

**Minutes of 1328th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 13.12.2024**

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

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Engineer/Traffic Survey & Support
Transport Department
Mr W.H. Poon

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North)
Environmental Protection Department
Ms Clara K.W. U

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

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

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Chief Engineer (Works)
Home Affairs Department
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Katy C.W. Fung

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Katherine H.Y. Wong

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting] [The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1327th Meeting held on 29.11.2024

1. The draft minutes of the 1327th meeting held on 29.11.2024 were confirmed without amendment.

Amendments to Confirmed Minutes of the 1327th Meeting held on 4.11.2024 and 5.11.2024

2. The Secretary reported that on 2.12.2024 and 3.12.2024, the Secretariat of the Town Planning Board (the Board) received emails from two representers (R2376 and R3535 of the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/22 (the draft OZP)) who attended the representation hearing of the draft OZP on 4.11.2024 and 5.11.2024 respectively. The two representers stated in their emails that their presentations recorded in the minutes were simplified, incomplete and/or inaccurate.

3. The Secretary said that according to the Procedure and Practice of the Board, the key points of discussion and decision of a meeting would be recorded in the relevant minutes of meeting to serve as official records of the meeting, the minutes were not recorded in verbatim. After further checking the audio recording of the hearing meeting, it was proposed to amend paragraphs 23, 23(d) and 23(e) on pages 22 and 23 of the confirmed minutes of the 1327th meeting held on 4.11.2024 and paragraphs 50(e) and 50(f) on page 49 of the confirmed minutes of the 1327th meeting held on 5.11.2024 in response to the comments made by the two representers (R2376 and R3535). The proposed amendments to the confirmed minutes were shown on the screen for the Board's agreement. In any event, the amendments had no material impacts on the accuracy or integrity of the confirmed minutes.

4. The Board agreed to the proposed amendments to the confirmed minutes. The Secretary said that the amendments would be recorded in the form of addendums to the confirmed minutes of the 1327th meeting, which would be uploaded to the Board's website.

[Ms Clara K.W. U joined the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan

5. The Secretary reported that on 29.10.2024, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as S/K3/38) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the OZP was notified in the Gazette on 8.11.2024.

(ii) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans

6. The Secretary reported that on 1.11.2024, the Secretary for Development referred the approved Tsim Sha Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K1/28 and the approved Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/37 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1A)(a)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 15.11.2024.

(iii) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations on Draft Urban Renewal Authority Development Scheme Plan

7. The Secretary reported that the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations in respect of the draft Urban Renewal Authority Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme Plan No. S/K3/URA5/1 (the draft DSP) was agreed by Members on 4.12.2024 by circulation. She briefly introduced that on 23.9.2024, the draft DSP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, 767 valid representations were received. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the valid 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 of the draft DSP was scheduled for January 2025.

- (iv) Dismissal of Judicial Review Application lodged against the Decision of the Town Planning Board on Section 12A Application No. Y/H5/7 (HCAL 2260/2023)

8. The Secretary reported that a judgment was handed down by the Court of First Instance (CFI) dismissing the judicial review (JR) application lodged by Hostford Development Limited, Dialogue in the Dark (HK) Foundation Limited and Wong Wang Tai (the JR Applicants) against the decision of the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on a partially agreed section 12A application No. Y/H5/7 (the s.12A application) in respect of a site at St. Francis Street and Sau Wa Fong in Wan Chai (the Site) made by Great Kinetic Limited, Full Glory Development Limited and Ever Genius Limited (the s.12A Applicants). Mr Simon Y.S. Wong had declared interests on the item for him and his spouse owning properties in Wan Chai. As the item was only to report the judgment of CFI on the JR application, Members agreed that Mr Simon Y.S. Wong could stay in the meeting.

9. The Secretary briefly introduced that the JR was lodged on 13.12.2023 against MPC's decision on 22.9.2023 to partially agree to the s.12A application to rezone the Site from "Residential (Group A)", "Residential (Group C)" and an area shown as 'Road' to "Residential (Group A)9" subject to a maximum building height of 110 metres above Principal Datum on the Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/31 to facilitate a proposed 28-storey residential development cum commercial uses (including arts facilities). The JR Applicants were commenters of the s.12A application. The major concerns of the JR application were related to pedestrian safety and provision of barrier-free access at the Site. The major grounds of the JR application were as follows:

- (a) Ground 1 – the Board acted ultra vires, made an uncertain decision and/or failed to give any adequate reasons by deciding to "partially agree" to the s.12A application without even specifying which part of the s.12A application it was agreeing to;
- (b) Ground 2 – the Board unlawfully delegated to the Planning Department

(PlanD) its statutory power to decide which part of the s.12A application to accept; and

- (c) Ground 3 – the Board failed to take into account the objecting public comments, which was in breach of its duty, the MPC Paper failed to fairly present to the Board such objecting public comments, and the Board failed to give any adequate reasons to explain why it rejected the points made in the public comments.

10. The Secretary said that on 6.11.2024, the CFI dismissed the JR application mainly for the following reasons:

- (a) the issues, factors, planning considerations and assessments, government departments' comments and PlanD's views (concerning the proposed provision of direct vehicular access, the non-building area and a 24-hour public passageway) were fairly and comprehensively presented to the MPC Members. MPC was fully aware of the contents of the MPC Paper and the representations made by PlanD and the s.12A Applicants at the MPC meeting. It was clear that MPC decided to adopt PlanD's recommendation for partial agreement to the rezoning application with stipulation of appropriate controls, where there was no undefined scope or lack of particulars in the partial agreement. As there was no undefined partial agreement (Ground 1 of the JR), the alleged unlawful delegation (Ground 2 of the JR) could not succeed either; and
- (b) the relevant objecting comments (the Comments) had been fairly presented to MPC for consideration in the decision-making process and the MPC Members were fully aware of the Comments. The Comments were looked at but not thought to be of any prime importance at the then stage of consideration, and so were given little weight. There was no evidence to suggest that the Board disregarded the Comments and there was no issue on whether the Board had any duty of giving reasons for rejecting those comments (Ground 3 of the JR).

11. The Secretary further reported that the JR Applicants served a Notice of Appeal on 3.12.2024 against the CFI's judgment dismissing their JR Application.

12. Members noted the CFI's judgment of dismissing the JR Application, and agreed that the Secretary would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal.

(v) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 4 of 2024

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

Application No. A/NE-KTS/534

13. The Secretary reported that a Notice of Appeal was received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) on 7.11.2024 against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 23.8.2024 to reject on review an application No. A/NE-KTS/534 for a proposed house (New Territories Exempted House – Small House). The application site fell within an area zoned “Agriculture” (“AGR”) on the Kwu Tung South Outline Zoning Plan.

14. The review application was rejected by the Board for the following reasons:

- (a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone, which was primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It was also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) land was still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Hang Tau which was primarily intended for Small House development. It was 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.

15. Members noted that the hearing date of the appeal had yet to be fixed and agreed that the Secretary would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.

(vi) Appeal Statistics

16. The Secretary reported that as at 10.12.2024, four cases were yet to be heard by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) and one decision was outstanding.

17. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	45
Dismissed	179
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	214
Yet to be Heard	4
Decision Outstanding	1
<hr/>	
Total	443

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-NSW/9
(TPB Paper No. 10988)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

18. The Secretary reported that the Amendment Items A1, A2 and B on the draft

Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-NSW/9 involved rezoning of a site at Ho Chau Road, Yuen Long to facilitate a proposed public and private housing development under the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS), in which the public housing development would be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). Richduty Development Limited, Success King Limited and Topwood Limited, all subsidiaries of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK), were the applicants of the LSPS development, and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) were the consultants of the applicants. Representations were submitted by The Conservancy Association (CA) (R2), the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R4) and Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation (R8). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Maurice K.W. Loo
<i>(as Director of Lands)</i> | - | being a member of HKHA; |
| Mr Paul Y.K. Au
<i>(as Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department)</i> | - | being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan | - | being a member of HKHA, a member of its Strategic Planning Committee and the chairperson of its Audit Sub-Committee |
| Dr Tony C.M. Ip | - | having current business dealings with SHK, AECOM and CA; |
| Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho | - | having current business dealings with SHK, AECOM and Arup; |
| Mr Timothy K.W. Ma | - | being a member of the LSPS Panel of Advisors; |

- Mr K.W. Leung - being a former executive committee member of HKBWS and the former chairman of Crested Bulbul Club Committee which was a group under HKBWS; and
- Mr Ryan M.K. Ip - being the vice-president cum co-head of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from the Kadoorie Family.

19. Members noted that Messrs Paul Y.K. Au, Vincent K.Y. Ho, Timothy K.W. Ma and Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Mr Maurice K.W. Loo and Dr Tony C.M. Ip were direct, they were invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Messrs K.W. Leung and Ryan M.K. Ip had no involvement in the submission of the relevant representations, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Maurice K.W. Loo and Dr Tony C.M. Ip left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

20. The Chairperson said that the LSPS was introduced by the Government as one of the measures to use privately-owned land to increase both public and private housing supply. Under the LSPS, no less than 70% of the increased domestic gross floor area (GFA) of the privately owned site should be set aside for public housing development, and the developer would be responsible for site formation works and construction of the supporting infrastructure and utilities. Seven LSPS applications were received before the closing deadline of application in May 2024. The proposed development in Nam Shan Wai (i.e. Amendment Items A1, A2 and B) was the first LSPS project submitted for the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB)'s consideration.

Presentation and Question Sessions

21. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the representers inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As

reasonable notice had been given to the representers, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

22. The following government representatives, representers and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo | - | District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSLYE) |
| Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak | - | Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE) |
| Mr Gary T.L. Lam | - | Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East |

Land Sharing Office, Development Bureau (LSO, DEVB)

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Mr Mann M.H. Chow | - | Head of Land Sharing Office (H(LSO)) |
| Mr Lawrence C.M. Hui | - | Assistant Secretary |
| Mr Raymond Y.B. Leong | - | Senior Engineer |
| Mr Kanic C.K. Kwok | - | Town Planner |

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Mr Boris S.P. KWAN | - | Senior Nature Conservation Officer (SNCO) |
|--------------------|---|---|

Representers and Representers' Representatives

R1 – Topwood Limited/Success King Limited/Richduty Development Limited

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Ms Wu Wan Yin Winnie |] | |
| Mr Franki Chiu |] | Representer's Representatives |
| Ms Chu Sin Yi |] | |

R2 – CA

Mr Ng Hei Man - Representers' Representative

R3 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

R4 – HKBWS

Ms Wong Suet Mei - Representers' Representative

R5 – Fung Kam Lam

Mr Fung Kam Lam - Representer

23. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that representatives of PlanD would be invited to brief Members on the representations. The representers and/or their representatives 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 and/or their representatives 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 and/or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, the representers and/or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers and/or their representatives 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.

24. The Chairperson invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of amendments on the OZP, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10988 (the Paper). The amendment items included:

- (a) Item A1 – rezoning of a site to the north of Ho Chau Road from “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) to “Residential (Group A)1” subject to a maximum GFA of 95,100m² and a maximum building height (BH) of 100 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) for public housing development;
- (b) Item A2 – rezoning of a site to the north of Ho Chau Road from “R(D)” to “Residential (Group A)2” subject to a maximum domestic GFA of 50,179m², a maximum non-domestic GFA of 2,245m², and a maximum BH of 100mPD for private housing development;
- (c) Item B – rezoning of a site to the north of Ho Chau Road from “R(D)” to “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Pumping Station”;
- (d) Item C – rezoning of a strip of land to the north of Ho Chau Road from “R(D)” to “Village Type Development” (“V”);
- (e) Item D – rezoning of a knoll to the north of Ho Chau Road from “R(D)” to “Green Belt” (“GB”); and
- (f) Item E – rezoning of a site at Wing Kei Tsuen from “OU” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” (“OU(CDWRA)”) to “OU” annotated “Comprehensive Development to Include Wetland Restoration Area 1” (“OU(CDWRA)1”) subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 1.55 and a maximum BH of 54mPD.

25. The Chairperson then invited the representers and/or their representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R1 – Topwood Limited/Success King Limited/Richduty Development Limited

26. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wu Wan Yin Winnie made the following main points:

- (a) she supported Items A1, A2, B, C and D as they reflected the decision

made by the Board on 21.6.2024 agreeing to the proposed LSPS development;

- (b) Items A1 and A2 could facilitate early implementation of the public and private housing developments under the LSPS; and
- (c) the proposed pumping station under Item B was an essential infrastructural facility to support the proposed LSPS development.

R2 – CA

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Hei Man made the following main points:

- (a) he expressed grave concern on the impact on ecological conservation of the LSPS development proposal as the LSPS site was close to the Wetland Conservation Area (WCA);
- (b) geographical limit had been set under the LSPS that conservation-related zonings on OZPs and areas including, among others, the 12 Priority Sites for Enhanced Conservation under the New Nature Conservation Policy (NNCP) were not eligible for LSPS. However, about 15% of the LSPS site planned for roads and landscaping overlapped with one of the Priority Sites for Enhanced Conservation (i.e. Deep Bay Wetland outside Ramsar Site);
- (c) according to the responses in the Paper, the LSPS Panel of Advisors (the PoA) had taken into account the planning history of the LSPS site that part of it was the subject of an agreed section 12A application (s.12A application) (No. Y/YL-NSW/4) with a minor portion at the fringe of the application site overlapped with Deep Bay Wetland outside Ramsar Site and considered that the LSPS proposal could strike a proper balance between housing demand and conservation, and supported the proposal. He questioned the irrelevance of the “planning history” to the criteria on

the geographical limits of LSPS, and whether the PoA had discretionary power to consider LSPS applications if the applications were not in line with the criteria. The proposed development, being the first LSPS project considered by the Board, would set a precedent for similar applications to allow development overriding the conservation policy in future;

- (d) although the Nam Sang Wai Wetland Conservation Park (NSW WCP) proposed under the Strategic Feasibility Study on the Development of WCPs System (the Feasibility Study) did not cover the LSPS site, the LSPS site was in close proximity to the WCP and the proposed development would adversely affect the WCP. Indirect environment disturbance to the NSW WCP was envisaged. While the ecological impact assessment (EcoIA) had included light assessment for some avifauna such as the night roost of Great Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax carbo*) (普通鸕鷀), the EcoIA did not assess the light impacts on nocturnal birds or include detailed flight path information. Besides, there would be human disturbance from the high-density residential towers;
- (e) the three proposed compensation wetlands were scattered and piecemeal, and their functions might not be comparable to the original ones which were larger in size. There were insufficient details to demonstrate their effectiveness to create synergy with the existing wetlands in the vicinity as stated in the Paper since there would be two management approaches, with one for the wetlands within the LSPS site and the other for the wetlands outside the LSPS site. It was doubtful how the ecological integrity of the proposed compensation wetlands within and outside the LSPS site could be ensured;
- (f) there were insufficient details in the Habitat Creation and Management Plan (HCMP) and financial arrangements to be provided by the LSPS applicants. The practicability and sustainability (including future maintenance and management (M&M)) of the compensation wetlands of the proposed LSPS development were questionable;

- (g) majority of the Item E Site fell within the NSW WCP, and there was no impact evaluation on the operation of the NSW WCP. Allowing development within the NSW WCP would set an undesirable precedent for similar cases in future; and
- (h) CA submitted a letter to LSO in September 2021, and CA together with six other green groups submitted a joint letter to DEVB expressing grave concern on two LSPS applications, including the one in Nam Sang Wai under Items A1 and A2 Sites. There was only a reply letter from DEVB acknowledging receipt of their comments, but no meetings/discussions were held with them. The green groups could only express their views at the representation hearing by the Board which was already at a late stage. There should be room for improving communication between the Government and the green groups so that both sides could share views, address concerns and strengthen mutual trust.

R4 – HKBWS

28. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wong Suet Mei made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed LSPS site encroached onto one of the Priority Sites for Enhanced Conservation (i.e. Deep Bay Wetland outside Ramsar Site), which was ineligible for LSPS application. Although part of the LSPS site was covered by an agreed s.12A application (No. Y/YL-NSW/4) for a proposed residential development, the planning history should not be the consideration for approving the proposed LSPS development and no discretion should be allowed to exempt it from compliance with the eligibility criterion of not falling within conservation-related zonings on OZPs and areas. A more stringent approach should be adopted, rather than merely balancing housing development and conservation;
- (b) the EcoIA for the proposed LSPS development was not as comprehensive

as those conducted for other developments within the WCA and the Wetland Buffer Area (WBA). The original abandoned ponds had species of conservation importance and should not be assessed as having lower ecological value. There was no independent flight line survey for the night roost of ardeids along Kam Tin River, the night roost of Great Cormorants to the north of the LSPS site, and the waterbirds foraged in the nearby wetlands and Kam Tin River. The vantage points for conducting the surveys were too low in elevation which did not allow surveyors to collect sufficient information for a complete picture on the birds' flight paths. The assessment of light impact on firefly and other species in the vicinity was qualitative only, with no survey conducted. The cumulative ecological impact of the proposed LSPS development and other projects in the vicinity had not been assessed;

- (c) the scattered compensation wetlands of 6,900m² were unable to replicate the ecological function of the original larger and continuous ponds, including those located outside the LSPS site. The indirect habitat loss resulted from the proposed development was not taken into consideration. The proposed compensation wetland at the further south of the proposed development was located beside a road that could cause environmental disturbance. The financial arrangements for the proposed compensation wetlands were not mentioned;
- (d) the LSPS site for a high-density development with 27-storey buildings was located in close proximity to the WCA. The nearest distance between the proposed building block and the WCA was only about 6m, and the proposed building setback was insufficient. With reference to the Study on Ecological Value of Fish Ponds in Deep Bay Area (the Fishpond Study) carried out by the Government in 1997, a setback of over 185m wide, together with ecological landscape design, was recommended for medium-rise developments;
- (e) Item E fell within the NSW WCP which was not shown in Plan H-6 of the Paper and should be clarified. There were recommendations from the

Feasibility Study on biodiversity conservation of the WCPs and there were doubts about the synergy between the development proposals and the WCPs;

- (f) Items A1, A2, B, C and D should be rejected. The LSPS applicants should be requested to reduce the development intensity and revise the design and layout to incorporate sufficient setback to serve as ecological buffer based on a sound, comprehensive and up-to-date assessment. The development intensity, such as BH, of the proposed development under Item E should also be reduced;
- (g) there was a lack of communication between the Government and the green groups. Green groups' comments on the ecological impacts of the proposed LSPS development with regard to the design, layout and development intensity of the proposed development were submitted to DEVB but no responses were received;
- (h) the "Undetermined" ("U") zone in the area with fishponds and within the WBA should be rezoned to conservation zonings such as "Conservation Area" ("CA") or "OU" for wetland conservation purpose to ensure that any development would not cause wetland loss or harm the integrity and ecological value of Deep Bay wetlands; and
- (i) the revised description of "no-net loss in wetland" principle which could refer to no decline in wetland or ecological functions as stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft OZP for the "CA" and "OU" annotated "Comprehensive Development and Wetland Enhancement Area" ("OU(CDWEA)") zones were not in line with the the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C for Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 (s.16) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) (TPB PG-No. 12C). According to the TPB PG-No. 12C, "no-net-loss in wetland" should refer to both area and function. The original description under the approved Nam Sang Wai OZP should be retained.

R5 – Fung Kam Lam

29. Mr Fung Kam Lam made the following main points:
- (a) the Government rezoned the LSPS site without going through s.12A application process, which set an undesirable precedent. There was no channel for the public to make comments on the LSPS projects under the administrative procedures. The administrative procedures on considering/approving LSPS projects bypassed the statutory procedures. Whilst part of the LSPS site was included in an agreed s.12A application (No. Y/YL-NSW/4) for a proposed residential development, it should be noted that the proposed LSPS development had a higher development intensity compared with the proposed scheme of the agreed s.12A application;
 - (b) according to the LSPS applicants, the compensation wetlands would be maintained and managed together with the future private residential portion, with reference to the approaches adopted for the compensation wetlands for Park YOHO to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC). However, the requirements of the DAFC were not clear, and the sustainability including the long-term M&M of the proposed compensation wetlands was questionable. It was uncertain whether the individual property owners of the residential development would have to bear the M&M costs of the proposed compensation wetlands. The M&M responsibility of the proposed compensation wetlands should be identified at the early stage;
 - (c) ‘Zoo’ use should not be incorporated under Column 2 of the Notes for the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone. There was no space for construction of a zoo within the “G/IC” zone on the OZP. The Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN) should not be strictly followed and the circumstances of Nam Sang Wai should be taken into account. In addition to consulting AFCD, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) should also be consulted as the Hong Kong

Zoological and Botanical Gardens, where animals were kept, was under the management of LCSD; and

- (d) the Remarks of the Notes for the “OU(CDWEA)”, “OU(CDWRA)” and “CA” zones on the filling of land/pond and excavation of land clause should not be revised in accordance with the MSN, and the inclusion of such clause in the Nam Sang Wai OZP should be reviewed.

R3 – Mary Mulvihill

30. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:
- (a) she strongly objected to the proposed LSPS development. The proposed development would fill a considerable area of ponds, which was considered not acceptable in view of the deteriorating climate conditions. As there was a declining demand for public housing and an oversupply in private housing, providing additional housing in the area was not necessary;
 - (b) the proposed LSPS development was unacceptable in light of the planning intention of Nam Sang Wai. Given that the LSPS site was located close to the ecologically sensitive area, the proposed development scale and BH were considered unacceptable. The original “R(D)” zone was intended for low-rise, low-density residential development and the proposed scheme under the agreed s.12A application No. Y/YL-NSW/4 only consisted of 57 villas of four storeys, whilst the proposed LSPS development would provide more than 3,000 residential units;
 - (c) it fell short of public expectations that the TPB PG-No. 12C for Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under s.16 of the Ordinance did not apply to the OZP amendments for the proposed LSPS development. On the contrary, the guidelines for developments requiring OZP amendments should be more stringent;
 - (d) the scattered compensation landscaped ponds of 6,900m², which were

concrete-lined, were unable to serve the same level of ecological function as performed by the ponds to be filled;

- (e) 153 trees were proposed to be removed for the proposed LSPS development. Amongst which, 104 trees were categorised as undesirable and invasive species and no tree compensation was proposed. The tree planting and landscape proposal could not meet the 1:1 compensation ratio as the felling of undesirable trees and invasive species were not counted for compensation, and only 49 new heavy-standard trees would be planted within the proposed LSPS development as part of the landscape proposal;
- (f) there was an overall shortfall in government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in the area. The non-domestic GFA constituted only 4.2% of the total GFA of the private housing portion and 1.8% for the public housing portion under the proposed LSPS development. For the whole LSPS development, the non-domestic GFA, which included retail uses, was only about 3% of the total GFA. Excluding the retail uses, there would be only 2% of the non-domestic GFA for GIC uses;
- (g) she objected to Item C as there was no justification for extending the “V” zone and the Item C Site was located at a distance from Shan Pui Tsuen and outside the village ‘environs’. The Small House Policy was unsustainable as it would result in inefficient use of land. No data was provided on the Small House demand for the village;
- (h) she fully supported Item D, which involved rezoning a knoll to the north of Ho Chau Road from “R(D)” to “GB” to reflect the existing condition;
- (i) she strongly objected to Item E as there was already an oversupply of private housing in the territory. Destroying wetlands to generate additional private housing was considered unacceptable. The proposed development of 15 storeys would create wall effect and cause noise and light pollution to the nearby habitats and the migratory birds;

- (j) the cumulative impacts of the proposed developments under the amendment items were not assessed. The lack of comprehensive planning and review in the district could overstrain the infrastructure capacity, the provision of GIC facilities and the environmental capacity;
- (k) she objected to the incorporation of 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' and 'Hotel (Holiday House only)' uses under Column 2 of the Notes for the "V" zone as hotel and holiday homes were commercial uses, which were not in line with the planning intention of "V" zone to provide land for the development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. If there was no demand for Small Houses, the Government could resume the land for subsidised low-rise residential development;
- (l) she objected to the incorporation of 'Zoo' use under Column 2 of the Notes for the "G/IC" zone. Keeping animals in cages was no longer justified as they could be left free in their natural habitat, while technology now enabled people to view and understand the nature through alternative means; and
- (m) she strongly objected to the revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the "OU(CDWEA)", "OU(CDWRA)" and "CA" zones on the exemption clause for government works on filling of land/pond and excavation of land in accordance with the MSN, as it gave the Government unfettered and unaccountable power to carry out such activities, which would undermine the public interests.

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

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

LSPS

32. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the objectives of LSPS and the geographical limits of LSPS applications;
- (b) the procedures for handling LSPS applications, and how they were different from a s.12A application;
- (c) whether the LSPS site had encroached onto the environmentally sensitive areas;
- (d) whether the construction cost of the required infrastructure and utilities to support the whole LSPS development would be borne by the developer; and
- (e) whether the comments from the green groups in their letter of 2021 addressed to DEVB as mentioned by R2 and R4 were received and considered, and how the public were informed of the LSPS applications, including any subsequent changes to the schemes.

33. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H(LSO), DEVB made the following main points:

- (a) as one of the Government's multi-pronged strategies to increase land and housing supply in the short-to-medium term, the 2018 Policy Address (PA) set out the proposed framework of the LSPS, with further details outlined in the 2019 PA. The LSPS was launched in May 2020 to accept applications up to May 2024. The LSPS aimed to unleash the development potential of private land with consolidated ownership that was outside specified environmentally sensitive areas (including country parks, environmentally sensitive zonings on OZPs and areas covered by 12 Priority Sites for Enhanced Conservation under the NNCP) and areas that

were not covered by the Government's development studies in order to boost both public and private housing supply. Under the LSPS, no less than 70% of the additional domestic GFA generated from the upgraded infrastructure should be set aside for public housing development, in order to achieve a public/private housing ratio of 70:30. An example of a privately owned lot currently capable of delivering a maximum domestic GFA of 20,000m² under the OZP/with previous planning approval by the Board was used for illustration. Assuming approval under the LSPS (and subject to the approval by the Board), the maximum domestic GFA attainable by the private lots would be increased to 80,000m², and the increased domestic GFA would amount to 60,000m². For such case, based on the public/private housing ratio of 70:30, a GFA of 42,000m² (70% of the increased GFA of 60,000m²) would be allocated for public housing, while the developer/lot owner would have a total GFA of 38,000m² for private housing (i.e. the original domestic GFA of 20,000m² plus the 18,000m² from the 30% of the increased domestic GFA). For the subject case at Ho Chau Road in Yuen Long, the LSPS application was received in 2021 and subsequently endorsed in principle by the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) in November 2022. The LSPS site did not fall within the WCA but was within the WBA. Out of the seven LSPS applications received, only the subject LSPS site involved wetlands. There were some other enquiries regarding development sites that involved larger area of environmental sensitive areas, which were rejected;

- (b) a streamlined arrangement with a three-stage approach was adopted to handle LSPS applications in a facilitating manner. With a view to ensuring speedy delivery of the housing yield in short-to-medium term, LSO was set up to provide one-stop advisory and facilitation services to LSPS applicants. The procedures for processing LSPS applications were comparable to the established procedures for s.12A applications. Technical assessments were required to be conducted to support the LSPS applications. Upon receipt and vetting by LSO in consultation with relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) in Stage 1, the LSPS applications would be proceeded to Stage 2 that the proposals with the

analysis of LSO and B/Ds would be put to the PoA for independent and third-party opinion. Those cases receiving support from the PoA would then be submitted to the CE in C for endorsement in principle. The LSPS applications endorsed would enter into Stage 3 which involved two parts – the statutory processes (mainly on town planning and road/sewerage works gazettal) and the land administration procedures. Notwithstanding the streamlined arrangement, the applicants still had to conduct the required technical assessments to substantiate the feasibility for B/Ds' consideration;

- (c) the agreed s.12A application (No. Y/YL-NSW/4) for rezoning the application site from “R(D)” to “R(D)2” for a proposed residential development with a total domestic GFA of about 10,150m² was the baseline of the proposed LSPS development. A minor portion at the fringe of the application site under the original “R(D)” zone had already overlapped with the fringe area of one of the Priority Sites for Enhanced Conservation under the NNCP (i.e. the Deep Bay Wetland outside Ramsar Site) at the stage of s.12A application. Taken into account the planning history of the LSPS site and that the land at the fringe of LSPS site would be used for compensation wetlands and access road, the PoA considered that the LSPS proposal could strike a proper balance between housing demand and conservation and supported the application, and submitted it to the CE in C for endorsement in November 2022;
- (d) the cost of site formation for public housing, and construction of infrastructure and utilities in support of the whole LSPS site would be borne by the LSPS applicants subject to premium assessment. For the public housing portion, the land would be handed over to HKHA for construction upon the completion of site formation by the LSPS applicants; and
- (e) the comments from green groups were received at a preliminary stage of the LSPS application and were passed to the PoA for consideration. In the early stage, a paper on the LSPS was submitted to the Panel on

Development of the Legislative Council in 2019 (the LegCo Paper) on the proposed framework, criteria and implementation arrangement of LSPS. To enhance the transparency of the LSPS, a dedicated website on the LSPS applications had been set up, which would be updated on a regular basis. For the public housing portion, the implementation party such as the Housing Department would release information as appropriate.

34. In response to a Member's question on whether the LegCo Paper on LSPS had mentioned any discretionary power of the PoA in considering LSPS application if the site fell within the Priority Sites for Enhanced Conservation under the NNCP, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H(LSO), DEVB said that the LegCo Paper had not provided such details as it was at the preliminary stage of the LSPS and no application had been received at that time. The Chairperson supplemented that the applications together with the technical assessments should be vetted by LSO and relevant B/Ds before submitting to the PoA, which comprised non-official members, for consideration. While the LegCo Paper stated that sites falling within the Priority Sites for Enhanced Conservation under the NNCP were not eligible for application, the PoA, having considered and balanced relevant considerations including planning history of the LSPS site, only a small portion at the fringe of the site overlapping with one of the Priority Sites for Enhanced Conservation under the NNCP, as well as the proposed mitigation measures, accepted the LSPS application.

Development Intensity and Layout of the LSPS Project

35. Two Members raised the following questions:
- (a) comparison of the development intensity of the proposed LSPS development and the agreed s.12A application No. Y/YL-NSW/4; and
 - (b) any procedures if there would be an increase in GFA or BH such as adoption of Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) or change in design for achieving environmental sustainability in the future.
36. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, with the aid of a

PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the proposed scheme under the agreed s.12A application No. Y/YL-NSW/4 for residential development of 57 residential units, the maximum domestic PR was 0.34 (or a maximum GFA of about 10,150m²) and the maximum BH was 3 storeys (11m) over 1 storey basement (4.5m). The proposed LSPS development had a domestic GFA of 143,579m², a non-domestic GFA of 3,945m² and a maximum BH of 100mPD (26 to 27 storeys including podium/basement), and would provide 1,868 public residential units and 1,261 private residential units; and
- (b) it was not uncommon to have subsequent changes in GFA or BH at the detailed design stage. Any change would be processed in accordance with the relevant ordinances/regulations and/or prevailing guidelines at the detailed design stage.

37. A Member questioned how the 70:30 public to private housing ratio was derived and how the development intensity of the LSPS site was determined, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H(LSO), DEVB replied that the calculation of housing mix excluded the domestic GFA of 10,150m² under the approved s.12A application No. Y/YL-NSW/4, which was the baseline. With upgraded infrastructure, the total domestic GFA of the LSPS site was 143,579m². Excluding 10,150m², the domestic GFA for calculating the housing mix was 133,429m² and based on the public/private housing ratio of 70:30, the GFA for public housing was 93,400m². The GFA for private housing was 50,179m² which was the total of 40,029m² (30% of domestic GFA 133,429m²) and 10,150m². The development intensity was supported by various technical assessments to demonstrate its feasibility.

Environment and Ecology Issues of the LSPS Project

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

- (a) any requirement for the size of the compensation wetlands and whether the size was relevant to the function of a compensation wetland;

- (b) whether the three proposed compensation wetlands were connected to the existing wetland areas, and whether they would be open to the public; and
- (c) the financial implications of HCMP and the sustainability of the proposed compensation wetlands.

39. In response, Mr Boris S.P. Kwan, SNCO, AFCD made the following main points:

- (a) the wetland compensation requirement was not solely related to the size but also to the ecological value of the wetland lost. The abandoned ponds at the east and south of the LSPS site were of low or low-to-moderate ecological value. Whilst the proposed compensation wetlands (about 0.69 hectare (ha)) were scattered, they were expected to synergise with the adjacent wetlands;
- (b) the two compensation wetlands in the immediate south and southeast of the proposed LSPS development would connect to adjacent wetlands, and the compensation wetland in the further south of the LSPS site would be neighbouring the landscaped area of an adjoining proposed residential development to the west of the LSPS site; and
- (c) the LSPS applicants had submitted the Wetland Creation Scheme (WCS) which provided preliminary design and management approach of the compensation wetlands. A detailed HCMP would be formulated at the detailed design stage.

40. To supplement, Ms Wu Wan Yin Winnie, R1's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) since the submission of LSPS application in 2021, the LSPS applicants had been in close liaison with relevant B/Ds and submitted further information to address their comments, and it was not agreed that the EcoIA submitted for the LSPS site was worse than others. Technical assessments in

support of the LSPS application were submitted to relevant government departments for consideration and agreement, and a light stimulation assessment had also been carried out;

- (b) there were two existing ponds (with a total area of about 0.69 ha) within the LSPS site. One of the ponds was abandoned while the other was located next to the “V” zone where Small House development was in progress. The ecological value of the two ponds was assessed as low and low-to-moderate respectively. The planning of the proposed LSPS development complied with the “no-net-loss in wetland” principle and was undertaken with due consideration of the surrounding environment. The three proposed compensation wetlands would be in the form of retention ponds with soft substrates or freshwater reedbeds that favored wildlife usage. It was expected that the compensation wetlands could fully compensate for the wetland loss in terms of both area and function, and might slightly enhance the overall ecological value of the surrounding area. The LSPS applicants would liaise with AFCD on the detailed design of the compensation wetlands; and

- (c) the compensation wetlands would be managed and maintained together with the future private residential portion, similar to the management approach adopted for the compensation wetlands at Park YOHO. Part of the management fees paid by the residents of Park YOHO contributed towards the M&M of the compensation wetlands within the development. Since the compensation wetland adopted a low-maintenance design, the management cost borne by the residents was not significant, and for reference, the management fee at Park YOHO was about HK\$5 per square foot. For the proposed LSPS development, the two compensation wetlands located in the south and southeast of the LSPS site were within the private residential development. The one located in the further south of the LSPS site could be seen by the public. The detailed design of the compensation ponds could be further considered when more information on the NSW WCP was available. Details on the M&M would be worked out and relevant requirements would be incorporated into the land lease as

appropriate.

41. In response to a Member's question on the reason why Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was required for the Item E Site but not for the LSPS site, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that the Item E Site fell within the area of Deep Bay Buffer Zone, and hence residential development was a designated project that required EIA under the EIA Ordinance. As the LSPS site was not within the Deep Bay Buffer Zone, EIA was not required.

42. Some Members raised the following questions to R2 and R4:

- (a) whether there was a minimum size requirement for compensation wetland to achieve its ecological function; and
- (b) the light disturbance to birds and their flight paths, in particular at the night time.

43. In response, Ms Wong Suet Mei, R4's representative made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed LSPS development would involve the removal of a large piece of existing wetland at the north of the LSPS site. The proposed development would pose disturbance to the surrounding habitats, and the resulting indirect habitat loss was a major concern. The proposed compensation wetlands should perform more functions and act as a buffer between the proposed development and the nearby habitats. As the largest piece of the proposed compensation wetlands (about 4,000m²) at the further south of the LSPS site was situated next to a proposed road, its ecological function was questionable and it would be difficult to create synergy effect with the adjacent wetlands. The other two compensation wetlands were relatively small. The scale of the proposed LSPS development was large with buildings over 20 storeys, and there would be long-term impact on the surroundings. The 6m-wide buffer between the proposed building block and the WCA was inadequate; and

- (b) the cumulative environmental impacts brought by the proposed LSPS development and other developments in the area should be assessed. With regard to the disturbance to birds, apart from the Great Cormorant, ardeids' night roosts could also be found in the area. The EcoIA did not assess the indirect impacts on birds. For instance, light from residential units might attract some bird species, which would lead to collisions, and hence it failed to provide a clear conclusion on how the light from the proposed development would affect the birds. Conditions should be imposed requiring the LSPS applicants to adopt building designs that would minimise the risk of bird collisions.

44. With regard to light disturbance, Mr Ng Hei Man, R2's representative, supplemented that there was already existing light disturbance in the area by street lights and lights from Yuen Long Highway, and the proposed development would exacerbate the situation. The green groups also had concern on the modelling and assumptions used in the light stimulation assessment which only tested lights from residential units facing north and northwest. As there were existing fishponds located to the east and southeast of the proposed LSPS development, the potential light disturbance on them should also be assessed.

45. In response to R4's concern that the location of the compensation wetland at the further south of the LSPS site was not suitable, Ms Wu Wan Yin Winnie, R1's representative explained that the location was considered suitable as it was adjacent to the landscaped area of a proposed development with water feature, which could create synergy effect. Besides, the road next to it would only be a local road leading to the proposed LSPS development. Preliminary design for the compensation wetland was included in the WCS, covering aspects such as plantation and the design of the compensation pond.

46. In response to a Member's question about the findings on light disturbance to birds in the EcoIA, Mr Franki Chiu, R1's representative, said that a Night-time Glare Impact Assessment had been conducted for the proposed LSPS development and was included in the submitted EcoIA. The existing ambient night-time light intensity at the identified habitats for Mai Po Bent-winged Firefly's habitat and the night roost of the Great Cormorant, which were located more than 400m away, had been measured as the baseline condition and

compared with the scenario with the proposed development. The Night-time Glare Impact Assessment also simulated the contribution of light generated by the proposed development on the concerned habitats. Given the considerable separation distance between the proposed development and the habitats of concern, the simulation demonstrated that the contribution of light caused by the development would be insignificant when compared to the natural variation established from the ambient light measurements. The area to the south of the proposed development was already influenced by other existing light sources (e.g. street lights), and hence the increase in light intensity experienced by the light sensitive receivers would not be significant. In conclusion, the proposed development would not induce any significant impact on the two identified light sensitive receivers.

47. In response to the Chairperson's question on whether the standard of assessment of LSPS applications was lowered compared to other development proposals, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that PlanD and other relevant government departments consistently maintained the same standard in assessing development proposals, and whether or not the proposals were submitted under the LSPS was not a consideration. She explained that the LSPS site was situated in an area previously zoned "R(D)", which was intended for low-rise, low-density residential development, and there was no requirement for wetland compensation under such "R(D)" zoning. When considering whether a higher density development would be feasible at the LSPS site, like the proposed LSPS development, the surrounding context including the planned development located to its west within the "U" zone under the approved application No. A/YL-NSW/274 and the technical assessments (including EcoIA) undertaken by the LSPS applicants would be taken into account. From district planning perspective, given the site context, the latest planning circumstances as well as the technical feasibility as demonstrated in the technical assessments undertaken by the LSPS applicants, the proposed LSPS development at the LSPS site was not considered unacceptable. Mr Boris S.P. Kwan, SNCO, AFCD supplemented that no matter whether it was a planning application for development or an LSPS application, the applicants were required to submit an EcoIA assessing the impacts of the proposed developments and proposing mitigation measures to alleviate the impacts if considered required, and AFCD would follow the "no-net-loss in wetland" principle and assess all submitted EcoIA according to the same standard.

48. A Member enquired about the reason for the width of the setback not following

the recommendations in the Fishpond Study, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD replied that the major recommendations of the Fishpond Study had already been translated into the TPB PG-No. 12C. The mitigation measures required for individual development proposals, such as setback, would be considered on a case by case basis, taking into account the comments/advice from relevant government departments.

GIC Provision of the Proposed LSPS Development

49. In response to a Member's question on the GFA set aside for GIC facilities in the proposed LSPS development, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, with the aid of a visualiser, said that as stated in the Paper, GFA equivalent to about 5% of the total attainable domestic GFA of the public housing portion of the proposed LSPS development would be set aside for provision of social welfare facilities in accordance with the 2020 PA. The social welfare facilities would be exempted from GFA calculation and therefore the calculation was not shown in the table on major development parameters in the Paper. The types and details of the social welfare facilities to be provided in the proposed public housing development would be determined at the detailed design stage subject to liaison between the Housing Department and the Social Welfare Department. For the private portion of the proposed LSPS development, kindergarten and public transport terminus would be provided.

Item C Site

50. A Member enquired the rationale of rezoning a strip of land to the north of Ho Chau Road from "R(D)" to "V" under Item C. Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD replied that the Item C Site with an area about 0.9 ha shared similar ownership pattern and site conditions as the adjacent "V" zone, and hence it was considered appropriate to rezone it to "V" to rationalise the zoning boundary.

Item E Site

51. In response to a Member's enquiry about the relationship between the Item E Site and NSW WCP, Mr Boris S.P. Kwan, SNCO, AFCD said that the Northern Metropolis Development Strategy (NMDS), which contained the proposal to establish a Wetland Conservation Parks System (WCPs System), was promulgated in 2021. It laid down the

preliminary area and boundary of the proposed parks under the WCPs System, including the proposed NSW WCP. Subsequently, AFCD commissioned the Feasibility Study in 2022 to provide recommendations on the overall implementation strategy of the WCPs System. The study scope of the Feasibility Study was mainly based on the boundaries of the park as proposed under NMDS and further expanded to cover some nearby and connected fish ponds and wetlands. The NCW WCP was one of the parks included in the WCPs System and the Item E Site was included in the proposed NCW WCP. S.16 application with detailed development scheme and supporting technical assessments would be required for future development at the Item E Site, and AFCD would further examine and suitably adjust the boundary of the proposed NSW WCP at a later stage to take into account the latest planning circumstances.

52. In response to a Member's question on the differences in development restrictions between the "OU(CDWRA)" zone and the "OU(CDWRA)1" zone, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that Item E Site was originally zoned "OU(CDWRA)" subject to development restrictions of a maximum PR of 0.4 and a maximum BH of 6 storeys including car park under the OZP. The planning intention was to provide incentive for the restoration of degraded wetlands adjoining existing fish ponds through comprehensive residential and/or recreational development to include WRA. To reflect and take forward the s.12 application (No. Y/YL-NSW/7) agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee of the Board in 2023, the Item E Site was rezoned to "OU(CDWRA)1" with a maximum PR of 1.55 and a maximum BH of 54mPD (i.e. 15 storeys excluding basement carpark according to the proposed scheme) while the planning intention of the "OU(CDWRA)" zone remained unchanged.

53. Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. She thanked the government representatives, the representers and their representatives 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 government representatives, the representers and their representatives left the meeting at this point.

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui and Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

54. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

55. Members generally supported the OZP amendments and the proposed LSPS development. Some Members expressed concerns on the M&M arrangements of the proposed compensation wetlands in the proposed LSPS development, and considered it undesirable for the future residents of the proposed LSPS development to bear the M&M costs in the long term, in particular as part of the proposed compensation wetlands was located further away from the proposed development. While the developer would explain to future residents the M&M arrangements of the proposed compensation wetlands including that the M&M costs would be borne by residents prior to property purchase, it would only apply to first-hand buyers but not second-hand buyers. Members were concerned about the sustainability of the proposed compensation wetlands and the possible follow-up actions to be taken if the proposed compensation wetlands were changed into other uses or the future residents were unwilling to bear the M&M costs. A Member commented that it would not be appropriate for the Government to bear the costs of the proposed compensation wetlands if no party took up the M&M responsibilities. Two Members suggested that the developer might set up a fund for the M&M of the proposed compensation wetlands. While the M&M arrangements including the costs could be set out clearly in the lease document, the arrangements should be considered carefully at the early stage. A Member opined that key planning elements should also be included in the lease of the LSPS site.

56. Some Members had the following comments and suggestions:

- (a) the LSPS, aimed at unleashing the development potential of private land for housing developments, was supported;
- (b) the LSPS intended to expedite the housing supply and a streamlined arrangement was adopted, yet, from the discussion at the meeting, it appeared that the LSPS required a longer processing time than a s.12A application;
- (c) the public/private housing mix of 70:30 under the LSPS should be

reviewed in order to gain more support from the developers;

- (d) whether it was a common practice for the developers to be responsible for the construction of infrastructure except under the “large-scale land disposal approach” (片區開發);
- (e) the comments from green groups were appreciated. The Government should strengthen the communication with relevant stakeholders, including green groups, during the processing of LSPS applications particularly at the early stage to improve the design of the proposed developments; and
- (f) the proposed layout of the LSPS development had already taken into account the issue on overlapping with the Deep Bay Wetland outside Ramsar Site. The proposed compensation wetlands were planned at the fringe of the site after balancing relevant considerations.

57. The Chairperson noted Members’ concerns that the M&M arrangements of the proposed compensation wetlands in the LSPS site should be fair and reasonable, and adequate resources should be set aside for the M&M of the proposed compensation wetlands to ensure its sustainability and practicability. DEVB would examine the arrangements at the land administration stage including the possibility for the developer and the retail portion of the proposed LSPS development to be responsible for the M&M of the proposed compensation wetlands.

58. Regarding Members’ other comments and suggestions, the Chairperson said that the LSPS was closed for application in May 2024. Some sites put forward for LSPS application might not be straightforward and require coordination across departments to resolve technical issues involved. Hence, despite the dedicated facilitating service provided by LSO and adoption of a streamlined arrangement, processing of LSPS applications might require more time than expected. As for the arrangement for applicants to take up the responsibility of improving the required infrastructure to support the proposed developments, such a requirement was not uncommon as it had also been adopted for land exchange cases other than the “large-scale land disposal approach” and LSPS. The Government had all

along valued the importance of communication with stakeholders and the public, and their comments. LSO, DEVB would strengthen communication with stakeholders in processing LSPS applications and consider how best to enhance the dissemination of information to the public in future including whether technical assessments could be made available for public information in a more timely manner.

Conclusion

59. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported all the amendments on the OZP, and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations. All grounds of the representations had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

60. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1**, **R2(part)** and **R3(part)** and decided not to uphold R2(part), R3(part) and R4 to R8, and agreed that the draft Nam Sang Wai Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“Items A1, A2 and B

- (a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase land and housing supply in the short-to-medium term, and Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS) is one of the initiatives. It is considered appropriate to rezone the sites under Items A1, A2 and B to take forward the proposed LSPS development endorsed by the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) **(R3)**;
- (b) the sites under Items A1, A2 and B have all along been planned for development and part of them is the subject of an agreed section 12A application No. Y/YLNSW/4 for residential development. Despite that minor portions at the fringe of the sites overlap with one of the Priority Sites for Enhanced Conservation under the New Nature Conservation Policy, the LSPS application was accepted and supported by the

Government and the LSPS Panel of Advisors, and subsequently endorsed by the CE in C **(R2, R4 and R8)**;

- (c) to take forward the endorsed LSPS application involving sites under Items A1, A2 and B, the relevant amendments to the OZP have been submitted for Board's agreement and subsequently exhibited for public inspection under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). All relevant statutory and administrative public consultation procedures have been duly followed in taking forward the endorsed LSPS application **(R5)**;
- (d) Ecological Impact Assessment has been conducted for the proposed LSPS development at the sites under Items A1, A2 and B to assess potential ecological and cumulative impacts. With the implementation of the proposed compensation wetlands and mitigation measures, there will be no-net-loss in wetland area and significant adverse residual and cumulative ecological impacts are not envisaged. The submitted wetland creation scheme has also provided preliminary design and management approach of the compensation wetlands. The proposed LSPS development is considered in line with the "no-net-loss in wetland" principle. The tree compensation proposal for the proposed LSPS development is also considered acceptable **(R2 to R8)**;
- (e) according to the study report of the Strategic Feasibility Study on the Development of Wetland Conservation Parks System (the Feasibility Study) released in October 2024, the sites under Items A1, A2 and B are not recommended to be included in the Nam Sang Wai Wetland Conservation Park **(R2)**;

Item C

- (f) the strip of land under Item C shares similar ownership pattern and site condition as the adjacent "Village Type Development" ("V") zone, and the "V" zoning is considered appropriate for the Item C Site for rationalising the zoning boundary **(R3)**;

Item D

- (g) the “Green Belt” zoning is considered appropriate for Item D Site to reflect the existing site condition and allow a buffer between the proposed LSPS development and the ponds and wetlands within the “Conservation Area” zone to the north (**R4**);

Item E

- (h) Item E is to reflect a section 12A application No. Y/YL-NSW/7 (the s.12A application) agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee of the Board. Relevant technical assessments have been conducted for the proposed development and it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause any insurmountable problem from traffic, drainage, sewerage, environment and ecological perspectives with implementation of mitigation measures. In particular, wetland restoration area will be provided which will result in a net increase in wetland area and meet the “no-net-loss in wetland” principle. All government departments consulted have no objection to the s.12A application and the related OZP amendments. Section 16 application would be required with detailed development scheme and relevant technical assessments to further demonstrate the technical feasibility of proposed development (**R2 to R4**);

Amendments to Notes

- (i) incorporation of ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ and ‘Hotel (Holiday House)’ under Column 2 for the Notes of the “V” zone and ‘Zoo’ under Column 2 for the Notes of the “Government, Institution or Community” zone is in line with the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN) promulgated by the Board. The provisions of these facilities also require planning permission from the Board (**R3 and R5**);

- (j) incorporation of the exemption clause for government works on filling of land/pond or excavation of land pertaining to public works co-ordinated or implemented by the Government from the requirement for planning application in the conservation-related zones is in line with the MSN promulgated by the Board and can streamline the planning application process. The exemption clause is only applicable to public works and minor works in which no major adverse impacts are anticipated. Statutory control over the developments in the conservation related zones would not be undermined (**R3 to R5**); and

Proposal

- (k) there is no detailed assessment conducted by the representer to support the rezoning proposal for the “Undetermined” (“U”) zone adjacent to Items A1 to D. Nevertheless, the fishponds in the subject “U” zone are recommended to be included in the Nam Sang Wai Wetland Conservation Park according to the Feasibility Study (**R4**).”

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

[Dr Tony C.M. Ip rejoined and Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho joined the meeting at this point.]

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Review of Application No. A/HSK/530

Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials with Ancillary Site Office for a Period of 3 Years and Associated Filling of Land in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 207 (Part) and 208 (Part) in D.D. 125, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 10989)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

62. The Secretary reported that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application.

63. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board decided to defer a decision, being the first deferment, on the application for two months as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information, as recommended in the Paper.

[Mr Maurice K.W. Loo rejoined and Mr Ryan M.K Ip left the meeting at this point.]

General

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Development Proposal of Ngau Tam Mei

(TPB Paper No. 10990)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

64. The Secretary reported that the Ngau Tam Mei (NTM) Land Use Review (the Study) was jointly commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and the Planning Department (PlanD) with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as the consultant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Dr Tony C.M. Ip] having current business dealings with

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho] AECOM;

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung - being a former Director of CEDD; and

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong] being an advisory committee member of

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip] the Advisory Committee on the Northern
Metropolis.

65. Members noted that Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the item was a briefing to Members on the development proposal for NTM, the interests of Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Messrs Vincent K.Y. Ho, Daniel K.W. Chung and Ryan M.K. Ip only needed to be recorded, and they could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

66. The following government representatives and the consultants (the study team) were invited to the meeting:

Development Bureau (DEVB)

Mr Vic C.H. Yau	-	Director, Northern Metropolis Co-ordination Office (D/NMCO)
Mr Steven Y.H. Siu	-	Assistant Secretary

PlanD

Mr Tom C.K. Yip	-	Deputy Director of Planning/Territorial (DD/T)
Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau	-	Project Team Leader
Mr Edwin C.H. Lee	-	Senior Town Planner (STP)
Ms Joyce L.Y. Tai	-	Town Planner
Mr Derek Y.S. Tsang	-	Assistant Town Planner
Ms Emily T.Y. Wong	-	Town Planning Graduate

CEDD

Ms Joyce Y.Y. Lau	-	Project Manager (PM)
Mr Joe H.P. Yip	-	Deputy Project Manager
Mr Julian K.L. Ng	-	Chief Engineer
Ms Iris K.W. Sin	-	Project Coordinator
Mr Lucas T.L. Lee	-	Engineer

AECOM

Mr Igor Ho]	
Ms Pearl Hui]	Consultants
Ms Queenie Tse]	

[Ms Doris P.L. Ho left the meeting at this point. The Vice-chairperson took over the chairmanship at this point.]

67. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome and invited the study team to brief Members on TPB Paper No. 10990 (the Paper).

68. Mr Vic C.H. Yau, D/NMCO, DEVB said that after the briefings to the Town Planning Board (the Board) on the development proposals of the San Tin Technopole (STT) in 2023 and the Lau Fau Shan/Tsim Bei Tsui/Pak Nai Area in early 2024, the study team would like to further introduce the development proposal of NTM to the Board. Under the Northern Metropolis (NM) Action Agenda promulgated in 2023, NTM would be for the use of post-secondary education institutions with a focus on scientific research to complement the innovation and technology (I&T) development in STT. With the proposed Northern Link (NOL) Main Line and Spur Line, NTM would be linked up with STT, forming the I&T Zone in the NM for promoting “research, academic and industry” collaboration. As announced in the 2024 Policy Address, the Government had earmarked over 80 hectares (ha) of land in the NM, comprising NTM, New Territories North (NTN) New Town and Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area (HSK/HT NDA), for the “Northern Metropolis University Town” (NMUT). The Education Bureau (EDB) was formulating the NMUT Development Conceptual Framework (the Framework) which was planned to be released in the first half of 2026. In that regard, a Broad Land Use Concept Plan for NTM was prepared.

69. With the aid of a video and PowerPoint presentation, Mr Edwin C.H. Lee, STP, PlanD briefed Members on the planning vision and positioning of NTM, the major planning and urban design concepts, land use budget, key planning parameters and other planning features as detailed in the Paper.

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi left the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

70. After the presentation of PlanD's representative, the Vice-chairperson invited questions and comments from Members.

University Town (UniTown)

71. Some Members had the following questions:

- (a) the positioning and functions of the UniTown, in particular its relation with STT;
- (b) the adequacy of the land reserved, considering that the Framework would only be released by EDB in 2026; and
- (c) management arrangements such as how different universities would be co-ordinated and whether the campus and the facilities would be open for public/tourism use.

72. In response, Mr Vic C.H. Yau, D/NMCO, DEVB and Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DD/T, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) the UniTown would provide land to encourage local post-secondary institutions to introduce more branded programmes, research collaboration and exchange projects with renowned Mainland and overseas institutions in a flexible and innovative manner, with a focus on scientific research, to complement the I&T development in STT;
- (b) EDB was formulating the Framework and would assess the land required by universities and consider the land allocation for both local and non-local universities. DEVB had been closely liaising with EDB and the views in relation to the UniTown collected during the public engagement for NTM

would be conveyed to EDB for their consideration and preparation of the Framework. In parallel, land use planning and consultation had to start in good time as the subsequent statutory processes and site formation works would take time;

- (c) it was decided to increase the land for NMUT from the original 60 ha suggested in the NM Action Agenda to over 80 ha, comprising 46 ha in NTM, 5 ha in HSK/HT NDA and 40 ha in NTN New Town. The comparison with the land areas of existing local universities had to be considered in context. The universities developed on mountainous/sloping terrain such as the Chinese University of Hong Kong had occupied a relatively large area as the topography posed a number of constraints on their development. On the other hand, for the universities located on flat land in the urban area, the areas were generally below 20 ha, and for Hong Kong Baptist University, even below 10 ha. The 80 ha of land reserved for NMUT could accommodate a few of these institutions. Land in the NM for NMUT would be mostly flat and this could generally allow better land utilisation; and
- (d) the proposed Broad Land Use Concept Plan only suggested reservation of land for post-secondary institutions/universities. There would be flexibility in land allocation for them and the shared facilities. Co-ordination among different institutions/universities, including the shared use of common supporting facilities, would be subject to the management of the institutions/universities. Whether the future campuses would be open for public/tourism use would be subject to the future management of the institutions/universities.

73. A Member opined that taking advantage of proximity to the Tam Mei Barracks, there might be an opportunity to include national education in the programmes of the institutions/universities in the UniTown from educational perspective.

Development Parameters

74. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) with a total of 130 ha of land, whether the proposed development parameters, such as a population of about 32,000 to 36,000 and job opportunities of about 22,000 to 26,000, were on the low-side compared with those for the proposed Global Innovation Centre of the University of Hong Kong; and
- (b) whether the plot ratio (PR) of 3 for UniTown was based on the gross site area and whether there would be scope to increase the PR for the UniTown and its future expansion.

75. In response, Mr Vic C.H. Yau, D/NMCO, DEVB and Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DD/T, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) a domestic PR of 6 would be adopted for residential sites, which were within 500 metres (m) radius of the railway station. The population of about 32,000 to 36,000 included residential population but excluded the students and staff residing in the UniTown. The job opportunities of about 22,000 to 26,000 covered the working population of the UniTown, the medical school and the integrated hospital. The photomontage at Enclosure 2 of the Paper showed the preliminary urban design concept of the NTM development. At this stage, the main tasks were to reserve adequate land for different purposes and development needs, and key planning parameters were assumed mainly for carrying out technical assessments to confirm the overall technical feasibility of the development proposal. Both sets of figures would be subject to review in the next stage of the Study with more detailed technical assessments with due regard to the Framework for NMUT being formulated by EDB; and
- (b) a PR of 3, which was slightly lower than those existing universities in flat land in the urban area, was assumed for the UniTown based on the gross site area, and had taken into account urban design consideration with the objective of providing a quality environment. There was scope to adjust the PR, if necessary, subject to infrastructure capacity and urban design, as well

as the Framework on positioning of UniTown, the number of institutions/universities to be accommodated and the required facilities, etc.

Land Use and Urban Design

76. Some Members had the following questions/comments:

- (a) noting that land near the NTM Station was designated for residential use and the UniTown was located away from the NTM Station, what the considerations for the such land use arrangements were and whether convenient transportation for staff and students of the UniTown had been taken into account. Locating some educational spaces near the residential neighbourhood would facilitate staff and students commuting to and from the campuses and the living places as some might choose to live in private housing;
- (b) whether some land near the NTM Station would be allocated for the UniTown and some low- to medium-rise residential developments would be located at the eastern end of the development area for a more convenient linkage with the UniTown and STT, and a more integrated community;
- (c) the considerations for separating the integrated hospital from the medical school and for locating the integrated hospital in the central part of the NTM development;
- (d) whether some commercial uses such as retail shops, eating and event spaces would be allowed in the Riverside Park and the public open space to allow different activities to take place for social interaction and a more active public space with place-making, and whether the zoning on the outline zoning plan could cater for these uses;
- (e) whether bridge(s) would be built to enhance connectivity between the two sides of the Riverside Park and whether shaded seating facilities and covered

walkway would be provided in the public open space and the Riverside Park;
and

- (f) any consideration of the interface between the high-density residential developments and the low-rise villages in the vicinity.

77. In response, Mr Vic C.H. Yau, D/NMCO, DEVB and Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DD/T, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) the distance between the NTM Station and the western end of the UniTown was about 1km, which would be about 15 minutes' walking time. There would be footpaths and cycle tracks along the open space and river channel and a weather proof walkway in the south passing through the residential developments and integrated hospital to link up the station and the UniTown. The UniTown would be well-connected with other areas of the NM by the NM Highway at the east and the proposed road connection to STT at the north. A public transport interchange was planned within the UniTown to provide public transport/feeder connection services. With 46 ha of land reserved for the UniTown, there would also be sufficient space for the provision of student hostels;
- (b) the railway scheme for the proposed NOL Main Line, including the NTM Station and the NTM Depot, was gazetted on 6.10.2023. The railway alignment of the NOL and the locations of NTM Station and railway depot were proposed after due consideration of various factors, including the topography/constraints of the area, railway operation requirements, and potential impacts on existing developments including villages in the vicinity. For better site utilisation, it was considered suitable and appropriate to have residential development and public spaces above the railway depot to be integrated with the public open space at ground level. The area around the railway station would be an activity node for the area where a variety of uses including commercial, community and leisure were planned to promote vibrancy, diversity and integration. Within the NTM development, the open space network would radiate from the railway station to the eastern and

western parts alongside the revitalised river channel for the enjoyment of residents, hospital users, staff and students of the UniTown, and the general public. If the UniTown was split into two parts, with one near the NTM Station, it might take up the space planned for community facilities and the central park, which would better be located near the NTM Station to facilitate full utilisation and convenience for residents and the public. The subdivision of land parcels would also reduce the flexibility in the layout to cater for different site area requirements and the planning of shared facilities;

- (c) the UniTown would cover the land reserved for the third medical school campus, which would be planned in close proximity to the integrated hospital. The integrated hospital would provide comprehensive healthcare services for the NM population, as well as teaching, training and research facilities. The central location of the integrated hospital adjoining the medical school would be mutually beneficial;
- (d) areas along the Riverside Park and the public open spaces, including the central park, would be vibrant and lively and might allow shops and restaurants for use by and interaction of different players in NTM including residents, staff and students of the UniTown, healthcare workers and the general public. In formulating the outline zoning plan, appropriate zonings would be considered to allow suitable uses and activities in and along the Riverside Park and public open space to make these two places vivid public realm to be enjoyed by all;
- (e) there would be pedestrian linkages to connect the two sides of the revitalised river channel, and shading facilities for pedestrian comfort would be considered in the detailed design stage; and
- (f) there were some villages near the western part of the NTM area. To address the interface between the proposed high-rise residential developments near the NTM Station and the villages in the surrounding area, public open space and Riverside Park were planned to the north of the NTM Station with

low-rise community uses along the northern and southern edges facing these villages to serve as buffer and achieve better integration.

Blue-green Infrastructure

78. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) acknowledging that it was a good design concept to revitalise the current drainage channel as a blue-green corridor which would greatly enhance the entire area, whether there would be a larger water body to further enhance the environment and if the revitalised drainage channel would be integrated with the open spaces on both sides;
- (b) the party responsible for the management of the Riverside Park;
- (c) whether there would be flood storage facility with water body provided atop for public enjoyment; and
- (d) the source of the water, particularly during dry season.

79. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DD/T, PlanD and Ms Joyce Y.Y. Lau, PM, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) the current drainage channel would be widened from about 15-25m to 26-40m and would be revitalised. Together with the adjacent open spaces on both sides, the future river channel (i.e. the Riverside Park) would be approximately 80m in width, providing ample space with water bodies as a relaxing and recreational area for the public;
- (b) the party responsible for the management of the revitalised river and open space had not been determined at this initial stage. The basic principle was to keep the entire green corridor open, providing not only recreational spaces but also pedestrian and cycling paths. The management arrangement would

be determined in the subsequent detailed design stage, which could be government departments and/or academic institutions of the UniTown;

- (c) the study team would explore flood storage facility incorporated with recreational use, with the former under the responsibility of the Drainage Services Department (DSD) and the latter by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. The study team would engage the two departments regarding the design and management responsibilities. In the past, CEDD had successful experiences in co-ordinating both departments to jointly manage a project that combined flood prevention with recreational green spaces; and
- (d) there was mountain water at the upstream. NTM was planned to provide reclaimed water (non-potable water) which could be another water source for the Riverside Park. This would be examined in the detailed design stage.

Resilient Design and Sustainable Measures

80. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether resilient design for flooding risk would be adopted in view of climate change; and
- (b) whether any green concept and sustainable measures would be adopted.

81. In response, Ms Joyce Y.Y. Lau, PM, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) the drainage system would be carried out in accordance with the latest stormwater drainage manual of DSD. There were several proposed measures to cope with flooding risk, e.g. raising the ground level, widening the river channels, incorporating design to infiltrate rainwater underground and building underground stormwater storage tank to make NTM a “sponge city”; and

- (b) various measures would be adopted in the aspects of land use and infrastructure planning as well as urban design, including increasing greenery, promoting green mobility and low-carbon solutions through provision of pedestrian and cycle friendly design, building disposition taking account of prevailing wind, providing blue-green infrastructure, etc. Carbon assessment for the NTM development was underway.

Others

82. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the proposed data centre in the UniTown would be a supercomputing centre to support the R&D of institutions/universities, Ms Joyce Y.Y. Lau, PM, CEDD said that this could be allowed subject to the policy of EDB. Another Member opined that locating the data centre in cavern could be explored if the UniTown could be located westwards near the NTM Station.

83. A Member enquired whether the NTM Water Treatment Works, located to the east of the UniTown, was a potentially hazardous installation (PHI) and hence would pose any impacts on the UniTown. Ms Joyce Y.Y. Lau, PM, CEDD responded that the NTM Water Treatment Works was not considered a PHI in the land use review study as confirmed by the Water Supplies Department. The views of the Environmental Protection Department would be further sought during the course of the Study.

84. The same Member noted that there were two transmission cables running along the southern and eastern edges of the development area and asked whether the cables would have any impact on the planned land uses, such as the need for setbacks or buffer areas. In response, Ms Joyce Y.Y. Lau, PM, CEDD said that the study team had already taken into account the high-voltage cables at the initial stage of defining the boundary of the development area.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong, Messrs Maurice K.W. Loo, Ben S.S. Lui, Rocky L.K. Poon and Derrick S.M. Yip left the meeting during the question and comment session.]

85. The Board noted the development proposal of NTM. The Vice-chairperson also invited the study team to take into account Members' comments and suggestions in taking forward the Study as appropriate.

86. The Vice-chairperson thanked the government representatives and the consultants for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting] [The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Any Other Business

87. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 2:25 p.m.