

Notes from Fifteenth Parliament of Singapore (First Session)
Parliament Sitting on 4 August 2026

Oral Response to PQs and SQs

Background

[Order Paper No. 33](#)

[Parliament Sitting 4 August 2026 Livestream](#)

Opening by Mr Alvin Tan, Minister of State, Ministry of National Development (MND)

The plans for Gilman Barracks and Sunset Way have not been finalised. Government will continue to engage stakeholders to take in views and feedback before deciding how we will carry out the development of both sites. This could involve adjustments to the development layout and the amount of greenery and heritage to conserve.

We publish the studies and conceptual plans so the public can study them, share their views, and help us to shape the final development plans. And I want to assure members that while the formal consultation period for the Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and the Heritage Impact Assessment, HIA, ends on 6 August 2026, our engagements with stakeholders will continue as we adjust and refine the development plans based on the inputs received.

I will first explain why Singapore needs to build, where we choose to build and how we build. I will then explain how these principles apply to Sunset Way and Gillman Barracks. First, why we need to build. Let's start with what I believe we can all agree on. We value our heritage and green spaces. We also want Singaporeans and our future generations to have access to affordable public housing. We want hospitals, schools and places where we can work and earn a good living. We want roads and public transport so we can get around.

We also need land for defence, essential infrastructure and coastal protection. And I wish we had an abundance of land so we can provide all of these without having to make trade-offs. But that is not our reality. Our choices are narrower than those faced by larger countries. We thus have to make the best use of our limited land.

That is why we plan decades ahead to meet Singaporeans' needs today while keeping enough options for future generations. And housing is one of our most pressing needs. Some asked why housing demand continues to grow even though our total fertility rate is lower than before. While the current low TFR figures reflect the smaller number of babies born in recent years, but Singaporeans who are buying HDB homes today and in the near future were born decades ago when our birth rates were higher. Now another reason is that household sizes are getting smaller. More young married couples prefer a home of their own to living with their parents or extended families. At the same time many prefer to live near their parents so they can care for and support one another. More singles are also setting up homes of their own.

And more seniors now live alone or only with their spouse. Now these trends mean we need more homes than we did in the past as the total number of households has increased.

Many members on both sides of this House have also called for the relaxation of the eligibility criteria to provide wider access to public housing and shorter waiting times for built-to-order flats. And we understand and we share these aspirations. But if we want more Singaporeans to qualify for HDB housing and to get their homes sooner, then we must build more homes and we must build them faster. So the question is not whether Singapore should continue to build homes, hospitals, schools and other developments to meet our people's needs. The question is where we build and how we build responsibly.

Let's go on to where we built. So we do not start with sites that have significant heritage or ecological value. We first ask a series of practical questions. Can we make use of vacant land? Can we make better use of existing land? Can we build higher, go underground, build compatible uses together, or better use underutilized spaces? That is what we have been doing and we will continue to do. For example, relocating Paya Lebar Air Base to Changi and Tengah will free up a substantial area for redevelopment, as will consolidating our port activities at Tuasport. We are also phasing out some golf courses and redeveloping older industrial areas for other uses.

We are already redeveloping the former capital golf course as part of the Greater Southern Waterfront. By 2030, we will have taken back more than 400 hectares of golf course land for redevelopment. We will also build taller where we can. This year, we announced Singapore's tallest public housing project and over 60-storey development at Pearls Hill.

Relaxing aviation height limits near airports also opens up new possibilities for us to build more intensity in suitable locations. We build underground where possible too. We are developing rock caverns at Gali Batu, building on earlier projects such as the Jurong Rock Caverns. And through the north-south corridor, we are moving vehicular traffic underground, freeing surface space for walking, cycling and greenery. We are also doing more with existing sites and underused spaces through integrated mixed-use developments and by activating spaces beneath viaducts and on car park rooftops.

As we do all this, we pay close attention to greenery and heritage. Today, Singapore has about 7,800 hectares of green spaces, including our nature reserves. Even after accounting for planned developments in the latest master plan, URA has safeguarded an additional 1,000 hectares of green space. And we are also strengthening ecological connections between core habitats.

By 2030, we aim to restore and enhance 80 hectares of forest, marine and coastal habitats and establish 300 kilometres of natureways. Now these efforts help make Singapore one of the world's greenest high density cities.

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Green View Index found that Singapore is ahead of most cities in urban tree coverage, including cities with much lower population densities. And we take a similar approach to heritage as well. We have conserved more than 7,200 buildings and structures in over 100 areas. And where possible, we retain significant heritage buildings and elements and incorporate them into new developments.

So these are guided by our long-term land use planning process. Through our master plan, we engage Singaporeans and set out how we use our limited land for the next 10 to 15 years. And we review the master plan every five years through a major public consultation exercise to ensure it remains relevant to our nation's changing needs.

Site zoning reflects its long-term planning intention, but when we develop the site depends on: our national needs, the availability of alternatives, and if the supporting infrastructure is ready. And within this framework, we will always do our best to retain sites with significant greenery and heritage value. But there will be occasions when no other suitable site can meet the same need in the same area and within the required timeframe. And when that happens, we must weigh the trade-offs carefully and consider whether we can develop a site responsibly to meet an important national need, such as providing homes for Singaporeans.

So the next question then is how do we build responsibly when it is necessary to develop a site. We proceed with great care when a site has significant ecological or heritage value. Government agencies appoint independent external consultants to conduct an EIA or HIA or both. These studies draw on inputs from nature and heritage groups. The consultants do three things. First, they establish what is on the site today. For an EIA, this means identifying the site's important habitats, plants, animals, and ecological connections. For a HIA, it means establishing the significance of the site's buildings, structures, landscape, and other heritage attributes. Second, the consultants assess how the proposed development could affect these features. And third, they recommend how to avoid, reduce, or mitigate potential impact to the site. Now, depending on the site, this could mean retaining areas of high ecological significance, maintaining ecological corridors, preserving important buildings, or incorporating heritage elements into the new development.

For an EIA, the consultants also propose a preliminary environmental management and monitoring plan (EMMP). The EMMP sets up mitigation measures, monitoring arrangements, and reporting requirements that will apply during development. So our general approach is to avoid impact when we can, where we can, reduce them where we cannot, and mitigate those that remain.

We then publish the findings, the potential impact, and proposed mitigation measures in the EIA or HIA report. And this allows residents and the wider public to study the proposal and to give their feedback and views. Agencies then consider the studies and these feedback before finalizing the detailed plans.

EIAs and HIAs are not meant to justify a detailed plan that is already fixed. They are an integral part of the consultation process through which the plan is shaped. Once development proceeds, HDB and NParks will monitor the works and require contractors to provide regular updates to ensure the measures are implemented properly.

Let me now explain how we apply the principles that I've laid out to both Sunset Way and Gillman Barracks. Both sites have been earmarked earlier for residential use. For Sunset Way, the planning intention for housing had been reflected in the Master Plan since 1980. Now that intention has been reviewed and reaffirmed at each subsequent Master Plan review, including the most recent review in 2025.

For Gilman Barracks, we announced the intention to study the site for development during the 2024 Committee of Supply debate. The site was subsequently rezoned to reflect that intention under Master Plan 2025. But we did not come to these sites first. Over the years, we prioritized brownfield redevelopment in Clementi, Bukit Merah and surrounding areas. In Clementi and Bukit Merah, we redeveloped several older estates under the selective en-bloc redevelopment scheme (SERS). In Bukit Merah, we are redeveloping the former Keppel golf course, as I mentioned earlier. But demand for housing in these estates remains strong.

The recent BTO launches at Clementi Emerald and Berlayer Rise were each oversubscribed by over four times. Many Singaporeans, especially young families, want to continue living near their parents for mutual care and support. And many understand this and so asked if we can build on sites that appear vacant or are underused instead.

So let me explain that some of these sites are already intended for housing. One example is the former Raffles Junior College site at Mount Sinai, where we are planning to introduce public housing in the near term, and the former bus facility at Ghim Moh, where BTO construction is already in progress. Some asked about the former ITE HQ site at Dover-Medway area, and a nearby site at Albert Winsemius Lane. Now the former will be redeveloped for a mix of public and private housing to be launched over the next few years, and the latter is an LTA worksite that is needed to support ongoing works for the Cross Island Line. It will be considered for redevelopment in the future after the MRT Line is completed. Others also asked about Maju Camp. We need Maju Camp to support our national defence needs, so we cannot use it for housing at this point.

For Gilman Barracks, some suggested building homes at Depot Lane Industrial Estate, the former Central Manpower Base (CMPB), and a reserve site at Pasir Panjang. Depot Lane Industrial Estate is indeed part of our future housing supply, and demolition of the buildings is currently ongoing to prepare the site. While the former CMPB has moved out of Depot Road Camp, the site is still required by MINDEF and other users. This also applies to the Pasir Panjang Reserve site, where there are existing users like the MOE Outdoor Adventure Learning Centre. This site can only be redeveloped in the longer term. In short, many of the sites suggested are already being redeveloped for housing, are needed for other national purposes, or cannot be redeveloped yet.

That is why we need to develop Gillman Barracks and Sunset Way to meet our housing needs over the next decade. But we recognise that Gilman Barracks has both environmental and heritage value. That is why we commissioned EIAs and HIAs, because we assessed that the development could have significant environmental or heritage effects and wanted to carefully study the impact before finalising any plans. These are comprehensive reports reflecting months of data collection and analysis by independent experts.

At Gilman Barracks, we are studying how to retain most of the native dominated secondary forest within the site. We are also studying how to maintain ecological connections in the east-west and north-south directions. Now the east-west connection would link Telok Blangah Hill Park and HortPark, and the north-south connection would comprise an ecological corridor supporting the movement of birds towards Berlayer Creek and Labrador Nature Reserve.

Gillman Barracks also has a distinctive heritage character. We are thus studying the retention of all buildings assessed to be of exceptional heritage significance, as well as most of those assessed to be of high heritage significance. Now this will allow the future neighbourhood to build on the character and charm of the former colonial buildings. But where heritage building cannot be retained because of practical site's constraints, we will explore other ways to preserve its history. These include detailed documentation, salvaging and reusing suitable materials, and incorporating heritage interpretation into the future development.

At Sunset Way, we are studying the retention of a significant stretch of greenery along the former Jurong railway line. This would preserve an important part of our railway heritage while maintaining ecological connectivity within the site. We are also studying the retention of a natural stream and its surrounding riparian buffer, which provides refuge for wildlife.

Now these retained green areas will be supplemented with more native trees and serve as buffers between the future neighbourhood and existing residential estates. Our approach to both sites will be informed by science and evidence. Gilman Barracks and Sunset Way lie within the wider Labrador Nature Park and Clementi Nature Corridor respectively.

And as NParks has identified, through its Ecological Profiling Exercise, or EPE. Now the proposed retention areas are based on findings of the environmental studies that aim to maintain ecological connectivity across these wider landscapes. HDB will also study how to design these future neighborhoods to reduce urban heat. This includes using environmental modelling to improve wind flow, incorporating greenery, using cool paint and orientating residential blocks to minimise direct sun exposure. Some members also asked how many homes the sites will eventually provide. We are not yet able to give an exact figure because the layout, scale and detailed design have not yet been finalised.

But in our current conceptual plan, we already reduced the number of homes to retain important green and heritage areas identified through the studies. If we conserve even more, we will build even fewer homes. So we must weigh this trade-off carefully before reaching a final decision.

HDB has also been attending local grassroots advisors' dialogues with residents to hear their concerns and suggestions in person. We appreciate the time and effort that many have put into studying the reports, attending the dialogues, and submitting detailed feedback. I've personally engaged many stakeholders myself and walked the ground at both Sunset Way and Gillman.

The Young PAP and the PAP Sustainability Group have also conducted engagements, gathering feedback and sharing that feedback with me and my team. Some nature enthusiasts, heritage advocates and nearby residents also asked us to preserve more greenery and heritage. Some also proposed additional mitigation measures. At the same time, we also heard from many Singaporeans, including residents in Clementi and Telok Blangah, about the desire for more affordable and accessible public housing. Many tell us they hope their children will have an opportunity to live near them. Sir, both perspectives reflect legitimate concerns and aspirations.

After the formal consultation period closes on 6 August 2026, we will conduct further engagements with stakeholders and closely review the study findings and feedback we received before finalising our detailed developmental plans. We will also publish a report summarising agencies' responses to the feedback and any amendments made to the original set of plans.

The question before us is not whether housing, greenery or heritage matters. They all do. The challenge is how we balance these needs responsibly within our limited space. We will and must always make the best use of existing land and safeguard our most important natural and heritage assets. But there will be times where we cannot avoid difficult trade-offs.

When that happens, we must be clear about why we need to build, deliberate about where we build and take great care over how we build. We must be honest with Singaporeans about the choices before us, listen carefully to their views and improve our plans wherever we can.

And after weighing all these different considerations, the government must decide in the best interests of Singapore and Singaporeans. And this is the approach we are taking for Gillman Barracks and Sunset Way. We are studying the environmental and heritage findings, listening to public views, and examining how the proposals can be improved before the detailed plans are finalized. These difficult choices are not unique to Gillman Barracks and Sunset Way.

And they will continue to confront us as we build homes, strengthen our economy, expand our infrastructure and realise our vision of a city in nature. So generations before us have faced similar choices. They made them with courage and foresight and Singapore is now better for it. Our responsibility is to do the same so we can leave to our children a country that is greener, more liveable and continues to provide opportunities and good homes for our people.

Summary of Opening by Mr Alvin Tan

Prepared by concerned members of the public and shared on 4 August 2026

Rationale for Building

- Land is limited; trade-offs between housing, greenery, and heritage are unavoidable.
- Housing demand keeps rising due to smaller household sizes, more singles/seniors living alone, and demand from couples wanting to live near parents — despite falling birth rates.
- Relaxing HDB eligibility criteria requires building more homes, faster.

Where MND chooses to build

- Priority is brownfield/underused land first: relocating Paya Lebar Air Base, consolidating port activities at Tuas, phasing out golf courses (400+ ha by 2030), building taller, going underground
- Sites with heritage/ecological value are not the first sites of consideration, but no comparable alternative exists in the needed area and/or timeframe.
- Currently ~7,800 ha of green space in Singapore; URA has safeguarded 1,000 ha more despite planned developments

How MND builds "responsibly"

- Independent EIA/HIA consultants: (1) document what's on site, (2) assess development impact, (3) recommend avoid/reduce/mitigate measures.
- EIAs also produce a preliminary Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP).
- Findings are published for public feedback *before* detailed plans are finalised — framed as shaping the plan, not justifying a fixed one.
- HDB/NParks will monitor construction and require contractor progress updates.

Sunset Way

- Zoned for housing since 1980, reaffirmed through every Master Plan review including 2025.
- Studying retention of greenery along the old Jurong railway line, a natural stream, and its riparian buffer as ecological/heritage buffers.

Gillman Barracks

- Rezoned for housing intention in Master Plan 2025 (studies announced at 2024 COS debate).
- Studying retention of most of the native secondary forest, plus east-west (Telok Blangah Hill Park–HortPark) and north-south (toward Berlayer Creek/Labrador Nature Reserve) ecological corridors.
- Studying retention of all "exceptional" and most "high" heritage-significance buildings; where retention isn't feasible, documentation/salvage/heritage interpretation will be used instead.

Responses to alternative-site suggestions

- Depot Lane Industrial Estate: already part of future housing supply — demolition of existing buildings is underway.
- Former CMPB and Pasir Panjang Reserve: still needed by MINDEF/other current users (e.g. MOE Outdoor Adventure Learning Centre); only redevelopable long-term.

Prepared by concerned members of the public and shared on 4 August 2026

- Maju Camp: retained for national defence, not available for housing.
- Other examples (Mount Sinai/former RJC site, Ghim Moh former bus facility, former ITE HQ) are already earmarked for housing; Albert Winsems Lane site is tied up with Cross Island Line works.

Moving forward

- Formal EIA/HIA consultation still closes **6 August 2026**, but stakeholder engagement continues afterward.
- Number of homes on both sites is not yet fixed — current concept plans already reduced unit counts to preserve green/heritage areas; more conservation means fewer homes.
- A report summarising how feedback was addressed, and any resulting amendments, will be published after the consultation closes.

Parliamentary Questions filed that remain unanswered

1. Were alternative sites evaluated? Were lower-density/smaller-footprint options assessed? Why was the current footprint preferred? (Rachel Ong)

The Minister discussed planning considerations generally but did not explain whether smaller-footprint or lower-density options for Gillman itself had been evaluated, nor why the preferred footprint was chosen.

2. Will Government hold further dialogue sessions after consultation closes? (Rachel Ong)

The Minister said agencies would continue engaging stakeholders, but did not commit to further public dialogues after 6 August. The form and modality of engagement was unclear.

3. Will phased clearance include checkpoints where monitoring results could pause or modify later phases? (Rachel Ong)

No explanation of decision points, monitoring thresholds or criteria that would trigger changes to the clearance schedule.

4. If a "major negative" biodiversity impact does not stop development, what threshold would? (Kenneth Tiong)

The Minister explained the EIA terminology but never identified what ecological threshold would justify preserving a site.

5. Was microclimate/urban heat modelling undertaken? What are the projected temperature impacts? (Elysa Chen)

The reply focused on future design measures but did not answer whether modelling had been conducted or quantify expected temperature changes.

6. How does MND determine that brownfield sites are insufficient before selecting greenfield sites? (Charlene Chen)

General planning principles were described, but no decision framework or assessment methodology was provided.

7. Will plain-language EIA summaries and explanations of how feedback influenced decisions be provided? (Charlene Chen)

There was no commitment to improving accessibility or publishing a feedback response matrix.

8. How was public feedback gathered? What other significant sites may be studied over the next five years? (Valerie Lee)

Consultation methods were described, but the second part on future sites was not addressed.

9. Cost comparison of clearing forests versus redeveloping mature estates; whether EIAs assess climate factors. (He Ting Ru)

Climate was discussed generally, but no cost comparison or explanation of climate assessment methodology was provided.

10. Will projected housing demand and reasons for selecting Gillman/Sunset Way be published before consultation closes? (Eileen Chong)

No publication of demand projections or site-selection analysis was committed to.

11. How can irreversible loss of endangered species be justified? (Patrick Tay)

The Minister spoke about mitigation and balancing competing needs, but did not directly answer how irreversible biodiversity loss is justified

12. When is an EIA triggered relative to confirmation of housing demand? (Hamid Razak)

The sequencing of planning and EIA was outlined generally, but not the specific trigger relative to confirming housing demand.

Supplementary Questions that remain unanswered

1. Can the Government still decide *not* to develop Maju or Gillman? (Andre Low)

MoS Alvin replied that both sites were already zoned for housing and "we will proceed", before explaining mitigation. However, he did not answer whether the Government could ultimately decide not to proceed.

2. What threshold of ecological harm would stop development? (Kenneth Tiong)

The Minister explained that "major negative" is a technical EIA term and said impacts would be mitigated. MoS Alvin did not answer what ecological threshold would cause the Government to preserve a site instead.

3. What housing demand are Maju and Gillman actually meeting? (Dennis Tan, He Ting Ru, Eileen Chong)

Prepared by concerned members of the public and shared on 4 August 2026

MoS Alvin replied generally that housing demand is driven by smaller households, BTO oversubscription and desire to live near parents. However, he did not provide projected household growth, projected housing demand or projected yield required and whether existing planned developments are sufficient.

4. Why Gillman and Maju instead of specific alternative sites? (Several MPs)

Depot Lane, CMPB, Pasir Panjang, Protective Security Command, Alexandra workshops, MSCP, Clementi Avenue 5 were proposed as alternative sites. MoS Alvin replied broadly that alternatives had been considered and explained some of their current uses. However, he did not explain why Gillman Barracks or Maju Forest performed better than each of these alternatives when it came to site selection.

5. Why do Berlayar and Gillman have different ecological corridor recommendations? (Rachel Ong)

MoS Alvin's response was that every site is unique. But he did not explain the scientific basis for the different widths, even though the two sites share the same ecological landscape.

6. Were cumulative ecological impacts of Gillman and Berlayar assessed? (Rachel Ong)

MoS Alvin said connectivity was considered, but he did not answer whether cumulative impacts across both projects were assessed, and how.

7. Can density still change? (Several MPs)

Many MPs asked whether footprint, density and layout could still change. MoS Alvin repeatedly said plans are not finalized but he did not explain how much could change, and what constraints remained fixed.

8. Why weren't consultations done earlier? (Dennis Tan, Rachel Ong)

MoS explained the existing process, but did not answer why consultations were not done earlier, before zoning rather than after.

9. Should EIAs occur before zoning? (He Ting Ru)

MoS Alvin explained why EIAs accompany proposals but did not answer whether earlier EIAs are possible or have been done before.

10. Urban heat modelling (Several MPs)

MoS Alvin replied that HDB would design developments to reduce heat, but did not answer whether existing forest cooling would be affected and if local temperatures would increase after clearance, and whether these have even been modelled.

11. Climate Adaptation (Kenneth Tiong)

The response by MoS Alvin and Minister Grace Fu focused on collective Cabinet responsibility. The answers did not address how clearing forests aligns with climate adaptation policy, or the Year of Climate Adaptation.

12. Social value of forests (Rachel Ong, Valerie Lee, Kenneth Tiong)

Many MPs referred to residents choosing Telok Blangah for green energy, wellbeing, identity, culture. MoS Alvin acknowledged these sentiments but did not explain how and if they were assessed alongside housing need.

The most important questions that remain unanswered throughout the sitting was: Why were Maju and Gillman Barracks/Forest selected over the alternatives that residents and MPs proposed, and what could still change?

MoS Alvin explained why those sites are not immediately available, but did not clearly compare them against Gillman or explain the trade-offs that led to their selection. That distinction matters because much of the public discussion has been about whether the decision-making process considered and weighed realistic alternatives transparently. Second, MoS Alvin repeatedly said that the plans were "not finalised" and that feedback could lead to "adjustments." However, he did not specify whether adjustments could include reducing housing density, changing the development footprint, retaining more forest, or preserving additional heritage features. Without that clarification, residents are left uncertain about what influence the ongoing consultation can realistically have.

Analysis

Based on the Parliamentary Questions and Supplementary Questions asked at the 4 August 2026 Parliamentary Sitting, only 8 questions were substantially answered, receiving a reasonably direct response:

- Why Singapore continues to require additional housing.
- Broad planning considerations when selecting housing sites.
- Why brownfield sites cannot always substitute for greenfield sites.
- The purpose and role of the EIA and HIA.
- Why ecological mitigation is proposed rather than avoiding all impacts.
- The intention to continue engaging stakeholders before detailed plans are finalised.
- Why every site is assessed individually rather than applying a single planning template.
- General explanation of the housing planning process.

Most questions were only partially answered, in that they received responses, but not at the level of detail requested. Examples include:

- Housing demand projections.
- Why Gillman was preferred over named alternatives.
- Urban heat impacts.
- Cumulative ecological impacts.
- Future dialogue after 6 August.
- How public feedback will influence planning.
- What aspects of the proposal remain open to change.
- Assessment of brownfield sites.
- Climate considerations.
- Timing of EIAs.
- How ecological corridors were determined.
- How heritage recommendations will be implemented.
- Monitoring after development.
- Housing planning assumptions.
- Sequencing of development.
- Consideration of neighbouring developments.

Questions that remain unanswered:

- Can the Government still decide not to develop Gillman or Maju?
- What ecological threshold would cause a site to be preserved?
- Why Gillman/Maju over each specific alternative site?
- Can housing density or the development footprint still change?
- Will phased clearance include formal review checkpoints?
- Why wasn't consultation conducted earlier?
- Could EIAs be undertaken before zoning decisions?
- Was the forests' cooling effect modelled?
- How were community wellbeing and social value assessed?
- Will the Government publish a response matrix showing how feedback changed the proposal?

Overall, the most significant unanswered issues were not about the need for housing, which the Minister addressed repeatedly, but about the decision-making process:

- Why Gillman/Maju was preferred over alternatives.
- What trade-offs were made.
- What ecological threshold would justify preservation.
- What aspects of the proposal remain open to change.
- How consultation feedback will tangibly influence the final outcome.

Those were also the recurring themes raised by residents during both the community-led dialogue and the [Government dialogue](#), suggesting a continuing demand for greater transparency around how these planning decisions are reached, rather than simply what has been decided.

Notes from Livestream of Parliamentary Sitting on 4 August 2026

Q&A	Member of Parliament, Questions and Answers Provided
Q	Rachel Ong - MP of Telok Blangah Thank you Speaker, Thank you MoS Alvin for your responses and for receiving feedback and proposals my residents and I submitted on Gillman Barracks. These came from in-person and written feedback and well-researched proposals that residents put together themselves submitted on Gillman Barracks. I understand and appreciate the stated need for more housing and the potential benefits for many families. Alongside these considerations my residents have also raised deep concerns including the loss of biodiversity and ecological connectivity in the area. The very greenery that drew many residents to make this precinct their home, for many Gillman forest is a place of respite, reflection and connection. Many also raised the impact on climate resilience and urban heat. With that, I would like to ask four supplementary questions. 1. Can the government clarify whether and if so how the earlier Berlayar EIS informed Gillman Barracks EIA. Corridor design and the cumulative impact across two adjacent developments. Both sites form part of the same ecological network and serve the same wildlife. In this context, why the recommended ecological width differ between the two despite shared ecology. The Gillman Forest links the Southern Ridges which includes the Telok Blangah Hill Park, Berlayar Creek through to Labrador Nature Reserve and Kent Ridge Park forming a larger ecological landscape retaining it. 2. Residents would also like to honor the 2021 pledge under the Glasgow Leaders Declaration on Forest and Land Use to halt and reverse forest loss by 2030. My second SQ: Instead of residential development on Gillman Barracks, will the Government consider reimagining and re-engineering the site to better meet the evolving needs of our next generation creating spaces that protect and promote human creativity and connection? 3. My third SQ. Will the government reveal our planning and consultation processes to ensure they remain fit for purpose in the changing climate? Specifically for forested or ecologically sensitive sites, could EIAs and public engagement begin at the master planning stage before land is slated for development? 4. My final SQ, will the government provide a summary of the feedback collected together with clarity on how it shaped the final development decisions? This matters deeply to residents who want assurance that their voices have made a difference.

	Thank you, Speaker.
A	Alvin Tan, MND So I thank Ms Rachel Ong for her strong advocacy on behalf of her Telok Blangah residents and for working together with our agencies to provide those feedback. As I mentioned earlier on, the plans for both Sunset Way and in this case, Gillman Barracks is not yet finalized. Even beyond 6 August, when the consultation period closes, we will continue to engage her residents. And after these further engagements and reviewing the feedback and findings from additional engagements with her residents, we will release reports summarizing the responses to feedback and also any adjustments that we make to the original plan, the original set of plans. With regards to the Gilman EIA and its links to Berlayer, the Gillman EIA took into consideration the Belaya estate, you know there's connectivity. It established an important connectivity in fact between Gilman and Belayar for in fact the movement of birds. And this draws upon the findings from the National Parks EPE and on Keppel Golf Club EIA. The conceptual plan therefore proposes retaining the East-West Corridor, as I mentioned earlier on, and to establish a new North-South Corridor to facilitate the movement of fauna. Both studies also proposed a minimum 30-metre ecological corridor and for Gilman Barracks it's a recommended corridor stretches up to 200 metres. So we acknowledge that there's ecological connectivity between sites. We've done that through the EIAs and the EIAs for each site is different because each site is unique. But where possible we recognise the connectivity as I mentioned earlier. Building on new spaces within this site. As I mentioned, will take in those feedback in the consultation process even beyond 6 August. We will listen to residents and see where we can make adjustments. On the spaces which you mentioned, today I want to say that as I mentioned, Singapore has over 7,800 hectares of green spaces and nature reserves. If you look at the bigger picture, even after accounting for the planned developments in both sites in the Master Plan. URA has safeguarded an additional 1,000 hectares of green space. So net-net, we are building a green city. And all of these plans, be it in Sunset Way or Gilman, are meant to enhance that ecological connectivity and also to balance between development for homes as well as green and heritage spaces.
Q	Andre Low, NCMP Thank you, Speaker. Thank you, MOS Tan, for the comprehensive response. I have three SQs for you today.

	1. I would like to ask if the MOS can confirm if not proceeding with development is still an option at either site rather than just adjusting developmental boundaries or taking mitigation measures. 2. MOS referred to quite a number of significant initiatives to free up further brownfield land such as the relocation of Paya Lebar Air Base, the continuing relocation of our port terminals to Tuas, as well as taking back golf course land. Will enough of these brownfield land be freed up in time so that we can continue to defer the development of green spaces like Maju Forest and Gillman Forest? 3. Regarding the location of the Cross Island Line Maju Station. Does the government regard the location of Maju station as compelling or requiring the development of Maju forest in order to be able to sufficiently utilize the capacity that the station will provide? And if that being the case, will the government consider in the future when planning MRT lines, alignments and station locations that we take into account the location of sensitive ecological sites such as Maju forest such that we do not perpetuate a vicious cycle where the station is planned for that location and therefore it compels the development of the forest.
A	Alvin Tan, MND The sites that we mentioned earlier on, Sunset Way as well as Gilman Barracks have already been zoned for residential use under our master plan and they've been set aside for housing. So we will proceed but how we build is important and that's why we have these EIAs and HIAs to identify the ecological significance, the heritage significance and then we will mitigate as best as possible the ecological and heritage impact to the site. With regards to alternatives, I mentioned earlier on that we have looked at in the vicinity of both Sunset Way as well as Gillman Barracks for alternative brownfield sites, vacant land, brownfield sites, underused sites. And there are a variety of ways in which we consider the availability of the land, whether the land has leases remaining, whether they have additional uses, as I mentioned earlier on, whether the infrastructure surrounding that site is sufficient. Because when you build homes for our people, you also need the surrounding infrastructure to support them. This brings me to his third point about trains. And that is one major consideration. When we look and select sites for homes for Singaporeans, it is not just on those considerations, but it's also very important for us to determine whether there are amenities. We can build amenities to support the community and housing, whether there are sufficient transport links, including stations. And when we do so, we do a couple of things. Number one, we do an ecological profiling exercise on a broad swath to look at the impact of where sites have ecological and natural heritage and natural significance. Then when the sites are meant to be developed, we also look at the EIA and the HIA to mitigate those sites and then in the process we get feedback and see how we can also better bring in amenities that will benefit home buyers and homeowners.

Q	Nadia Samdin - Ang Mo Kio Thank you, Speaker. I also thank the Minister of State for his assurance that MND continues to be equally committed to both providing affordable housing as well as our city in nature as planning principles. We know the first gives Singaporeans a stake in society and the second is really what continues to make us exceptional as nature is functional. I have three PQs. 1. How are these planning principles consistent even through reviews of various master plans? And can I confirm that MND is committed to the structured decision matrix and hierarchy, avoiding impact before minimizing or mitigating environmental or historical sites in guiding these decisions. 2. Our City in Nature vision is ultimately about maintaining functional ecosystems that strengthen Singapore's resilience through biodiversity, ecological connectivity and climate adaptation. Beyond the size of the green spaces which are retained, what ecological criteria does the government use to determine if a site should be avoided altogether? Is there a desired minimum viability that we are optimizing for the longer term? When development does proceed, how does the government monitor over time whether retained forests remain ecologically viable? For example, in terms of habitat quality, stormwater attenuation and urban cooling. 3. Could you please share more about the engagement process including for this case of Maju forest? How does the Government ensure that development decisions are made consistently and transparently? Specifically, which nature groups and experts are consulted, at what stages of planning, and how does the feedback finally influence the planning outcome? Has the Government considered whether EIAs and HIAs should be legislatively strengthened, brought earlier, and the stages of the consultation process enshrined? Thank you.
A	Alvin Tan, MND Thank you Ms Nadia Samdin for your questions. I explained earlier on our development process and quite in detail but let me make a few emphasis. The first is that no development can take place without planning permission under the Planning Act. And as part of the planning approval process, all development proposals are screened for potential environmental as well as heritage impact. And the developments that are assessed to have lightly significant environmental and heritage impact are then subjected to the EIA and HIA process, which I mentioned earlier on. And then we work together with different stakeholders, community groups, residents, nature groups, to then study the EIA or HIA and to see where we can make adjustments. On her point about the broader considerations, we've undertaken an EPE, as I mentioned, to better understand the role of sites in protecting and also supporting biodiversity and ecological connectivity. Now these findings are important because they help to identify important habitats and

	ecological corridors. I mentioned that earlier on. It also helps us and guides planning how to balance development with nature conservation. But the development priorities and development projects that are close to sensitive areas will be subject to and in fact are subject to greater scrutiny. And it guides measures to help us to mitigate the impact. For example, we will protect our nature reserves and any nearby developments that may affect nature reserves are subject to very strict planning controls. In consultation with groups, the nature groups I've met with, many of them, including the Nature Society of Singapore, the Singapore Youth Voices for Biodiversity, LepakInSG, and NUS Academics, and many residents as well. So as I mentioned earlier on, our consultation process will continue even after 6th of August, and we welcome more feedback and more views so that we can take into that as we look to finalize our plans in later stage. Thank you..
Q	Christopher De Souza, Holland-Bukit Timah I thank the MOS for his fairly comprehensive replies. I take comfort in the fact that he mentioned that the plans have not been finalized and I take comfort in the good minister's position that there's been an agreement to extend the consultation period or at least the engagement post 6th of August. These are good, valuable explanations for the residents that I serve. My questions arise out of possible alternative sites. I accept the government's national priority to have housing close to parents and to family, something that I support. But I think we can look at alternative sites close to Maju Forest, and here I have two. <u>Alternative Sites:</u> • The MSCP and the canal at Sunset Way have a current construction site for the Cross Island Line. And if one was to build high there, it would have beautiful waterfront living. So that's one alternative that is within my own ward. Would that be considered? • And taking a leaf out of Dover Forest and the debate I had some years ago, we managed to find alternative housing sites that preserve half of Dover Forest. And it was a win-win situation. So I invite the good minister to look at this as a blank sheet of paper to see whether we can achieve such a win-win. • And therefore an alternative site is also Clementi Avenue 5. I understand

	that it is a work site, a large work site for the Cross Island Line and it will be a rather eloquent and elegant position to put high-rise HDB flats. So I'm not one to just throw the problem away. I'm giving solutions. Would the good minister consider this? • The last point, sir, if I may, arises out of Ms Sim Ann and my engagement on the ground. We've had town hall meetings, we have done home visits, we've been responding to emails, and we visited Maju Forest twice. And there is this great affinity for the forest, it is a part of their lives, and there's also heritage. So for all of these reasons, I ask for the same ethos, the same principles that governed the debate between the backbench and the frontbench regarding Dover Forest and if we can receive a win-win-win solution with alternative sites and as much mitigation as possible. I think that would be a great advantage and great flip for this House. So in summary, those are my responses. I do support the national priority of building. My question is where and if we can find a good win-win-win compromise. Thank you.
A	Alvin Tan, MND Sir, I thank Mr Christopher De Souza as well as Grassroots Adviser Sim Ann. They have been very actively engaging myself, Mr Chee, Minister Indrani, very strongly speaking up on behalf of the residents at Sunset Way. They have gone down to the ground, they have organized town halls, have conveyed many of the residents' feedback to us, they have also visited the residents so they have been very actively engaged, both on the ground and to me as well as our MND colleagues. I mentioned earlier on the alternative sites and I thank Mr Chris de Souza for also being very practical and also identifying some potential alternative sites. We do our best to optimize the land use and to tap the vacant land and brownfield sites where possible, but there are no other suitable sites to meet the near-term demand in the vicinity. For example, the Albert Winsimius Lane that he mentioned earlier on, that MCSP, is currently being used for LTA for the Cross Island Line. Clementi Avenue 5, also to support ongoing works for the Cross Island Line, but will be considered for residential development after the MRT line is complete. So these are already measures that we have taken in place. First look at brownfield sites, first look at underused land, we first look at vacant land and we look into whether we can first use them and see whether there are alternative sites for us to build. So I thank Mr Chris De Souver for his inputs and we urge him to continue engaging with us beyond 6th of August so that we can take in

	his residence feedback and make relevant adjustments to the plans before they are finalised.
Q	Dennis Tan, Hougang Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the MOS the following supplementary questions. 1. In my adjournment motion on Serangoon River Forest earlier this year, I raised concerns that public engagement often takes place only after key land use directions, which includes non-consultative zoning decisions, have been determined. So why were consultation not conducted before the scope and parameters of the environmental studies for Maju Forest and Guman Barracks, for example? Will the government consider engaging stakeholders at an earlier stage for future major redevelopment proposal? 2. I would like to again urge the MOS to consider, to clarify whether the development plans for human barracks and housing proposed under consideration remain open to substantive revision and whether the government is prepared to reduce development intensity or footprint and consider alternative sites. And I've got one more alternative site. What about the Protective Security Command and Ulu Pandan? 3. Would the minister tell the House what specific long-term population and household formation? Projections are driving the planning for HDB housing developments in Maju Forest and Cuban barracks and indeed elsewhere. And will MND publish this figure so that the public can independently assess if clearing these forests is necessary now? 4. Given residents' concern about the loss of canopy cover, has HDB modelled the potential urban heat impact of the proposed developments on both sides? And what measures are being considered to ensure surrounding neighbourhoods do not experience significant ambient temperature increases? And finally, could I ask the MOS to consider extending the current one-month consultation period beyond 6 August so that the residents, experts, civil society, can have more time to review the reports and submit their feedback. Thank you.
A	Alvin Tan, MND Mr Dennis Tan had five PQs and we've debated this many times before on Serangoon Forest. Let me try to answer him as best as I can. First, we will be extending the engagement period beyond 6th of August, though that's very clear. So please, as I mentioned, please share with us your views and your feedback and

	we will take them into consideration as we finalize the plans. We will also publish the agency's responses to these feedback. On the canopy carbon and urban heat, I spoke about this in my main reply about how HDB has already taken these steps in existing and also future developments to reduce urban heat through many of these factors. On population, I've also mentioned why currently we require more housing. Household formations have increased, household sizes are smaller and there's increased demand particularly in the central areas where the two sites enclosed by Clementi for example are four times oversubscribed. So we need those. I also wanted to ask for Mr Dennis Tan and the WP colleagues in this House to also stand by us in this regard. Because we've debated housing in this House many times. We've debated it in, I think, 2023 on the debate on motion for public housing. And the WP's stance on housing is very clear. Let me just share a little bit. First, Ms He Ting Ru, Mr Pritam Singh, Mr Louis Chua, had proposed to reduce the age eligibility for singles to access public housing from 35 to 28. Mr. Pritam Singh also suggested allowing a first-time couple who exceeded income eligibility criteria threshold to buy a BTO. Mr Pritam Singh and Mr Louis Chua also pushed for the government to increase public housing supply. Mr Louis Chua in his adjournment motion in September 2022 implored the government to take urgent and decisive steps to increase the availability of public housing and address the current demand supply imbalance to ensure housing demand of all Singaporeans, not just singles, are met. He also asked in the same adjournment motion for the government to build residential homes ahead of demand and to have a fundamental rethink of the BTO system. So all of these are very clear positions that housing is required and we need to build more. And when we do that, it is not a question of why we built, I think it's very clear. It's a question of where we built and I've explained to members the sites. I think the Police Security Command is also set aside for residential housing, for example. And as I mentioned also to Mr. Christopher De Souza, we've already looked at all of the surrounding brownfield sites and where possible, have to factor in the timing, the availability, the infrastructure, as well as the lease and other factors before we go into vegetated sites. And in this case, we have been quite comprehensive in that regard. On the public engagement, already mentioned that we will continue to engage the public and we welcome public consultation and feedback beyond 6th of August. Thank you.
Q	Kenneth Tiong - Aljunied

	Thank you, Speaker. I have three SQs, but first I don't think my PQ was answered. • What was the threshold of harm that sets aside if A) major negative EIA assessment does not and B) whether underused state land including the grounds of Black and White bungalows and aging low rise as states hadn't assessed as an alternative now. I've been to the grounds of some of these Black and white bungalows and I think that they're very very low density and certainly if you wanted to build more housing there it would be ideal. My three SQs: 1. Residents value the Telok Blangah for its greenery and forest, and that's a large part of its identity. I think that removing the forest removes that identity. So in the spirit of alternative sites, I think could the car workshops around Alexandra Village Food Centre be considered for development? 2. Can there be a formal extension of the consultation deadline beyond 6 August? 3. Many nature observers have expressed to me deep disappointment in what they perceive to be MSE's [Ministry of Sustainability and Environment] lack of leadership and ownership in the decisions on Gillman Barrack and Maju Forest. In their perception MSE has gone missing on this issue. In this very year, 2026, that MSE has designated the year of climate adaptation. Why has MSE not been seen leading and advocating for this forest?
A	Alvin Tan, MND So let me answer Mr Kenneth Tiong's questions on the major negative, it's a formal technical term used in the EIA. And it's not always possible to avoid the ecological and heritage impact, including the type for Sunset and Gillman. But with the EIA and the HIA, we have plans already to mitigate these possible impact. And we will do what we can to do so. On alternative sites, we've already explained why and where we have looked into alternative and brownfield sites. On the engagements under consultation, I also mentioned that we were extended beyond the consultation period on 6th of August. And on the MSE, I disagree with this characterization. The government makes decisions across different ministries. We speak to MSE, MSE gives us the feedback, but at the end of the day, we will have to make decisions based in the best interests of Singapore and Singaporeans. You cannot say you want housing as the WP has already mentioned multiple times and sit in this house, but yet then also in the same breath say, you know, why don't you do this and why don't you do that? I think what is important is for us to look at

	the compatible uses, the trade-offs, and for us to at the same time build homes for people whom both the WP and us want to build homes for, but at the same time also preserve where possible, heritage sites as well as ecological sites. These are not incompatible. It requires us to make very deliberate decisions on where we build, which is alternative sites, and also how we build in this regard. So I hope that the member agrees with me, and I hope that he will work with us as well in engaging the nature groups, explain all of these different considerations. And I also really wanted to say that MSE has been working very closely with us in terms of addressing many of these issues together. Grace Fu, MSE Thank you very much and the suggestion that MSE should take a different position as MND and then to make a strong stance because it's the year of climate adaptation to object to some of the decisions that have been made for MND. It's not how we work as a government. For us, any one of us standing in front of here presenting a position to the government, the rest of us are in support. So I think if a WP member is hoping for a fight between ministers, I think they will be disappointed. But in any case, the purpose of having a year of climate adaptation is precisely for that. For all the agencies and ministries, when they're planning long-term land use, when they're planning long-term transport infrastructure, when they're planning long-term power infrastructure, to have a view on the adaptation that's needed given the long-term climate change is not to change the way that we have worked as effectively as a team in the government. Thank you.
Q	Dr Charlene Chen, Tampines Mr Speaker, Young PAP recently engaged Singaporeans on the proposed housing developments at Gillman Barracks and Maju Forest. My fellow YP advisors David Hoe and Lee Hui Ying heard two key concerns. First, some young Singaporeans felt let down. They have been taught in school to make personal responsibility for sustainability, but perceive a disconnect between this message and these developments. 1. Will the Ministry further enhance public accessibility of EIAs and HIAs, make them easier to understand among general public?

	Our young accept that trade-offs are necessary, but they feel that they lack sufficient information to understand why this particular trade-off was made. Questions remain such as why more areas of high ecological value are not included within the proposed retained area, and they want to know how the decision was reached and whether every reasonable alternative has been considered. 2. Will MND publish a report similar to the National Climate Change Secretariat's response on Singapore's long-term low emissions development strategy to respond to these questions and suggestions and explain how feedback informed its final decision. 3. Maju Forest is quite hilly and it may entail potentially higher construction costs that potentially could be passed on to HDB buyers. It is also a very desirable site given all the nature and greenery surrounding it. How can we keep public housing at these sites affordable for HDB buyers? Thank you.
A	Alvin Tan, MND So I thank Ms. Charlene Chan for leading, together with Mr. David Hoe and Ms. Lee Hui Ying, together with the young PAP to engage our youths. And I understand that they will be engaging them further. We can understand why our youths are.. they feel strongly about this and our youth ought to feel strongly about this. These are important issues, these are important considerations. And it means they treasure our heritage and they treasure our green spaces. And we will continue to engage them beyond and to get their feedback on where we can make adjustments to those sites, but then also to explain the rationale as well. On those sites, we are not yet able to give an exact figure about the plans because they are not finalized yet. And we could make, for example, potential adjustments to the layout, to the scale, and to the detailed design. If you look at what we are trying to study, we are trying to study the retention of some of these green spaces, including a significant stretch of greenery along the former Old Jurong railway line, and also a natural stream and a riparian buffer that will help to support wildlife. And we will also publish a report summarizing the agency's responses to feedback and also any amendments made to the original plans. So we will do all of that. We will continue to engage our use. Sir, if you just allow me, I also hadn't answered Mr. Kenneth Tiong's questions earlier about alternative sites. I wanted to make the point that where feasible, bungalows have been redeveloped or earmarked for future redevelopment already. And previously demolished clusters, for example of bungalows at Seletar Camp have made way for an industrial park and that supports our aerospace sector. In the coming years we will also be studying plans to redevelop bungalows at Medway Park as part of the Dover-Medway estate. So again it reinforces our point that where we can, we will prioritize brownfield sites, vacant sites, but where we can't, then when we have to build, then we build very carefully, taking into account the EIA, the HIA, and then also looking at mitigation measures working together with residents, communities, youth groups, nature

	groups and the likes.
Q	Fadli Fawzi, Aljunied Thank you Mr. Speaker. Firstly, just like to make the point that asking the government to build new houses should not preclude us from questioning where these houses should be built and the trade-offs that need to be made for these houses. 1. Sunset Way has been largely zoned for residential use since the master plan in 1980. But since then, Maju Forest has become ecologically significant amidst the loss of many other green spaces in Singapore including Tengah and parts of Bukit Brown. The MOS has mentioned that MND has safeguarded a lot of green space, but there are also different types of green spaces. Destroying a secondary forest and then replacing it with a park yields the same amount of green space, but the ecological impact is completely different. So in light of this, will the government consider reclassifying forested green field sites that are currently zoned for development into sites to be preserved, wherever feasible? And if not, what factors might lead the ministry to consider rezoning forested greenfield sites that have already been identified for development for park or nature reserve use? 2. What is the threshold for conducting environmental impact assessments before developments on greenfield sites? Thank you
A	Alvin Tan, MND I thank Mr Fawzi for agreeing with us that there is a need for housing. I also agree with him that it doesn't preclude the fact that we need to ask questions and tough questions. I appreciate members of this House for conveying those concerns of your residents as well as the community in this regard. It's important to ask these questions and it's on the Government to explain them, to explain the different aspects of it and to also ask for the public as well as residents to work with us in the design of these areas. I've answered quite substantively the questions that the member had asked, particularly the ones that I answered Ms Nadia Samdin about how we look at the overall green space, the ecological profiling exercise. I've also answered before how we look at alternative sites and I also answered earlier on how the EIA and the HIA is meant to identify where their ecological and heritage significance and then where that's what's happened, what's today, what the proposed development, how the proposed development may impact ecological and heritage features within the site and also how we also mitigate the impact. So overall if you look at where we are as a nation, we are one of the most livable cities in the world. And despite our limited space, we have gone on to conserve and preserve over 7,800 hectares of greenery, and within all of these constraints. If you look at sites,

	like even Maju, in 1976, it was a brownfield site. Vegetation started growing there. And then of course right now, even as we plan for Sunset Way, we factor in those green features. The stream, for example, the ecological corridor, for example, the old Jurong line, for example. So these were not there in 1976, but they were there now. They have grown onto a brownfield, original brownfield site, they are secondary native forests. And when we plan, we already factor in that we will, because we want to preserve these green sites and these green features, we already are lowering the number of homes that we can build on these sites. So we take those into consideration and we will be able to build desirable homes for our people living close to their parents and also to enjoy the greenery that abuts these sites. Thank you.
Q	Valerie Lee, Pasir-Ris-Changi Thank you, Speaker. 1. Would the ministry consider publishing a forward-looking list of intended planning studies within the near term, say about two to three years, that may affect areas with heritage or ecological significance and actively engage the community from the outset? 2. Would the ministry consider incorporating measures of non-market values, including existence value, bequest value, and cultural value into its evaluation framework for redevelopment decisions affecting heritage or natural areas.
A	Alvin Tan, MND I thank Ms Valerie Lee for her questions. Again, I mentioned earlier on how we look at the overall landscape as well as our island and how we've undertaken, for example, EPEs to better understand the role of sites in supporting, for example, biodiversity and ecological activity. And all of these in concert, these findings do help us. They help us to identify important habitats and ecological corridors to guide how we plan and how we can balance development with niche conservation. And as part of this planning approval process, and I had answered it earlier on as well, all development proposals are screened for potential ecological and heritage impact before we proceed. And the developments that are assessed to likely have high significant ecological and heritage impact are then subject to the EIA. And again, I have mentioned how we do that as well. So I hope that answers your question.
Q	He Ting Ru, Sengkang

First I'd like to respond to the Minister of State. I'm not sure I agree that his characterization of the Workers' Party's position is a fair one. I think the question at hand here is not about whether or not we should build more.

The question is, and I believe that members of this House are actually asking whether this location and the decisions or at least the announcements that have been made, you know, have been, are going to be the best given that, you know, there's a lot of pressure on housing. We all know that residents have balloted many, many, many times for housing. So again, we're not disagreeing about this, but the question before us today is whether or not these sites are the best places to build.

And we also want to understand a bit more from the government why these announcements have been made, what are the considerations that have gone into it. In this regard, I also want to ask a couple of SQs of this.

1. We are talking about Gillman Barracks and also Maju Forest. I noticed that, and I believe the MOS also said earlier, that the Southern Waterfront, for example, is an area that's being developed, and I believe that the number's estimated about 7,000 new units, nearer to Maju Forest, we've got a turf city development where up to 20,000 housing units are being proposed or at least being planned. So I would like to ask, despite all these numbers coming up, is it actually the government's at least MND's decision or rather assessment that these 7,000, 20,000 units coming up in the vicinity is not enough?
2. And I also noticed that Minister Chee earlier in the last few days also mentioned that the MND is continuing or HDB is continuing to study the impact of reducing BTO age and whether or not this is something. And I'm just curious about whether or not this sort of announcement of these, development of these two areas is tied in any way to any potential reduction in BTO eligibility ages.
3. And the last SQ that I would like to ask is whether or not, we've heard a lot about EIAs and HIAs and when these are actually being, when these are being conducted. We also heard a bit about zoning and I think it was mentioned earlier that Sunset Way has been zoned for residential since 1980 for residential housing purposes.

So I just wanted to know whether or not, because whether there have been any precedents where formal EIAs or HIAs have been conducted before any zoning changes or zoning decisions are made in order for us to have a bit more forward guidance in deciding, you know, do a formal assessment, something a bit more formalized, EIAs or HIAs, whether or not we, before we even decide site to change the zoning.

	Thank you.
A	Alvin Tan, MND Thank you for your questions and I also thank her for acknowledging that members on both sides of the aisle agree that we need to build more and she also acknowledged that there is a lot of pressure on housing. She mentioned residents coming and balloting many times for housing. I am sure she has faced it with residents coming to her and I have residents coming and saying I have multiple ballots and I can't get the home. Residents and home owners want housing, many of them want housing in central areas, living near their parents. That's why there is a huge demand for housing. Housing in these areas are 4 times oversubscribed. The question is whether alternative sites have been sufficiently looked at - yes we have and we will continue to look for alternatives and look at brownfield sites before touching vegetative sites. But these are considerations I have already mentioned. We are reviewing BTO eligibility age. On the EIA and HIA, there is misunderstanding. We need EIA/HIA to present a proposal - which is meant for agencies and communities and residents to look at the proposal and see where the impact is, and see how to mitigate that impact. EIAs are very extensive which are around 300 pages, and there are executive summaries for it. The EIA/HIA are plans that show what is there, and what the impact would be, and where the potential mitigations are. The feedback is ongoing, and we hope that many will continue to give that feedback because the development plans are not finalised.
Q	Eileen Chong, NCMP Thank you Mr Speaker, I have 2 SQs and one clarification for the MoS. MoS actually spoke about better use of existing land, building taller when we can and using underutilized land. So in this regard, I also know that the government has committed to first, from the early 2030s, to renew aging estates. 1. So I would like to ask, when the recommendation was made to clear parts of Maju Forest, Gilman Forest and Gilman Barracks for housing? Was there any consideration to bring forward this renewal as an alternative and if yes, what were the comparisons? 2. My second SQ is related to MoS' earlier reply about how he was unable to share about the exact housing yield of these sites because the layouts have not been finalized. So I would like to ask whether there is a target per site yield that HDB is looking at. I note that in the 2025 URA draft Masterplan that it does contain indicative site yields for sites like Newton - 5000, Patterson - 1000 and also for Bayshore - 10 to 12,000 but none has been given in this Masterplan for the Gillman sites and Maju Forest/ Sunset Way.

	3. And related to this, I would like to ask MoS what is the exact size of the housing demand that these sites are meant to respond to. How much of this housing demand reflects local family formation per MoS' outline about households getting smaller versus planned population growth? And finally I have one clarification. Given the volume of questions raised in this house today and the clear public interest and feedback on this, 4. Could the MoS clarify whether MND will be extending the consultation window beyond 6th of August just like what it was done for Dover Forest in 2021 or is it that MND will continue to engage the public and relevant agencies beyond the 6th of August? I am asking this so that Singaporeans can have more meaningful opportunities to participate. Speaker: That has been answered three times, I recall rightly. Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just a clarification. Whether this window is extended beyond 6th of August, just like what it was done for Dover Forest in 2021, or is it simply that MND will continue to engage the public and relevant agencies beyond the 6th of August?
A	Alvin Tan, MND I have answered about the process of how we looked into the ecological profiling exercise, the EIAs and the HIAs, but she raises some important points which I wanted to address. The first is on the sites in the Master Plan with housing use. I think she mentioned Newton and other places. It's because the plans are firm. Newton is my constituency. For Maju and for Gillman, they're not firm. And that's why we have the consultation period, that's why we have the EIA, that's why we're extending that, so that we can make adjustments. I mentioned earlier on that we make adjustments already prior with the EIA and HIA, where we could potentially have built more homes for Singaporeans. But we already have the EIA and HIA, where we already accept that there'll be lesser homes. The feedback exercise that will extend beyond the 6th of August, as the speaker had mentioned, I have explained many times, will continue to help us to shape these plans as we go ahead. On CSRS, is long-term policy to have gradual redevelopment. It's not specifically linked to this, but earlier on, I have already mentioned... I've already mentioned why there is a demand for housing. I've already mentioned smaller household sizes. I've mentioned greater family formation and also where people want homes. So that's why we need to take this decision, look at the sites, look at where to build, look at alternatives and then where we build, we do our best

	to mitigate the impacts of development. All to build homes for Singaporeans, which is our main objective.
Q	Joan Pereira, Tanjong Pagar MP Thank you, Speaker. MOS, I have an SQ. May I know how the Government intends to support the arts community at the Gillman Barracks, either in relocating them or in continuing their work as an enclave in another area? Thank you.
A	Alvin Tan, MND Sir, I thank Ms Joan Pereira for her question. The Singapore Land Authority (SLA) has already engaged tenants at Government Barracks since 2023 and informed them that the site has been already safeguarded for residential use in the longer term. SLA has also kept attendance updated on the environmental and heritage studies which I mentioned earlier on, as well as upcoming development works. For arts tenants, I thank Ms Joan Pereira for thinking of our arts practitioners in our site. I wanted to assure her that SLA is working closely with the National Arts Council to support them. NAC will continue to engage the tenants and work with relevant agencies to facilitate their relocation where possible, including pointing them to suitable alternative spaces and opportunities within Singapore's arts ecosystem.

Closing Remarks

Sir, if you'll allow me to quickly wrap up, very quickly. Okay. Sir, it's been a long, I think we took a majority of question time and it really reflects upon all members of the houses.

Reflecting the voices of our people, reflecting the voices of youth, reflecting the voices of our residents, reflecting the voices of our communities. And I thank them. I appreciate them. And it also shows how we care. I think last night, Mr. David Hoe sent me, earlier this morning as I was preparing for this, at 2.30am in the morning, he messaged me and he said he just finished his MPS. And he showed me two young children, you know, with a little black card that says, please save the forest.

I texted him and I said, that's wonderful. Because we should care. Our children should care, our youth should care. That they care enough to come together, to write to us, to ask tough questions, but also to walk with us and to work with us to find solutions together. To build homes, to also protect our precious green and heritage spaces. And Mr. Speaker, both are not incompatible. Both are not incompatible. We can build homes that are nestled in greenery. We can also build homes which are nestled in heritage. We can do that if we understand collectively

why we need to build, if we choose carefully where we build, and if we manage carefully how we build.

Sir, we're gonna celebrate National Day on Sunday. And as we celebrate National Day, we'll be going down to our estates as we usually do. And you know these estates were once upon a time probably vegetated sites or brownfield sites. Like Maju Forest was in 1976, but are now thriving estates - with families, with homes, generations raising families. So can I also, even as we have this very robust debate, can I ask my colleagues here in this house to walk with us collectively to assure our people that despite our limitations and our constraints, that we continue to shape our island into one of the most livable cities in the world and with Singaporeans at the heart of everything we do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.