Chun Court and the Sai Shan Road site and adopting his estimated passenger demand figure, about **24** bus and **176** minibus capacities would be required . . . . ;”

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Closed Meeting (Deliberation)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TY/27  
(TPB Paper No. 10085)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

**Deliberation Session**

5. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests for the representations and comments were reported at both the hearing sessions on 21.4.2016 and 26.4.2016 as well as the deliberation session on 20.5.2016, and were recorded in paragraphs 2 of the minutes on 21.4.2016, paragraph 4 of the minutes on 26.4.2016 and paragraph 3 of the minutes on 20.5.2016. Subsequently, Mr Franklin Yu declared that he no longer had business dealings with Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), AECOM Asia Company Limited and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited. The declaration of interest was updated and shown in the PowerPoint presentation for Members' information.

6. Members noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr H.F. Leung, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr Franklin Yu, Mr K.K. Ling and Mr Martin K.C. Kwan had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members also noted that Professor S.C. Wong's interests were indirect and agreed that he should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

**Request for minutes of the Metro Planning Committee meeting**

7. On 24.5.2016 and 15.6.2015, a representer/commenter (R919/C185) requested the Board to provide a copy of the minutes of the Metro Planning Committee (MPC)

meeting held on 6.12.1991 on the proposed zoning amendments to the Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). As the meeting was held before the commencement of the Town Planning (Amendment) Ordinance 2004 (the Amendment Ordinance), the MPC minutes in question was a 'Restricted' document. According to the established practice, the minutes would not be released but a gist of the relevant minutes could be provided to the representer/commenter. After deliberation, the Board agreed that the MPC minutes should not be released but the representer/commenter should be informed of the gist of the relevant minutes;

Further information received from representers/commenters

8. On 20.5.2016 and 15.6.2016, the Secretariat received submissions from representers/commenters (R394/C1 and R919/C185, R394/C1 and R171/C2 and R637/C176) providing further information regarding their submissions. As the hearing sessions of the representations and comments were completed, the Board agreed that those further submissions from the representers/commenters should be treated as not having been made according to the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);

Letters from Legislative Councillors and Kwai Tsing District Council members

9. The Secretary reported that three letters from Legislative Councillors Dr. Hon Kwok Ka Ki, Hon. Michael Tien, JP and some Kwai Tsing District Council (KTDC) members regarding the draft Tsing Yi OZP were received on 14.6.2016, 16.6.2016 and 15.6.2016 respectively. Those letters were submitted out of time, and they were tabled for Members' information; and

Petition letter from a KTDC member and Incorporated Owners of Rambler Crest

10. The Secretary also reported that a petition letter from a KTDC member and the Owners' Committee of Rambler Crest regarding the draft Tsing Yi OZP was received earlier in the morning. The petition letter was identical to a further submission received after the completion of the hearing of the representations and comments. The petition letter was circulated to Members for information at the meeting.

11. The Chairman said that Members might not be present in all previous sessions of the meeting for the consideration of representations and comments on the draft Tsing Yi OZP. He asked and Members confirmed that they had suitably acquainted themselves with the issues discussed by referring to the relevant minutes of meeting and/or video recordings of the meeting. He said that the deliberation would follow the framework as agreed in the last session on 20.5.2016 and continue the discussion on the supporting facilities, public consultation, procedural matter/meeting arrangement and representers/commenters' proposals.

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, the Secretary briefly recapitulated the issues raised by the representers/commenters and the responses from the government representatives related to the supporting facilities, public consultation, procedural matter/meeting arrangement and representers' proposal as recorded in paragraphs 16 to 19 of the minutes on 20.5.2016.

13. In response to a Member's query on the timing of the delivery of Town Planning Board (TPB) paper and whether the representers/commenters had been notified about the availability of the relevant TPB paper on the Board's website, the Secretary said that it was the normal practice for TPB paper to be delivered to representers/commenters 7 days before the meeting. However, in the present case, a significant number of the TPB papers could not be delivered to the specified address provided by the representers/commenters and they were returned to the Secretariat. To ensure the timely availability of the TPB paper to the representers/commenters, the Secretariat had currently adopted the practice of advising the representers/commenters well in advance before the scheduled hearing that the relevant TPB paper would be made available at the Board's website. The Chairman supplemented that there were adequate channels to notify representers/commenters of the availability of the TPB paper and the issues raised by representers/commenters on the meeting procedures/arrangement were similar to those raised in the representations on other OZPs, which had been considered previously by the Board.



14. While the representers/commenters' views on the supporting facilities, public consultation, procedural matter/meeting arrangement were noted, Members generally considered that the responses from government representatives on those aspects had adequately addressed the relevant concerns.

Suitability of the representation site for the proposed public rental housing development

15. The Chairman said that some representers were of the view that the representation site (the site) should not be rezoned for public rental housing (PRH) development while some considered that the development intensity and building height of the proposed PRH development should be reduced, or that Block 4 of the proposed PRH development as shown in the schematic layout should be deleted. He invited Members to give their views on whether the site was suitable for the proposed PRH development and whether the proposed development intensity/layout needed to be modified should Members consider PRH development at the site acceptable.

16. A Member said that it was difficult to decide whether the proposed PRH development would be acceptable without first examining possible modifications to the layout. Another Member did not support the proposed PRH development having regard to the strong objection from the local residents to any residential development at the site. The Member said that the Board should consider the amendments to the OZP as presented in the Paper, as the Board might not be in a position to determine which alternative layout of the proposed PRH development would be the most appropriate. In response, the Chairman said that the Board could determine suitable development restrictions to be imposed on a particular site with justifications and decide whether the scale of the proposed PRH development should be reduced as proposed by some representers/commenters.

17. The Secretary supplemented that in carrying out the plan-making function under the Ordinance, the Board should take full account of the representations and comments on the representations in deciding whether any amendment to the OZP should be proposed to meet/partially meet the representations/comments. If further amendments to the OZP were proposed, they would be gazetted for further representation and the Board

would hold a meeting to consider any further representations received, in which the original representers and commenters would also be invited to attend. The Board would then decide whether to amend the OZP by the proposed amendments in question, or by any further variation to the proposed amendments. The plan-making process would be completed when the draft OZP was submitted to the Chief Executive in Council for approval after the consideration of the representations/comments.

18. A Member said that Rambler Crest was shielded by the adjacent hotel development on the east from the glare and noise generated from Container Terminal No. 9 (CT9). However, the proposed PRH development at the site would be exposed to adverse light pollution from CT9. The proposed PRH development would also be subject to noise and air pollution from the existing open-air container vehicle park to the south. The site was originally zoned "Open Space" ("O") to serve as a buffer to mitigate air, noise and light pollution from CT9. Should the site be used for PRH development, the future residents there would suffer. The Member further said that according to an article by the Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences regarding a long-term study on a group of primary school students, the learning ability of the concerned students living near open space was generally better than those students not living near open space, possibly due to the screening effect of the open space on harmful pollutants which might affect the health of the students. The Member considered that the site was not suitable for PRH development and the zoning should retain as "O" to provide buffer from CT9 and the port back-up uses in the vicinity. The Planning Department (PlanD) had previously withdrawn a rezoning proposal in Ma On Shan for residential development as there was unanimous objection from local residents and the District Council. An alternative site was subsequently identified for the proposed residential development. The Member considered that an alternative site should be explored to replace the proposed PRH development at the site.

19. The Vice-chairman said that the site was subject to physical constraints and pollution from CT9 and it was not an ideal site for development. However, impacts from CT9 such as noise and light pollution could be mitigated technically through modification of the site layout and building design. In view of the long waiting list for PRH and the

pressing demand for housing supply, the proposed PRH development at the site was not unacceptable and would be able to improve the living condition of those in need.

20. Another Member considered that the major concerns of the representers/commenters on the proposed PRH development were related to traffic, noise and light pollution, and air quality. Additional population generated from the proposed PRH development would increase the demand for transportation facilities, which would in turn provided further justification to enhance green minibus (GMB) services and help resolve the problem of inadequate transportation facilities. From the Rambler Crest residents' perspective, Block 4 of the proposed PRH development would block their views and was undesirable. However, from the future PRH residents' perspective, Block 4 would be shielded from the light and noise pollution of CT9 by Rambler Crest. For Blocks 2 and 3, by adopting a linear building design with the main building façade facing away from CT9, the light and noise pollution from CT9 might be minimised. Block 1 was comparatively less desirable as it was close to the road on both sides. As a steady public housing supply was important to meet the pressing housing demand, the proposed PRH development would be acceptable with modifications.

21. Another Member said that the Ma On Shan case quoted by another Member might not be comparable to the current zoning amendments. The Member further said that it was not uncommon that residents living near the proposed PRH development would object to the proposal, but the Board should balance those views against the overall needs of the community. As it was difficult to find suitable site for residential development in the urban area, the site should not be given up easily.

22. A Member said that the overall benefit of the community should be considered and there was a need to identify sites for PRH development. Although the site was not the most ideal for development, given that there was an acute shortage of housing supply and the site could provide PRH flats for those in need, the proposed PRH development was considered acceptable in principle. However, the development intensity of the proposed PRH development could be subject to further discussion. Two other Members said that while the site was subject to various constraints, it was technically feasible for such constraints to be addressed and PRH development would help ameliorate

the acute housing problem of the community. One Member further said that the Board should facilitate the proposed PRH development to meet the housing demand and let those in the public housing waiting list to decide whether they would choose to take up the flats there.

23. A Member asked whether the Board could request the provision of specific facilities such as public transport interchange at the site to address some of the concerns raised by the local residents. In response, the Chairman said that the Board could determine on planning matters, such as the zoning of a site. Whilst decisions on the provision of specific facilities might be beyond the Board's jurisdiction, the Board could request the concerned government departments to consider the provision of relevant facilities as reflected in the representations and comments. In the past, the Board had issued letters to government departments to urge them to follow up on various issues which could not be addressed through land use zonings on the OZP.

24. A Member supported the Chairman's suggestion that relevant government departments should be requested to address the public concerns on traffic, transportation services and adverse impacts from CT9.

25. Another Member said that the Board should take a holistic view and consider whether the proposed PRH development at the site was suitable for the future residents, its impact on the existing residents and the overall housing need of Hong Kong. Although there were no technically insurmountable problems for the proposed PRH development, the site was not an ideal site for development. However, the Board could determine a better overall layout for the development. The Board should also consider whether the issues raised by the representers/commenters, e.g. inadequate community and transportation facilities and adverse impact from CT9, could be resolved. While the future residents of the proposed Block 4 might be shielded from the noise and light pollution generated by CT9, it would be located in a rather congested space due to the topography of the area and hence not desirable. The Member considered the rezoning of the site for PRH development acceptable subject to deleting Block 4 and changing the layout/design of Blocks 1-3 to mitigate the adverse noise and light pollution from CT9.

26. A Member said that while the hotel development to the east of Rambler Crest provided a buffer for Rambler Crest against the noise and light pollution generated by CT9, there was no such buffer for the proposed PRH development at the site. The proposed Blocks 1-3 would be directly facing the existing container vehicle park. Although there was a pressing demand for PRH development, the site was not suitable for PRH development due to its various constraints.

27. Another Member said that it was difficult to find a suitable site for PRH development without constraints. The noise and light pollution problem could be resolved technically through building design. The site was considered acceptable for the proposed PRH development.

28. A Member asked whether suitable noise buffer could be incorporated in the future development at the container vehicle park site to the southeast of the site in order to address the noise and light pollution problems to Blocks 1-3 of the proposed PRH development. The Member considered that the proposed PRH development was acceptable subject to modification of the building design/site layout and a reduction in its scale. The Member was also concerned about the effectiveness of the proposed acoustic windows which might not allow natural ventilation.

29. In response, the Chairman said that the Board was to consider representations/comments on the amendments to the draft Tsing Yi OZP. The development of the container vehicle park site in the vicinity, which was not an amendment item of the OZP, should be considered separately. Nevertheless, should Members consider it useful, the Board could convey the Member's suggestion to relevant departments for consideration when the container vehicle park site was developed in future. Mr C.W. Tse, Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1), supplemented that there was a new type of acoustic window design, which was widely adopted in private residential developments, would enable noise mitigation and natural air ventilation at the same time. His department was liaising with Housing Department to examine the feasibility of using this new type of acoustic windows in future PRH development. With proper building design, e.g. the provision of building fins, noise would not be an insurmountable problem. In response to a further query from the Chairman, Mr Tse

confirmed that should the proposed PRH development proceed, the building plans would be circulated to the Environmental Protection Department for comment and the proposed noise mitigation measures would have to be provided to their satisfaction.

30. Another Member also considered that technical assessments had been carried out for the proposed PRH development at the site and all requirements of relevant departments would need to be met. Hence, the proposed PRH development would be acceptable and its design and layout could be further enhanced at the detailed design stage.

31. A Member said that the representers/commenters' concerns on procedural matters and meeting arrangement were not relevant as the Secretariat had made such arrangements in accordance with the established practice. The lost of view of residents in Rambler Crest should not be taken as an issue as there was no right to a view under the law. Also, fire hazard and the presence of a petrol filling station should not be an issue as there were petrol filling stations near residential developments throughout the territory. However, the site was not considered suitable for PRH development as it would be subject to adverse noise and glare impacts. As the proposed PRH development was meant for the under-privileged class, who had no choice on their living place, rezoning the site for PRH development would have significant implication on the future residents whose welfare should be safeguarded. The Member also considered that compensatory tree planting was not effective as some trees would be planted off-site and there was no effective mechanism for monitoring the implementation. The suggestion of the Board to issue letters to government departments requesting for the provision of improvement measures would not be legally binding and hence might not be useful.

32. A Member said that the Board should take note of the unanimous objecting views of the local residents, and consider to what extent those views would be taken into account. In response, the Chairman said that Members should take into account all relevant planning considerations in making a decision. Another Member said that the Board had listened carefully to the views expressed by the representers/commenters and in general agreed that there was a pressing demand for PRH development.

33. The Chairman said that Members' views were diverse, with some Members accepting the rezoning of the site, some accepting the rezoning only with modifications, and others not accepting the rezoning at all. He recapitulated that the Board should decide whether to uphold or not to uphold the representations, i.e. the site would either remain as "O" or be rezoned from "O" to "Residential (Group A) 4" ("R(A)4"), or to partially uphold the representations by proposing amendments to the zoning. The Chairman then invited Members to have a show of hands to indicate their views on the above. The majority of Members considered that the representations should be partially upheld by amending the zoning boundary of the site to facilitate a more acceptable PRH development at the site.

*Proposed amendment to the zoning boundary of the site*

34. The Chairman then invited Members to give their views on how the zoning boundary of the site should be amended.

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau and Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

35. A Member said that as the site was not ideal for development in view of the various constraints, opportunity should be taken to explore how various issues as raised by the representers/commenters could be addressed. In response, the Chairman said that apart from amending the zoning boundary of the site, Members could suggest improvement measures which would be consolidated by the Secretariat in the form of a draft letter to the concerned government departments for follow up, where appropriate. The draft letter would be submitted for Members' consideration before it was issued.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li left the meeting at this point.]

36. A Member asked whether HKHA should be requested to revise the design/layout of the proposed PRH development before the Board could decide on the zoning boundary of the site. In response, the Chairman said that it would be up to HKHA to work out a scheme in compliance with the revised zoning boundary agreed by the Board.

37. A Member said that Blocks 1 to 3 of the proposed PRH development should be retained and the zoning boundary might follow the water works reserve (WWR) as indicated in the schematic layout of the proposed PRH development (Figure B.1 of Appendix A of the Final Traffic Impact Assessment Report submitted by HKHA) at Appendix VI of the Paper so that the area to the east of the WWR would be reverted to “O” to maximise the number of trees to be preserved. The Vice-chairman supported the deletion of Block 4 and said that the existing Tsing Hung Road Playground could be integrated with the area to be reverted to “O” to form a larger open space development.

38. A Member considered that from the perspective of the future PRH residents, Block 4 would be least affected by the noise and light pollution from CT9 because of Rambler Crest serving as a buffer. There was also a reasonable gap between Block 4 and the adjacent residential developments. On the contrary, Block 1 at the southwestern corner should be deleted as it would be adversely affected by Tsing Yi Road and the elevated Tsing Sha Highway.

39. The Secretary said that Members could make reference to the physical features of the site in making a decision on the zoning boundary. He said that there would be significant constraints to build over the land situated between the WWR and the drainage reserve (DR) within the site. The Chairman supplemented that Members could also take into account the location of the ingress/egress to the site, which was located on the southwestern side of the site, in considering the proposed zoning boundary adjustment.

40. A Member was of the view that only Block 4 with slight modification to its design by deleting the east and west wings should be built as Blocks 1 to 3 would be subject to noise and light pollution from CT9.

41. Another Member said that the schematic layout of the proposed PRH development was a 2-dimensional plan and could not reflect the topography of the site where Block 4 was proposed. Block 4 would be situated at a lower level of the site which might impose design constraints for any building development. As such, Block 4 should be deleted and the area retained would be able to serve as a breathing space in the area.



42. The Secretary supplemented that the roads surrounding the site were at different levels and the ingress/egress to the site would be provided from Tsing Yi Road at the southwestern end of the site. As the portion of the site bounded by the WWR and the DR could not be built-over, the alignment of those reserves might serve as a reference for aligning the zoning boundary of the revised “R(A)4” zone.

43. The Vice-chairman said that if Blocks 1 to 3 were deleted and only Block 4 was proposed, it would be far away from the proposed ingress/egress point at Tsing Yi Road and might be inconvenient to the future residents. On the contrary, retaining Blocks 1 to 3 but deleting Block 4 would be able to have synergy effect as Blocks 1 to 3 were close to retail and welfare facilities in the area. Another Member suggested that the WWR and the DR could be re-aligned to avoid any constraint on the layout design.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes.]

44. With regard to the amendment to the zoning boundary of “R(A)4”, the Chairman recapitulated that Members’ views generally concentrated on either deleting Block 4 on the northeastern end of the site or deleting Block 1 on the southwestern end of the site.

45. A Member said that considering the synergy effect of the provision of facilities for the existing and future residents, retaining Blocks 1 to 3 would be a better option. Another Member said that while there were merits for the two alternatives, deleting Block 4 would also be able to partially address the concerns of the residents of Rambler Crest although the Board should not be preserving private views. The Chairman noted that Members generally agreed to retain the part of the site where Block 4 was proposed as open space.

46. Regarding the delineation of the zoning boundary, a Member said that the “O” zone should be maximised by aligning the zoning boundary as close to Block 3 as possible. In response, the Secretary said that the physical features of the site, such as the alignments of the WWR and DR could be used as a reference for the revised zoning

boundary. He further said that as the proposed “R(A)4” zone was subject to a maximum plot ratio restriction, the site area of the “R(A)4” zone would have implication on the number of flats to be provided. To strike a balance, the zoning boundary should be suitably adjusted so as not to unduly affect the flat production. A Member supported that in delineating the zoning boundary, consideration should be given to a larger “R(A)4” zone to ensure flat production.

47. A Member emphasized that the proposed deletion of Block 4 of the PRH development was not to address the lost of view from Rambler Crest. The Chairman agreed, noting that the Board considered the noise, air ventilation, light pollution and traffic issues could be resolved technically. As there was a pressing need for housing supply and land suitable for housing development in Hong Kong was scarce, the proposed PRH development at the site was considered acceptable. The reduction of the “R(A)4” zone would enable a consolidated open space on the northeastern part of the site to serve as a buffer, taking into account convenience to future residents in terms of accessibility and synergy effect with retail and welfare facilities in the area.

48. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive view of Representation No. R1. The Board also decided to partially uphold the Representations No. R2 to R961 and considered that the Plan should be amended to partially meet the representations, having regard to the physical features of the site including the WWR and DR in revising the zoning boundary of the “R(A)4” zone.

49. The Secretary said that the revised OZP would be submitted to the Board for consideration at the next meeting before gazetting. The Chairman said that the amended OZP would be gazetted for further representation for 3 weeks and the Board would consider the further representations, as appropriate. The Board would also consider drafting a letter to concerned government departments after further representations on the OZP, if any, were considered.

50. After deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold the remaining part of Representations No. R2 to R961 and the reasons were :

- “(a) Land suitable for housing development in Hong Kong is scarce and there is a need for optimising the use of land available to meet the pressing demand for housing land. Rezoning of suitable sites for residential development is one of the multi-pronged approaches to meet housing and other development needs. Planning is an on-going process and the Government will continue to review various land uses and rezone sites as appropriate for residential use.
- (b) With good transport network and residential, commercial and educational development nearby, the site is considered suitable for residential development. The proposed development intensity and building height are technically feasible and will not have insurmountable problems. The zoning amendment of the site will contribute to the Government’s effort in meeting the pressing need for housing land supply in the short term.
- (c) The proposed public housing development under the zoning amendments would not generate unacceptable impacts in terms of traffic, environment, ecological, landscape, infrastructure, air ventilation and visual impacts on the surrounding areas.
- (d) Part of the site has been retained as a buffer, taking into account convenience for future residents and synergy effect with retail and welfare facilities in the area. There are no Old and Valuable Trees within the remaining part of the site and the existing trees are mainly common species. Tree preservation and landscaping will be required following the established procedures.
- (e) The planned provision of major GIC facilities and open space in the district including those at the site are generally sufficient to meet the demand of the future population as well as additional demand from the new housing development.

- (f) The statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the proposed zoning amendments have been duly followed. The exhibition of OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance.”

51. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.