

**Minutes of 1324<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 23.8.2024**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr K.W. Leung

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor B.S. Tang

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West)  
Transport Department  
Mr M.Y. Tse

Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Karl K.L. Kwan

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

Deputy Director/General, Lands Department  
Ms Jane K.C. Choi

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Rico W.K. Tsang

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Edward H.C. Leung

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1321<sup>st</sup> Meeting held on 19.7.2024 and 1323<sup>rd</sup> Meeting held on 26.7.2024

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The Chairperson said that the draft minutes of the 1321<sup>st</sup> and 1323<sup>rd</sup> meetings had been circulated to Members before the meeting. Members agreed that the minutes of the two meetings were confirmed.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations on Draft Outline Zoning Plan

2. The Secretary reported that the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations in respect of the draft Discovery Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-DB/5 was agreed by Members on 14.8.2024 by circulation. She briefly introduced that on 12.4.2024, the draft Discovery Bay OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, 50 valid representations were received. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the representations was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the full Board) collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for September 2024.

3. The Secretary also reported that the hearing arrangement for consideration of

representations in respect of the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/22 was agreed by Members on 21.8.2024 by circulation. She briefly introduced that on 22.3.2024, the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. During the two-month exhibition period, 3,678 valid representations were received. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the representations was recommended to be considered by the full Board collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for September 2024.

(ii) Dismissal of Appeal against the Decision on Judicial Review Application in respect of Section 12A Application No. Y/TM-LTY Y/8 (CACV 470/2021)

4. The Secretary reported that an appeal was lodged by Join Smart Limited (the Applicant) against the Court of First Instance (CFI)'s judgment for judicial review (JR) in relation to the decision of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) not to agree to a section 12A (s.12A) application No. Y/TM-LTY Y/8 (the s.12A Application) for rezoning a site in Lam Tei, Tuen Mun (the Site) for high-density private residential development (the Appeal). The Applicant was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was a consultant of the s.12A Application. Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had declared interests on the item for having current business dealings with SHK and AECOM.

5. Members noted that Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the item was only to report the dismissal of the Appeal and no discussion was required, Members agreed that Dr Tony C.M. Ip could stay in the meeting.

6. The Secretary briefly introduced that the Site was located at Hong Po Road in Lam Tei, Tuen Mun. The Applicant submitted a s.12A application to rezone the Site from "Residential (Group E)" to "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") to facilitate a high-density private residential development. Noting that the Site was under a government study for public housing development and the proposed zoning amendment to facilitate a private residential development was not in line with the planning intention of the Site for public housing, RNTPC decided not to agree to the s.12A Application on 24.4.2020. On 23.7.2020, the Applicant filed a JR against RNTPC's

decision. On 15.9.2021, CFI dismissed the JR and agreed that RNTPC of the Board had already been informed of and taken into account the planning intention of the Site for public housing when considering the s.12A Application. CFI also endorsed most of the important legal principles put forth by the Board, including, among others, that considerations relevant to a s.12A application were broader than those for a section 16 application. On 12.10.2021, the Applicant requested the Court of Appeal to set aside CFI's judgment. The draft LTYO OZP No. S/TM-LTYO/11 and the draft Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/38, incorporating amendments to rezone the respective portions of the Site to "R(A)", were exhibited for public inspection in 2021 and 2023 respectively. The land resumption process was currently in progress.

7. The Secretary further reported that on 25.7.2024, the Applicant informed the Board of its intention to withdraw the Appeal. Upon a joint application for dismissal of the Appeal by the Applicant and the Board, the Court of Appeal made an order to dismiss the Appeal on 30.7.2024.

8. Members noted the dismissal of the Appeal.

(iii) Town Planning Appeal Decision Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 1 of 2023

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lot 857 RP in D.D. 9, Tai Wo Village, Tai Po, New Territories

Application No. A/NE-KLH/611

---

9. The Secretary reported that the subject appeal was against the Town Planning Board (the Board)'s decision to reject on review an application (No. A/NE-KLH/611) for a proposed house (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) at the application site (the Site) zoned "Agriculture" ("AGR") on the Kau Lung Hang Outline Zoning Plan.

10. The review application was rejected by the Board on 24.2.2023 on the reasons that the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the "AGR" zone and land was still available within the "Village Type Development" zones of Yuen Leng, Kau Lung Hang and Tai Wo Villages for Small House development.

11. The appeal was heard by the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB) on 19.2.2024. On

12.8.2024, the appeal was dismissed by TPAB and the reasons were summarised below:

- (a) the Appellant contended that although the Site was zoned “AGR”, it was surrounded by Small House developments. TPAB pointed out that whilst the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation’s view that the Site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation was not convincing, and agricultural rehabilitation at the Site might not be pragmatic, economically viable nor result in better utilisation of land resources, the Appellant’s decision on how to utilise the land should not be a consideration for the Board or TPAB. TPAB should also not give weight to the Appellant’s claim that using the land for agricultural purpose was a waste of land resources; otherwise it would set an undesirable precedent. Allowing such reasoning would convey a misleading message to the public that departure from the planning intention of the “AGR” zone could be justified if the land owner did not intend to use the Site for agricultural use to avoid a waste of land resources;
- (b) TPAB did not agree with the Appellant’s claim that the adoption of the more cautious approach since 2015 was inconsistent and unfair. TPAB agreed that more weighting should be put on the number of outstanding Small House applications provided by the Lands Department (LandsD) rather than the 10-year Small House demand forecast figure provided by the Indigenous Inhabitant Representatives, which could not be verified by LandsD and could fluctuate over a short period of time; and
- (c) the methodology adopted by the Planning Department in estimating the land available for Small House development, including the deduction of land not suitable for Small House development (e.g. the land covered by dense vegetation or used for road purpose) and not taking into account land ownership as a material consideration, was reasonable.

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan joined the meeting during the reporting of the town planning appeal.]

(iv) Appeal Statistics

12. The Secretary reported that as at 16.8.2024, two cases were yet to be heard by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) and one appeal decision was outstanding.

13. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	45
Dismissed	178
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	214
Yet to be Heard	2
Decision Outstanding	1
<hr/>	
Total	440

**Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Tin Shui Wai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TSW/17

(TPB Paper No. 10979)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

14. The Secretary reported that Amendment Item A (Item A) on the draft Tin Shui Wai (TSW) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TSW/17 (the draft OZP) involved rezoning of a site in TSW Area 14 to facilitate private residential development, which was supported by an engineering feasibility study (EFS) conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as the consultant. Items B1 and B2 were to reflect two completed residential developments under Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho and Dr Tony C.M. Ip had declared interests on the item for having current business dealings with AECOM and SHK.



15. Members noted that Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As Dr Tony C.M. Ip had no involvement in the amendment items and submission of the relevant representations, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

16. The Secretary also reported that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest as his spouse was a school manager of a primary school in TSW. As the said primary school was not in close proximity to the representation sites nor related to the amendment items, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

### Presentation and Question Sessions

17. The following government representatives (including the consultants) and representers were invited to the meeting at this point:

#### ***Government Representatives***

##### Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Raymond H.F. Au - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW)

Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu - Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW))

Ms Jessie M.H. Kwok - Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West

##### CEDD

Mr Carl K.S. Ng - Senior Engineer/West (SE/W)

Mr Ray C.W. Choy - Engineer/West

##### AECOM

Mr K.W. Lo ]

Mr Y.S. Wong ] Consultants

Ms Y.M. Chung ]

***Representers***

R1 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

R2 – Tong Kin Fung

Mr Tong Kin Fung - Representer

18. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that the representatives from PlanD would be invited to brief Members on the representations. The representers would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representers had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives (including the consultants) or the representers. After the Q&A session, the government representatives (including the consultants) and the representers would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

19. The Chairperson then invited the government representatives to brief Members on the representations.

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu, STP/TMYLW, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including background of the amendments to the OZP, grounds/views/proposals of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10979 (the Paper). The amendment items included:

- (a) Item A – rezoning of a site in TSW Area 14 from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Bus Depot”, “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A) 2” (“R(A)2”);

- (b) Item B1 – rezoning of a site in TSW Area 115 from “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) to “Residential (Group B) 3” (“R(B)3”) with designation of a non-building area (NBA);
- (c) Item B2 – rezoning of a site in TSW Area 112 from “CDA” to “Residential (Group B) 4” (“R(B)4”) with designation of an NBA;
- (d) Item B3 – rezoning of two strips of land in TSW Areas 112 and 115 from “CDA” to area shown as ‘Road’; and
- (e) Item C – rezoning of a site at the junction of Tin Yip Road and Tin Kwai Road from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Telephone Exchange” to “G/IC”.

21. The Chairperson then invited the representers to elaborate on their representations.

R2 – Tong Kin Fung

22. Mr Tong Kin Fung made the following main points:

Item A

- (a) he objected to rezoning the site for private residential development;
- (b) other than the justifications provided in the EFS, Members should take into account the general public perception of TSW and the provision of infrastructure and community facilities in the district when considering the zoning amendment. TSW would be stigmatised as a ‘population landfill’ (人口堆填區) if the Government took the policy of increasing housing supply as the sole consideration for the zoning amendment. Approval of the current zoning amendment would also set an undesirable precedent and might become a blemish on the development and governance of the Northern Metropolis (NM);
- (c) the number of flats to be provided at the site should be slightly reduced. To compensate for the loss in flat production, the development intensity of the

proposed development at Fung Ka Wai under the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme, which was located to the east of TSW New Town, could be increased for the public benefit;

- (d) given the government policy on increasing land and housing supply in the past two decades, while there had been considerable flat production in TSW, some social and economic problems had arisen within the community of TSW. The local residents were severely affected by the negative image of TSW. In light of the NM development and the close proximity of TSW to the Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area (NDA) and Lau Fau Shan, the Government should review the positioning of TSW in the territorial context;

*Traffic and Transport Aspect*

- (e) upon the rezoning of the site on the OZP, the proposed private residential development at the site with a planned population of about 4,760, together with the new public housing development at Tin Tsz Road with a planned population of 25,000 and the proposed residential development with 2,200 housing units in Fung Ka Wai under the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme, would overload the traffic and transport networks in the district;
- (f) according to the findings of the preliminary traffic and transport impact assessment (TTIA), the current public transport services were sufficient to cater for the additional population arising from the proposed private residential development at the site. However, it was doubtful whether such level of public transport services would be able to accommodate the cumulative demand from the future population of other planned new housing developments (such as those at Tin Tsz Road in TSW, Tin Wah Road in Lau Fau Shan and Sha Kong Wai North) in the area;
- (g) many residents of TSW expressed concern with Transport Department's conservative approach in responding to public requests for increase in bus frequency and new bus routes, which had resulted in delays. As revealed in recent news reports, the public transport services (including franchised buses

and the Light Transit Railway) were still inadequate to cope with the demand from residents of the two private residential developments, namely Wetland Seasons Bay and Wetland Seasons Park, adjacent to the Hong Kong Wetland Park nearly three years after their completion;

*Commercial Land and Government, Institution and Community (GIC) Facilities*

- (h) there were concerns about the lack of community and commercial facilities at the site and their integration with the surrounding developments;
- (i) while the Paper stated that TSW was a comprehensively planned new town with various supporting facilities to meet the needs of the local community, according to the draft OZP, nearly 40% of the Planning Scheme Area was zoned for residential use, but commercial land area (about 3.44 ha, excluding the shopping arcades within residential developments) only accounted for about 0.85%, which was far below that of Tseung Kwan O (TKO) New Town (about 20.07 ha for commercial/residential uses) and Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen NDA (about 24.12 ha for commercial use). Commercial activities were constrained by the limited supply of commercial land in TSW and the local residents had to travel to other areas for work and shopping;
- (j) there was a lack of information in the EFS regarding the number of new jobs to be created and the economic benefits to be generated as a result of the proposed private development at the site;
- (k) given the current shortfall of GIC facilities in TSW, apart from elderly facilities, other community facilities such as child care facilities should also be provided to address the increasing demand;
- (l) the remaining GIC sites in TSW had been reserved for hospital development and expansion of the police station. Social welfare facilities, accounting for only 5% of the total domestic gross floor area (GFA) of the proposed private residential development at the site, were insufficient to meet the local demand. In view of the lack of developable land in the district, the Government should

adopt a more proactive approach and reserve more floor space at the site for residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) which was currently in severe shortfall. Consideration should also be given to incorporating other much needed social welfare facilities/services, such as pre-school rehabilitation services and residential care services, into the private residential development at the site;

*Maximising Site Utilisation and Development Potential*

- (m) the site was one of the few reserved GIC sites in TSW. According to the current proposal, the proposed private residential development at the site would provide retail facilities and kindergarten with a GFA of only 5,000m<sup>2</sup>, and thus there should be scope to accommodate more GIC uses;
- (n) given that the surrounding areas of the site were well-served by public facilities such as swimming pools and a sports complex, it was worth exploring the inclusion of the adjacent telephone exchange and sewage pumping station sites into the proposed private residential development site to enable the development of the entire area into a new town centre/large-scale development node in TSW. Although the above land amalgamation proposal was previously suggested by a Member of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee during the consideration of the proposed amendments to the TSW OZP at its meeting in March 2024, PlanD responded that there was no plan to relocate the existing telephone exchange and sewage pumping station. Utilising telephone exchange sites for residential development was one of the land supply options put forward by the Task Force on Land Supply in 2018;

Items B1, B2, B3 and C

- (o) there was no objection to Items B1, B2, B3 and C; and
- (p) the Government should allow flexibility in providing more community and commercial facilities, which were urgently needed by the residents of TSW, at Item C site.

R1 – Mary Mulvihill

23. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

Item A

*Land Uses*

- (a) she objected to the zoning amendment for the site, which was currently mainly occupied by a bus depot of The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (KMB) under short term tenancies, for private residential development. The site should be used for GIC uses, public housing or Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) development;
- (b) the Government was wasting public funds on the construction and management of transitional housing. The unit cost of transitional housing was nearly as high as that for public housing. At present, developers were withholding the construction of private residential projects due to the large number of unsold units. The target completion date of the proposed private residential development in 2029 seemed unrealistic, but could be achievable for HOS development or provision of GIC facilities;
- (c) given that the surrounding area of the site was predominantly residential with various GIC facilities, she shared the views of R2 that the site should be developed as a new town centre or a community node of TSW, attracting more people and bringing vibrancy to the area, rather than for private residential development that might not integrate well with the community;
- (d) the Town Planning and Development Committee of Yuen Long District Council (YLDC) was previously consulted on the proposed amendments to the OZP. While some YLDC members expressed concerns about the proposed development intensity and suggested that the site be considered for public housing development, they did not raise much concern about the provision of community facilities. It was considered that the YLDC members could not

represent the TSW community's interests and had not fulfilled their duties during the OZP amendment process;

*Provision of GIC Facilities*

- (e) based on the planned population of TSW, there were significant shortfalls in GIC facilities including child care centre (a requirement of 1,166 places versus the existing and planned provision of 410 places; a deficit of 65%); community care services facilities (a requirement of 1,690 places versus the existing and planned provision of 412 places; a deficit of 76%); RCHE (a requirement of 2,092 beds versus the existing and planned provision of 271 beds; a deficit of 87%); pre-school rehabilitation services (a requirement of 231 places versus the existing and planned provision of 67 places; a deficit of 71%); day rehabilitation services (a requirement of 588 places versus the existing and planned provision of 408 places; a deficit of 31%); and residential care services (a requirement of 920 places versus the existing and planned provision of 578 places; a deficit of 37%). There were immediate needs for those community services but the provisions of such GIC facilities were tagged as long-term targets. The provision of community services was as important as housing development;
- (f) the lack of child care services that could ease parents' caregiving burdens would not help increase the birth rate or encourage families to have more children;
- (g) there were other community services, such as study rooms, that were not covered in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). There was also a need to provide more floor space for GIC facilities to serve the growing number of residents facing mental health issues;
- (h) in view of its isolated location and demographic profile, there should be a community rehabilitation day centre in TSW even though the existing population did not meet the threshold of one centre per 420,000 persons under HKPSG;



*Traffic Noise and Pollution*

- (i) given the traffic noise and pollution issues associated with the site as well as its proximity to the existing sewage pumping station, the site was considered more suitable for GIC use rather than residential development;

*Tree Compensation*

- (j) as all 104 trees on the site were proposed to be felled and only 98 new trees would be planted, a 1:1 compensation ratio could not be achieved. The exclusion of undesirable tree species for the calculation of the compensation ratio would set an undesirable precedent for other development projects;

*Land Contamination*

- (k) the site was currently used as a bus depot potentially subject to a high level of soil/ground contamination but this issue was not mentioned in the Paper. KMB should be responsible for cleaning up the site and removing any contamination before the proposed private residential development was implemented. In that connection, Members should question the level of contamination and the time required for decontamination;

*Amendment to OZP by the Government*

- (l) she queried if the site was intended for development by a specific developer;
- (m) the subject amendment to OZP to facilitate private residential development at the site was initiated by the Government. Such arrangement of omitting the statutory procedure of making a section 12A planning application had been discussed by the Board during the consideration of representation in respect of the TKO OZP in May 2024. At that meeting, some Members had expressed concern about bypassing the due process to facilitate the implementation of private projects, and the Chairperson responded that the streamlined procedure would only be considered for private projects with policy support;

- (n) noting that the site was proposed to be tendered out for private residential development, there was no need to spend public funds to conduct an EFS for a spade-ready land sale site with detailed development parameters (e.g. proposed number of bicycle parking spaces). This should be the responsibility of the developer to work out their own proposal. The above had reinforced the view that the site was tailor-made for a specific developer;

Items B1, B2 and B3

- (o) the items were for housekeeping purpose;

Item C

- (p) the item was supported but there was no planned GIC use to address the shortfalls in the provision of community facilities in TSW; and
- (q) the site could be developed for RCHE, which would be compatible with the adjoining TSW (Tin Yip Road) Community Health Centre.

24. Ms Mary Mulvihill also expressed other views not related to the subject OZP. She said that the streamlining approach to consider planning applications currently adopted by the two Planning Committees under the Board should be abolished. In the past few months, many of the planning applications considered by the Planning Committee meetings were merely deferral requests. As such, heavy workload should no longer be a reason for adopting such approach in handling planning applications.

25. As the presentations of PlanD's representatives and the representers had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the question and answer (Q&A) session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representers or the government representatives (including the consultants) to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Item A

*Relocation of Existing Bus Depot*

26. In response to a Member's question on the relocation site for the existing bus depot at Item A site, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint Slide, said that Item A site was currently occupied by an open-air bus depot with ancillary facilities, including refuelling and washing facilities. To make way for the proposed private residential development, some of the existing functions of the existing bus depot at Item A site would be relocated to the freed-up area of the Tuen Mun – Chek Lap Kok Link Toll Plaza.

*Housing Type*

27. In response to a Member's question on whether Item A site, which was currently zoned "R(A)2" on the draft OZP, was permitted for public housing development, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that based on the findings of the EFS, the planning intention of the site for private housing development was stated in the non-statutory Explanatory Statement of the OZP. As the proposed housing type was not specified in the statutory Notes of the draft OZP, there would be no need to go through the statutory plan-making process again should the site eventually be used for public housing development.

*Public/Private Housing Split and Land for Commercial Use in TSW*

28. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the current public/private housing mix in TSW, and whether there was any available information about a further breakdown of public rental and HOS flats; and
- (b) the commercial land area in TSW.

29. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) the current public/private housing mix in TSW was a ratio of 76:24. Upon completion of the proposed private residential development at Item A site which would provide about 1,760 flats as well as other planned developments in the TSW area, the ratio would be about 74:26. There was no available information on the further breakdown between public rental and HOS flats in TSW at hand; and
- (b) according to the draft OZP, about 3.44 ha of land was zoned for commercial use, including Phases 1 and 2 of +WOO shopping mall and One Sky Mall. In addition, the existing shopping malls under the ownership of Link Asset Management Limited in public housing estates as well as those within private residential developments also provided daily necessities and services to the residents.

*Preliminary TTIA*

30. A Member raised the following questions with regard to the comments made by Mr Tong Kin Fung (R2) in his oral submission:

- (a) whether the traffic impact arising from the planned developments in the vicinity of Item A site had also been taken into account in the TTIA; and
- (b) based on the findings of the TTIA, whether the current provision of public transport services would be sufficient to serve the future residents of Item A site. If not, whether there was spare road capacity for introducing new bus routes, and the time required for its implementation.

31. In response, Mr K. W. Lo, CEDD's Consultant, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) for Item A, the preliminary TTIA had already taken into account the planned and committed developments as well as proposed developments under construction in the vicinity of Item A site including those mentioned by Mr Tong Kin Fung (R2) in his oral submission. Road improvement schemes to be implemented

under other projects in the locality had also been considered in the assessment. The findings of the preliminary TTIA indicated that the proposed private residential development would not induce adverse impact on the surrounding road network; and

- (b) Item A site was well-served by franchised buses and minibuses, and the assessment indicated that those services would be sufficient to meet the needs of future residents at the site. Currently, the frequency of minibus services was at a 30-minute interval. Opportunity could be explored to enhance the minibus services as and when needed.

#### *Land Contamination*

32. Regarding the concern on land contamination at Item A site raised by a Member, Mr Carl K.S. Ng, SE/W, CEDD responded that a land contamination assessment had been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD). Under the land contamination assessment, a site investigation was conducted and the testing results of the soil and underground water samples extracted from the site indicated no exceedance of land contamination. EPD had no comment on the contamination assessment report.

#### *Provision of Social Welfare Facilities*

33. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) given the shortfalls in both elderly and child care facilities in TSW, the major considerations for only providing elderly facilities at Item A site;
- (b) PlanD's responses to the shortfalls in GIC facilities raised by Ms Mary Mulvihill (R1) in her oral submission, and the difference in the catchment area adopted for assessing the adequacy of GIC provision under HKPSG and by the Social Welfare Department (SWD) in the assessment for provision for social welfare facilities; and
- (c) whether more social welfare facilities could be provided at Item A site and

whether the provision level should be determined before land sale.

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

- (a) the types of social welfare facilities/services to be provided at Item A site were determined by SWD based on the site characteristics and relevant provisions and demands in the area;
- (b) there were shortfalls in the provision of some social welfare facilities in TSW. SWD had adopted a different/wider spatial context/cluster, which did not tally with the Planning Scheme Area boundary of the OZP, in the assessment for provision of social welfare facilities. In applying the population-based planning standards, factors such as the distribution of welfare facilities, supply in different districts, service demand as a result of the population growth and demographic changes as well as the provision of various welfare facilities had to be considered. As the HKPSG requirements for those facilities were long-term goals, the actual provision would be subject to consideration of SWD in the planning and development process as appropriate; and
- (c) according to the requirements of SWD at the current stage, three types of social welfare facilities, including a 150-place RCHE cum 30-place Day Care Centre for the Elderly, a Neighbourhood Elderly Centre and a team for Home Care Services for Frail Elderly Persons, would be provided at Item A site, with a GFA equivalent to about 5% of the total domestic GFA of the site. SWD would be further consulted on whether there was any update on the requirements during the detailed design and land document preparation stages. There was still scope to increase the provision or change the mix of social welfare facilities, if considered necessary.

35. The Chairperson recalled that the issue of reviewing the catchment area in the GIC table for the assessment of provision of community facilities had recently been discussed by the Board. The matter would be followed up separately with a view to determining whether the catchment area as shown in the GIC table would need to be enlarged to a regional scale to tally with the

catchment areas adopted by relevant government departments to facilitate Members' consideration of the provision of GIC facilities in the concerned area. Regarding Item A site, the Chairperson invited DPO/TMYLW to convey Members' suggestions to SWD about including child care/nursery facilities at the site, which would help alleviate the burden on carers (often women) and support their participation in the workforce.

*'Population Landfill' and New Development Areas in the Surrounding Areas of TSW*

36. A Member raised the following questions to Mr Tong Kin Fung (R2):

- (a) whether he was a resident of TSW; and
- (b) an elaboration on the term 'Population Landfill' used to describe the current state of TSW in his oral submission.

37. In response, Mr Tong Kin Fung (R2) made the following major points:

- (a) he was a resident of TSW and had been living there for a long time;
- (b) 'Population Landfill' was a term used by some YLDC members some years ago in view of their grave concern about the substantial increase in new public housing developments in TSW. Over the years, TSW had been associated with many negative labels and was even dubbed the 'City of Sadness' (悲情城市). The poor ambience of TSW was attributed to the lack of GIC facilities and areas for commercial developments and hence employment opportunities; and
- (c) some YLDC members had raised objection to new residential developments in TSW but the reserved sites were still used for residential development.

38. In response to a follow-up question from the same Member on whether Mr Tong Kin Fung (R2) supported the proposed private residential development at Item A site to achieve a balanced community and demographic diversity, Mr Tong said that he maintained his objection to the zoning amendment of Item A site for private residential development.

39. The Chairperson said that TSW was a new town primarily planned to address the housing needs rather than becoming a major commercial or employment centre. That said, with the latest development initiatives under various policies and in a wider spatial context, the Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen NDA and the Lau Fau Shan, Tsim Bei Tsui and Pak Nai areas, which were located near TSW, were planned for the development of various industries and would create ample employment opportunities for the residents of TSW. Upon the implementation of the NDA and development of the surrounding areas, the connection between Lau Fau Shan and the northern part of TSW would also be enhanced to facilitate daily commuting.

40. Upon the Chairperson's invitation, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, supplemented that TSW, Yuen Long, Lau Fau Shan and Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen NDA were located in New Territories West, which formed part of the NM. To the immediate south of the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) TSW Station was Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen NDA, which was positioned as a high-end professional services hub to connect with the neighbouring Nanshan and Qianhai in Shenzhen. The NDA was planned with a variety of land uses, including logistics and commercial-related facilities, with about 2 million m<sup>2</sup> commercial GFA, providing some 150,000 job opportunities. The new MTR station at the future town centre of the Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen NDA, which was under construction, was only one station away from TSW Station. Moreover, the Lau Fau Shan, Tsim Bei Tsui and Pak Nai areas, located to the west of TSW across the nullah, were subject to a land use review study and regarded as an extension of the NDA. The concerned areas were positioned as a digital technology hub, serving as an incubation base with supporting facilities for start-ups. According to the preliminary findings of the land use review study, some 50,000 jobs would be created in the Lau Fau Shan, Tsim Bei Tsui and Pak Nai areas. It was envisaged that the working population of TSW could provide the necessary workforce to support the NDA and its extension.

Items B1, B2 and B3

41. In response to a Member's question on the necessity of rezoning the sites to reflect the completed developments under Items B1, B2 and B3, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that as agreed by the Board, a review of "CDA" sites designated for more than three years was conducted biennially by PlanD and the findings were submitted to the two Planning Committees for consideration. The two sites under Items B1 and B2, which were situated to the east of Wetland Park Road, were rezoned from "CDA" to



“R(B)3 and “R(B)4” respectively on the draft OZP to reflect the two residential developments completed in 2020 and 2022 respectively. Under the prevailing practice, upon completion of the proposed developments, the concerned sites would be rezoned to appropriate zonings to reflect the completed developments. The current “R(B)” zonings under Items B1 and B2 would allow suitable flexibility for the developer to make minor changes to the developments concerned in the future without the need to seek further planning permission from the Board. Opportunity was also taken to rezone the two adjoining strips of land to areas shown as ‘Road’ to reflect the as-built conditions under Item B3.

42. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. She thanked the representers and the government representatives (including the consultants) for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board’s decision in due course. The representers and the government representatives (including the consultants) left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

43. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

44. Members generally supported Item A and considered that the site was suitable for private residential development, which would help establish a more balanced community with a diversified demographic mix, stimulate economic development, and create more employment opportunities in TSW. Members had no objection to Items B1, B2 and B3 as they were technical amendments to reflect the completed residential developments and as-built conditions, and to Item C as it would facilitate a better utilisation of the site for GIC uses.

45. Noting that only about 3.44 ha of land (i.e. about 0.85% of the Planning Scheme Area) were zoned “Commercial” for commercial uses on the draft OZP, a Member suggested extending the geographical boundary of TSW to include some of the adjacent new development areas to enhance the provision of infrastructure and GIC facilities in TSW as a whole and to prevent the public from having a misperception of the district.

46. Members generally acknowledged the high demand for GIC facilities in TSW and had

the following observations/suggestions:

- (a) for public housing estates, the Housing Authority might construct a service block to accommodate GIC facilities for local residents. As for private residential developments, developers might not build such service block or provide more GIC facilities;
- (b) given the significant changes in the dynamics of economic activities in Hong Kong, especially in areas near Shenzhen and the Greater Bay Area where many cross-boundary economic activities were being undertaken, the demand for GIC facilities might be quite different from other districts. As such, relevant standards and data related to GIC facilities might need to be updated/reviewed specifically for such areas. More information on the provision of GIC facilities should also be provided to Members when considering OZP amendments in future;
- (c) it was not entirely convincing to adopt such a wide spatial context/cluster (e.g. New Territories West, including Yuen Long, TSW and Tuen Mun) for SWD to assess the provision of social welfare facilities;
- (d) the demand for social welfare facilities would vary across districts. For instance, more elderly facilities were required in older districts such as Kwun Tong, Wong Tai Sin and Sham Shui Po. A review of relevant planning guidelines should be conducted in consultation with the social welfare sector to reflect the actual demand for GIC facilities; and
- (e) apart from SWD, the private sector might also be willing to provide child care facilities and nursery services for the community.

47. In response to a Member's question on assigning more GFA (i.e. more than 5% of the total domestic GFA) for social welfare facilities, the Chairperson said that as announced in the 2020 Policy Address, for suitable public housing projects, premises equivalent to about 5% of the total domestic GFA would be set aside for welfare purposes. It was expected that more GIC facilities would be provided as more public housing was completed in the medium and long term.

This provision ratio for welfare facilities was recently adopted as a benchmark in suitable land sale sites for private resident developments and Item A site would be one of such land sale sites with the inclusion of this provision ratio. Under the prevailing arrangement, the developer was responsible for constructing the bare shell premises, which would be handed over to SWD for subsequent allocation to suitable NGOs for provision of social welfare services/facilities. While the 5% GFA for such social welfare facilities would be exempted from the total GFA calculation of the private developments, the associated construction cost was borne by the developer. Should more GFA be required for such purposes, it might undermine the attractiveness of the sale site and affect land sale revenue. Noting from the GIC table of the OZP, there were some shortfalls in social welfare facilities, including elderly and child care facilities. Having said that, such shortfalls could not be resolved by Item A site alone. For R2's suggestion of increasing the GFA for social welfare facilities at Item A site, further discussion with SWD, taking into account the views of Development Bureau and Lands Department regarding land revenue implications, would be required. The mix of social welfare facilities to be provided under the private residential development at Item A site could also be reviewed in consultation with SWD.

48. Given that TSW was perceived as a 'City of Sadness' and a number of social and family problems had occurred in the district, a Member opined that the Government should provide more HOS flats to facilitate upward mobility for young people. That said, two Members expressed the view that the living environment in TSW had improved significantly over the years. With the recent completion of private residential developments (i.e. at Items B1 and B2 sites), more middle-income households were willing to live in TSW. Although employment opportunities in the district were limited at the present moment, public transport services were adequate for daily commuting.

49. Upon the Chairperson's invitation, Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, provided information on the latest planning circumstances of TSW New Town in respect of employment opportunities, transport linkages and provision of social welfare facilities, as well as land use planning in adjacent new development areas, which were summarised below:

- (a) TSW was one of the third generation new towns in Hong Kong, first developed in 1987 as a dormitory town at the outset. Residential use was predominant in the district and local residents had to commute daily to work;

- (b) according to the findings of ‘Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030’ and the Northern Metropolis Development Strategy promulgated in 2021, there would be two metropolitan areas in Hong Kong, namely the Victoria Harbour Metropolitan Area and the NM, setting out a new strategic planning framework for the future development of Hong Kong. In planning new development areas, both housing and employment opportunities should be considered, with a view to attaining home-job balance and minimising the need to work across districts. The NM, upon its full development, would accommodate a population of about 2.5 million and create about 500,000 to 600,000 new jobs. For the Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen NDA, it was planned to provide about 150,000 jobs, covering various industries including commercial, logistics and industrial sectors;
- (c) TSW was a fully developed community and it was very difficult to identify suitable land parcels in the town centre to develop new economic clusters to serve the local community. As such, the Government needed to take forward new land use planning initiatives as mentioned above and implement new development areas to create more employment and development opportunities to meet the needs of the residents in TSW;
- (d) on traffic and transport aspects, the Transport and Logistics Bureau announced the “Three Railways and Three Major Roads” initiative in 2022, which included the Hong Kong-Shenzhen Western Rail Link, Central Rail Link and TKO Line Southern Extension, NM Highway, Sha Tin Bypass and TKO – Yau Tong Tunnel. The proposed NM Highway, one of the three major roads, would serve as a new east-west corridor connecting key development areas across the NM, supporting its long-term development. On that basis, other new projects, including “Two Railways and One Major Road” (i.e. Northern Link Eastern Extension, Northeast New Territories Line and NM Highway – New Territories North New Town Section), were proposed to enhance the transportation network in New Territories North, which would further enhance the connectivity within the NM and would be beneficial to the development of TSW;
- (e) regarding the provision of social welfare facilities, 5% of the total domestic GFA

of public housing development would be set aside for welfare purpose in accordance with the 2020 Policy Address. Noting that a number of sites had been rezoned for public housing in recent years, more social welfare facilities would be provided in the reserved floor spaces. The requirement for the provision of social welfare facilities was also stipulated in some private housing sites such as in Kai Tak and Item A site;

- (f) referring to the Notes of the draft OZP, any floor space that was constructed or intended for use solely as GIC facilities, as required by the Government, might be disregarded, i.e. exempted from GFA calculation. Flexibility had been allowed under the Notes of the draft OZP for further increase in the provision of GIC facilities. Further liaison with SWD and other relevant B/Ds could be conducted to work out the optimal scheme for Item A site before land sale;
- (g) the Government endeavoured to promote mixed development under the “single site, multiple use” model, which had been widely adopted in new developments. In the past, it was common practice for a single use to occupy the whole GIC site. Under the current government policy, by working out a reference plot ratio for individual GIC sites by PlanD, more GIC uses (e.g. in the form of joint-user complex) would be incorporated into a single site to maximise utilisation. For example, the site occupied by Tuen Mun Clinic would be redeveloped as a joint-user building to accommodate various GIC facilities. The approval of planning application for minor relaxation of building height restrictions at the GIC sites on Anderson Road also facilitated the development of a joint-user complex with various GIC facilities and an underground public vehicle park; and
- (h) the provision requirements for social welfare facilities based on population had been formulated years ago, was subsequently abandoned but reinstated a few years ago. Those population-based requirements provided a clear reference for the public to examine any shortfalls in provision. The Government had strived to provide more GIC facilities, including social welfare facilities, to alleviate the shortfalls in recent years. While the catchment areas adopted by SWD and PlanD in their assessments for the

provision of GIC facilities were different and the Hospital Authority planned its services (e.g. hospital beds) on a cluster rather than on an OZP basis, PlanD would further liaise with relevant bureaux/departments to undertake better analyses on the provision of GIC facilities for Members' reference when considering OZP amendments in future.

### *Conclusion*

50. The Chairperson concluded that Members supported all the amendments to the OZP, and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations and that all grounds of the representation had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives (including the consultants) at the meeting. While there had been some shortcomings in planning of TSW New Town at the early stage, the prospect of future development in the district remained promising, especially when the adjacent new development areas such as Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen NDA began to take shape, providing more job opportunities and GIC facilities for the residents of TSW.

51. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1 (part)** on Item C and the views of **R1 (part)** on Items B1, B2 and B3 and decided not to uphold R1 (part) and R2, and agreed that the draft Tin Shui Wai (TSW) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

#### “Item A

- (a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to make available sufficient supply of land for both public and private housing progressively to meet the acute demand for housing, including carrying out various land use reviews on an on-going basis. The representation site is located at the southeastern part of the TSW New Town with residential, government, institution and community (GIC) and open space uses in the area. It is considered appropriate to rezone the representation site for residential use with a view to increasing housing land supply (**R1 and R2**);

- (b) an Engineering Feasibility Study covering various aspects including traffic, environment, drainage, sewerage, visual, landscape and air ventilation has been conducted by the Government and confirmed that there is no insurmountable technical problem in developing the representation site for private residential use. It is considered appropriate to initiate the rezoning through amendments to the OZP under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) (R1); and
- (c) the provision of GIC facilities is generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population in the TSW area in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, except for some elderly facilities, child care centres, rehabilitation and residential care services, as well as hospital beds. The private residential development would also provide social welfare facilities to meet the needs of the residents in the area as appropriate. The provision of GIC facilities will be closely monitored by relevant government bureaux/departments (R1).”

52. The Board also agreed that the draft TSW OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 15-minute break.]

### **Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-KTS/534

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 496 S.F in D.D. 94, Hang Tau, Sheung Shui

(TPB Paper No. 10980)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

### Presentation and Question Sessions

53. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), the applicant and the applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung	- District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East
Ms Lucille L.S. Leung	- Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE)
Mr K.Y. Liu	- Applicant
Mr C.F. Som	] Applicant's Representatives
Mr C.S. Cheung	]

54. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the review hearing. She then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the review application.

55. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lucille L.S. Leung, STP/FSYLE, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site (the Site) and the surrounding areas, the applicant's proposal and justifications, the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10980. As there had been no major change in planning circumstances since the consideration of the section 16 application, PlanD maintained its previous view of not supporting the application.

56. The Chairperson then invited the applicant and the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the review application.

57. Mr C.S Cheung, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) it was not feasible to rehabilitate the Site for agricultural or fish pond use as it



was small in size and surrounded by existing houses. It was expected that the nearby villagers would lodge complaints against agricultural and fisheries activities at the Site due to the environmental and odour nuisances arising from such activities;

- (b) some houses had already been built within the subject “AGR” zone which was outside the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Hang Tau;
- (c) the Site was the subject of a previously approved planning application for Small House development. The application was rejected as a result of the change of Government’s policy in considering planning applications for proposed Small House. It was hoped that Members would adopt a flexible approach in considering the application, taking into account that the applicant had waited for a long time to materialise the proposed Small House development and the Site was surrounded by existing houses; and
- (d) one of the reasons for rejecting the application was that land was still available within the “V” zone of Hang Tau for Small House development. In fact, majority of the available land in Hang Tau was currently used for storage purposes under private ownership, which was not expected to be taken for Small Houses development in the coming 10 to 20 years. Newly built Small Houses were rarely found within the “V” zone in the past decade.

58. As the presentations of the PlanD’s representative and the applicant’s representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

59. A Member asked if the previous planning approval for Small House development at the Site under application No. A/NE-KTS/314 in 2011 was one of the main reasons for purchasing the Site by the applicant in 2014 and whether the applicant would expect that he would obtain the planning approval for Small House development at the Site in view of the previous planning approval. In response, Mr C.S. Cheung, the applicant’s representative, said that considering a number of Small Houses built outside the “V” zone of Hang Tau and the previous planning approval for Small House development at the Site in 2011, the applicant spent a large amount of money to purchase the Site in 2014 for Small House development. Noting that the Board had

adopted a more cautious approach in considering New Territories Exempted House/Small House applications since 2015, the applicant appealed to the Board to give favourable consideration to the application.

60. In response to a Member's question about the request for the Board to adopt a more flexible approach in considering the application despite the land within "AGR" zone not being intended for Small House development, Mr C.S. Cheung, the applicant's representative, reiterated that the applicant purchased the Site in 2014 based on the previous planning approval for Small House development in 2011, and it was expected that the current application for Small House development could also be approved. On the understanding that the Government's policy, law and regulations could change over time, he was of the view that the Board could approve the application at its discretion.

61. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in the absence of the applicant and his representatives and would inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives, the applicant and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

62. Noting that the applicant had not provided any substantive new justification or information in support of the review application, Members generally agreed that there was no reason to deviate from RNTPC's decision and the review application should be rejected.

63. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone, which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning

justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and

- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Hang Tau which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.”

**Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/YL-NSW/293 (2<sup>nd</sup> Deferment)  
Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development with Commercial Uses and Social Welfare Facilities in “Undetermined” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 103 and D.D. 115, Nam Sang Wai, Yuen Long  
(TPB Paper No. 10981)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

64. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and So, Lung & Associates were two of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the items:

Dr Tony C.M. Ip - having current business dealings with Arup;  
and

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being a consultant of So, Lung & Associates.

65. Members noted that Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As Dr Tony C.M. Ip had no involvement in the review application, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

66. After deliberation, the Board decided to defer a decision, being the second deferment,

on the application for two months as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information, as recommended in the Paper.

**Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

**Any Other Business**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

67. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:30 a.m.