

1. The meeting resumed at 9:10 a.m. on 10.11.2014.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Professor S.C. Wong

Professor P.P. Ho

Professor C.M. Hui

Dr C.P. Lau

Dr W.K. Yau

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr F.C. Chan

Mr Francis T.K. Ip

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Mr Eric K.S. Hui

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Victor W.T. Yeung

Deputy Director of Lands (General)
Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 3
Transport and Housing Bureau
Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

3. The Chairman said that so far only one representer with an estimated speaking time of 20 minutes had arrived. Members agreed to adjourn the hearing until 9:40 a.m. to see if more representers would turn up at the hearing.

[Mr Roger K.H. Luk left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

[The meeting resumed at 9:40a.m.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

[Open Meeting]

4. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), representers and representers' representative were invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin - District Planning Officer/Fanling,
Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East
(DPO/FS&YLE), PlanD

Mr Otto K.C. Chan - Senior Town Planner/Fanling,
Sheung Shui 1, PlanD

Mr Kevin C.P. Ng - Senior Town Planner/Fanling,
Sheung Shui 2, PlanD

FLN-9495, KTN-R9045 - Wong Lai Ming

Ms Wong Lai Ming - Representer

FLN-R9629, KTN-R9179 – 黃志凌

FLN-R9736, KTN-R9286 – 湯漢生

Ms Icy Ng (東北城規組)

- Representers' representative

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He said that the meeting would be conducted in accordance with the “Guidance Notes on Attending the Meeting for Consideration of the Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kwu Tung North (KTN) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KTN/1 and Draft Fanling North (FLN) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/FLN/1” (the Guidance Notes) which had been provided to all representers/commenters prior to the meeting. In particular, he highlighted the following main points:

- (a) in view of the large number of representations and comments received and more than 3,400 representers/commenters had indicated that they would either attend in person or send an authorised representative to make oral submission, it was necessary to limit the time for each oral submission;
- (b) each representer/commenter would be allotted a 10-minute speaking time. However, to provide flexibility to representers/commenters to suit their needs, there were arrangements to allow cumulative speaking time for authorised representatives, swapping of allotted time with other representers/commenters and requesting for extension of time for making the oral submission;
- (c) the oral submission should be confined to the grounds of representation/comment in the written representations/comments already submitted to the Town Planning Board (the Board) during the exhibition period of the respective Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) or the publication period of the representations; and
- (d) to ensure a smooth and efficient conduct of the meeting, the representer/commenter should not repeat unnecessarily long the same

points which had already been presented by others earlier at the same meeting. Representers/commenters should avoid reading out or repeating statements contained in the written representations/comments already submitted, as the written submissions had already been provided to Members for their consideration.

6. The Chairman said that each presentation, except with time extension allowed, should be within 10 minutes and there was a timer device to alert the representers and the representers' representatives 2 minutes before the allotted time was to expire and when the allotted time limit was up.

7. The Chairman said that the proceedings of the hearing would be broadcast on-line, and the video recording of the presentation made by the representative of PlanD on the first day of the Group 4 hearing (i.e. 13.10.2014) had been uploaded to the Board's website for the meeting and would not be repeated at the meeting. He would first invite the representers/representers' representatives to make their oral submissions, following the reference number of each representer who had registered with the Board's Secretariat on the day. After all registered attendees had completed their oral submissions, there would be a question and answer (Q&A) session during which Members could direct enquiries to any attendee(s) of the meeting.

FLN-R9495, KTN-R9045 - Wong Lai Ming

8. Ms Wong Lai Ming made the following main points:

- (a) she did not understand why it was stated in paragraph 5.2.2B(9) of the Paper that the agricultural policy was not related to the OZPs. The Board should explain which government department was responsible for agricultural development;
- (b) as the provision of land for agricultural development was an important component of town planning, PlanD and the Board should not claim that issues affecting agricultural development were not related to the OZPs.

Instead, PlanD and the Board should formulate better policies on land and planning, so that there would be room for a better agricultural policy;

- (c) about 30 to 40 years ago, the development of the agricultural sector was regarded as a strategy to maintain social stability. Even though a lot of agricultural land was resumed to facilitate commercial and industrial development, the remaining agricultural land was not subject to severe pollution at that time, and people of Hong Kong were generally proud of their achievements. In contrast, in today's Hong Kong, the economy was dominated by the real estate sector. There were no longer manufacturing industries, and pollution of agricultural land was one of the major problems affecting our food supply. We were now worse off than we were 30 to 40 years ago;
- (d) the Government's justifications for developing the North East New Territories New development Areas (NENT NDAs), such as the lack of developable land and the need to accommodate the increase in population, only promoted the outdated "value system of the Central District" (「中環價值」). It was difficult for Hong Kong people to accept that outdated value in the planning of NDAs. Tin Shui Wai and Tseung Kwan O were examples that bad planning had resulted in serious social problems. They were also proofs that that approach to the planning of a NDA was not viable;
- (e) when planning for NENT NDAs, the Government claimed that 60,000 housing units including 36,600 subsidised housing units and 23,300 private housing units for about 173,000 residents would help solve the housing problem. The Government had also used statistics of a similar nature to justify the development of new towns such as Tung Chung, Tseung Kwan O, and Tin Shui Wai where she had bought a private flat. It was clear that those new towns of "snail homes" (蝸居) – a term made popular by a TV series in the Mainland – would be replicated in the NENT NDAs. The Government was not realistic to claim that that

outdated approach to the planning of a NDA would be viable. The effectiveness of spending huge amount of public resources on developing those NDAs should be questioned;

- (f) instead of promoting agricultural rehabilitation, the Government should formulate an agricultural policy. The existing and proposed measures of the Government such as reservation of farmland, and certification, exhibition and sale of organic produce were not sufficient for the continued existence of the agricultural sector in Hong Kong. What the agricultural sector truly needed was an agricultural policy that could provide a sense of direction into the future;
- (g) the sincerity of the Government in supporting agricultural rehabilitation was doubtful. The Government had claimed that no one in Hong Kong was willing to be engaged in the agricultural sector. However, the truth was that the farmland had been gradually converted to other land uses, and there was not enough farmland for those people who wanted to farm. The Government should have taken a wider and longer perspective in formulating the agricultural policy;
- (h) even though the Government had not paid much emphasis to agricultural development in the past, it did not mean that it could not revise its policy and provide more support for the agricultural sector. Hong Kong had much to learn from Japan, South Korea and Singapore, not just in the creative and entertainment industries, but also in agricultural development. Japan and South Korea underwent rapid economic development in the mid-1950s to early 1970s and in the early 1960s to mid-1990s respectively. That had led to an outflow of investment and manpower from the agricultural sector to the manufacturing and service industries in the cities. Since then, both countries had put much more emphasis on their agricultural sector and had set targets on the self-sufficiency rates for their food supply. Singapore had also set a self-sufficiency rate of at least 10% for their supply of vegetables, and 2.1% of the total land area was set aside for agricultural development.

In comparison, the self-sufficiency rate for vegetables in Hong Kong was only 1.8%, and only 0.7% of the total land area was reserved for agricultural use. The agricultural policy of Hong Kong was out of place with the rest of the world. The Government should have conducted more research on agricultural policies of other countries;

(i) in July and August 2014, she and her friends had visited the wet markets all over Hong Kong to conduct a survey on the self-sufficiency of the local food supply. The people surveyed were generally frustrated that even though there was a shortage of local food supply, agricultural land was sold off for property development. A summary of the results of the survey was as follows:

- all the respondents considered that food safety was important;
- 90% of the respondents considered that the Government should set a self-sufficiency rate in food supply;
- 95% of the respondents considered that the existing agricultural land in NENT should be retained;
- all the respondents considered that agricultural rehabilitation in Hong Kong would improve their livelihood;
- regarding the importation of food from other countries, some respondents were concerned about safety of the food imported from the Mainland. They believed that the chemical fertilisers used in the Mainland had led to an increased incidence of cancer. Some other respondents were concerned about the high price of food imported from Europe or North America; and
- some respondents were of the view that, even though the majority of our food was imported, Hong Kong should still maintain its own self-sufficiency rate with regard to the food supply;

(j) based on the results of the survey, she had written an article which was recently published in the Hong Kong Economic Journal. She had also prepared some leaflets for Members' reference. She considered that the Government should also conduct a similar survey to gauge the views of

the public; and

- (k) to conclude, she considered that the development of the NENT NDAs would not solve the housing problem and the proposed agricultural rehabilitation would not solve the problems of food supply and food safety. Although an agricultural rehabilitation scheme had already been announced, many farmers insisted that there should be no removal and no clearance of their current homes. To the farmers, home was irreplaceable. It was insulting and hurtful to ask farmers to sacrifice their homes for the sake of development. When considering whether to build the NDAs, the Government should put itself in the shoes of the farmers and should not just look at the housing statistics alone.

[Actual speaking time : 17 minutes]

FLN-R9629, KTN-R9179 – 黃志凌

FLN-R9736, KTN-R9286 – 湯漢生

9. Ms Icy Ng made the following main points:

- (a) she was a member of 東北城規組 (the Group). Her views were from the perspective of a young Hong Kong person who was about to graduate from university;
- (b) the Chief Executive Mr CY Leung and the Secretary for Development Mr Paul Chan had both indicated that the NENT NDAs were needed so that young people might have a place to live in the future. However, the young people were not convinced that they could afford a private housing unit or could be eligible for a subsidised housing unit in the NDAs. It was unreasonable for the Government to ask the young people to support the NENT NDAs;
- (c) as many of the university graduates needed to repay their student loans, it was difficult for them to afford a flat in the private housing market.

The proposed private residential developments in the NDAs would not be able to meet the needs of the young people;

- (d) even though most of the sub-divided flats were in areas such as Mong Kok and Sham Shui Po where the living conditions were poor, they were still highly sought after by prospective tenants. That was because these sub-divided flats were relatively cheap, and they were close to areas where job opportunities could be found. Even though she was a resident of Sha Tau Kok, she would also like to live in the urban areas in future to save commuting time. The NENT NDAs were not attractive to people who would like to live in areas close to their workplaces. The NDAs would not be able to solve the housing problem in Hong Kong. It was doubtful whether the NDAs were intended to serve the people of Hong Kong;
- (e) she regularly took the East Rail from Sheung Shui or Fanling to Hung Hom and she noticed that the East Rail trains were very crowded. At one point at about 8 a.m., she had to wait until the ninth train before she could find a spot to stand in the first class compartment. The NENT NDAs would only bring more passengers to the East Rail and further worsen the situation. There was a need to rethink the NDA development;
- (f) she noted that the Northern Link was being planned to link up Kwu Tung Station of the East Rail with Kam Sheung Road Station of the West Rail. However, the proposed rail link would not be helpful as it was very unlikely that people living in NENT NDAs would make a detour, via the West Rail, to go to the urban areas;
- (g) she had got to know many Kwu Tong villagers in the past two years. Many villagers felt uncertain about their future. Their families had lived in the village for a few generations and they would not know whether they could survive in other places which were not their own. As their roots were in the village, it was improper for the Government to

relocate them to other places as if they were inanimate objects. The feelings of the villagers were no different from those arising from the loss of collective memory that had been experienced by many Hong Kong people in recent years. Their feelings were not difficult for the Government to understand;

- (h) furthermore, it would be difficult for many villagers to adapt to the urban way of life. To them, the village life was irreplaceable. If they were forced to live in the urban areas, they might not know how to live their lives any more. Government officials should visit the villages more often in order to understand the differences between the villages and the urban areas; and
- (i) she would also like to ask the Board a few questions on behalf of the Group. First, whether land resumption would be required for land zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) on the draft KTN OZP. Second, whether land resumption would be required for the Long Valley Nature Park (LVNP) and its nearby agricultural land. Third, the Group was supposed to make oral submission to the Board on behalf of about 200 representers on 17.12.2014. They should have a total speaking time of about 2,000 minutes. Every minute of the speaking time was important to them. However, it would not be practical for them to present continuously for 2,000 minutes in a single session. The Group would like to know the arrangement of the meeting so that they could plan ahead for their presentation.

[Actual speaking time: 14 minutes]

10. As the presentation from the representer/representaters’ representatives had been completed and no other representers had registered to present at the meeting, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

11. A Member asked whether Ms Wong Lai Ming had held any discussions with the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) concerning the

agricultural policy. In response, Ms Wong said that she was just an ordinary citizen and she had not had the opportunity to discuss with AFCD on the subject. Like Mapopo Community Farm, she was concerned not just about the production of organic food, but also the sustainability of each and every aspect of the agricultural cycle. However, AFCD might not be the appropriate government department to talk to, as it was not a policy bureau and therefore it might not be in charge of the formulation of the agricultural policy. The agricultural policy should not simply be about the organisation of agricultural exhibitions, the distribution of seeds to the public, or the promotion of hydroponic agriculture. Instead, it should be about issues of strategic importance. The agricultural policy should be initiated and formulated by the Government, as it was vested with the necessary powers to do so.

12. Referring to a previous question from Ms Icy Ng, a Member asked whether DPO could indicate on the OZPs which parts would be resumed and which parts would not. In response, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, said that land resumption in the two NDAs would only cover the areas zoned for development. Land would not be resumed for areas zoned “GB” or “Conservation Area”, which were intended to serve as buffers between the development areas and the rural areas. With an area of 37 ha, LVNP was intended to compensate for the loss of wetland due to the NDAs development and to conserve the farming practice there, which was closely related to the local ecology. As an area of high ecological value, Long Valley was one of the priority sites for enhanced conservation listed in the New Nature Conservation Policy in 2004. It was hoped that nature conservation of the ecologically important environment could be enhanced under systematic management and the practice of wet farming in wetland could be preserved. Therefore, all private land within the LVNP would be resumed for management under AFCD. In order to further enhance its agricultural and conservation value, green groups and local farmers would be invited to participate in the study process for the formulation of a detailed management plan.

13. Ms Chin further said that the two “AGR” zones to the north and south of LVNP, as well as 12 ha of “AGR” zone in Fu Tei Au in FLN would not be resumed. Unlike other new towns or NDAs, a total of about 95 ha of land in the two NDAs would be conserved for agricultural use. Having noted the public view on agriculture, “AGR” zones were designated in the two NDAs. Land falling within the “GB” zone, which included

feng shui woodland and natural habitats near Ho Sheung Heung, would not be resumed.

14. The Chairman said that there were similar questions on land resumption in previous sessions of the meeting and the government representatives had already provided replies on those questions. The relevant audio recordings had already been uploaded to the website of the Board. Ms Icy Ng was invited to check out the audio recordings and inform the Group accordingly. In general, land falling within the “GB” zones would not be resumed. As for LVNP, land resumption was required so as to preserve the existing agricultural practice which was beneficial to the local ecology. It should be noted that the proposal was supported by many green groups.

15. A Member asked whether agricultural rehabilitation could be carried out to bolster the agricultural sector and to help ensure the provision of local agricultural produce without affecting efforts to meet the needs of society for more housing and other facilities. Ms Wong Lai Ming said that just like one’s life partner, it was difficult to find a replacement of a person’s home. After Ma Shi Po was developed into a town centre with a school, what would be lost would not just be fresh agricultural produce, but also (a) a mechanism to reduce food waste and pollution; (b) job opportunities in transportation, logistics, food processing, catering and ecotourism; (c) an opportunity to promote creative industries which included the home-grown art and culture such as those showcased in Mapopo Community Farm and which could not be replicated by the Government; (d) a far more proper way to preserve biodiversity and to combat the impending food crisis, as compared with some politician’s suggestion to grow vegetables on top of landfills; and (e) an opportunity to facilitate the transition from traditional farming practices to sustainable agriculture. As the NDAs would only lead to the demise of local agriculture without resolving the housing problem, the proposed development would only lead to a lose-lose situation. The only people who would benefit from the NDAs would be developers. The proposed residential development should be located in the urban areas wherever possible, so that the existing agricultural land, which was considered a treasure, could be preserved. Some of the areas currently reserved for agriculture were located in the wilderness where the soil would take years of preparation before farming could take place. The \$120 billion to be used for the development of the NDAs was a large sum of money. The Government should consider withdrawing the NDA proposals or using only a fraction of that money and the land areas involved to resolve the housing problem.

16. In response to a question from Ms Icy Ng, the Secretary said that the Secretariat of the Board had been trying hard to find a contact person of the Group to discuss the arrangement for the session on 17.12.2014. If the oral submission of the Group could not be finished on 17.12.2014, the Board would arrange additional sessions for the Group to complete the oral submissions of their remaining authorizations. Ms Icy Ng was invited to provide the information of a contact person of the Group to facilitate future communication with the Secretariat of the Board.

17. Ms Icy Ng asked if the “GB” and “AGR” zones would not be resumed, whether there would be any policy or plan to manage the land under such zonings. In response, the Chairman said that the OZPs stipulated the types of land uses that were permissible on a piece of land. The Food and Health Bureau was the policy bureau responsible for agricultural policy.

18. As the representer/representers’ representative attending the session had completed their presentations and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman thanked the representer, the representers’ representative and PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

[Closed Meeting]

19. The Secretary said that the representative of the Real Estate Developers Association (REDA) (KTN-R9 and FLN-R9) made an oral submission in the first session of the Group 3 meeting on 8.10.2014. Subsequently, REDA’s representative submitted a letter to the Board providing supplementary information in support of REDA’s proposal to increase the number of housing units in the two NDAs by about 29,000 flats. The letter had been tabled at the meeting for Members’ information. The Board noted that such information had been included in REDA’s original representations.

20. The Secretary further said that since a large number of representers had authorized the Group to make oral submissions to the Board, the Board had previously agreed that representers other than those who had authorized the Group should be invited to speak first so that more time would be available for the Board to liaise with the Group

on the arrangement for its oral submission. For the above reason, the Group had been scheduled to present to the Board on 17.12.2014, which was the last scheduled session for the presentation of the representers. If more than one session was required for the oral submission of the Group, additional sessions could be arranged between 17.12.2014 and 19.1.2015 (i.e. before the first session of the oral submission of the commenters). Notwithstanding the difficulty in contacting the Group, the Secretariat would continue to try to liaise with the contact person of the Group.

21. The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.