

**Minutes of 1164th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 12.2.2018**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Franklin Yu

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr. C.F. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West)
Transport Department
Mr Patrick K.H. Ho (a.m. session)

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)
Transport Department
Mr Ricky W.K. Ho (p.m. session)

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor K.C. Chau

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

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

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms April K.Y. Kun (a.m.)
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr T.C. Cheng (a.m.)
Ms W.H. Ho (p.m.)

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Further Representations on Proposed Amendments to the Draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/33 Arising from Consideration of Representations and Comments made on the Draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/33
(TPB Paper No. 10389)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

1. The Secretary reported that on 22.9.2017, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to uphold/partially uphold some representations by reverting the zoning of a site at On Muk Street (the Site) previously proposed for public housing development by the Housing Department (HD) which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) from “Residential (Group A)6” (“R(A)6”) back to “Open Space” (“O”) on the draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/ST/33. The Chairman of the Building Committee of HKHA (F1) and two Members of HKHA (F2) had submitted further representations (FRs) on the proposed amendment. The following Members had declared interests on the item for being associated/having business dealings with HKHA and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup), the consultant for the proposed public housing development commissioned by HKHA, or affiliated with one of the representers/commenters, Mary Mulvihill (R207/C541), or owning properties or family member owning properties in Sha Tin :

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
(as Director of Planning) | - | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
(as Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department) | - | being an alternative member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA |
| Mr H.F. Leung | - | being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA |

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho]	having current business dealings with
Dr C.H. Hau]	HKHA
Mr Patrick H.T. Lau]	having current business dealings with
Ms Janice W.M. Lai]	HKHA and Arup
Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon	-	family member living in Sha Tin and his spouse being a civil servant of HD but not involved in planning work
Mr Ivan C.S. Fu	-	having current business dealings with Arup and past business dealings with HKHA
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu	-	having past business dealings with HKHA
Mr Franklin Yu	-	Having past business dealings with HKHA and Arup
Professor S.C. Wong	-	having current business dealings with Arup
Mr K.K. Cheung]	their firm having current business dealings
Mr Alex T.H. Lai]	with HKHA and Arup, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time
Professor K.C. Chau]	owning properties in Sha Tin
Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung]	
Ms Christina M. Lee	-	her spouse owning property in Tai Wai, Sha Tin

2. Members noted that Mr H.F. Leung, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Professor K.C.

Chau, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung, Mr K.K. Cheung, Ms Christina M. Lee, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Mr Raymond K.W. Lee had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The meeting agreed that the interests of other Members were indirect as they had no involvement in the project and they could stay in the meeting.

3. The Secretary also reported that the Society for Community Organisation (F3) had submitted a petition letter to the Board before the meeting. Representatives of that organisation would make oral submission during the meeting. A copy of the petition letter was tabled for Members' information.

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the further representers, representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the further representers, representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

5. The following government representatives, further representers, representers and commenters or their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point :

Government representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Jessica H.F. Chu - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin,
Tai Po & North (DPO/STN)

Mr Clement Miu - Town Planner/Shu Tin 3 (TP/ST3)

Further Representers, Representers/Commenters or their representatives

F1 – Professor Bernard Vincent Lim Wan-Fung (Chairman, Building Committee of
Hong Kong Housing Authority)

Professor Bernard Vincent Lim]	
Wan-Fung]	
Ms Teresa So Oi Tsz]	Further Representer's representatives
Mr Lionel Lau]	
Mr Leung Bing Man]	

F2 – Wan Man Yee & Lau Kwok Yu

Mr Wan Man Yee]	Further Representatives and Representatives'
Dr Lau Kwok Yu]	representative
Ms Lam Wai Hing]	

F3 – Society for Community Organisation

F91 – 周碧貞

F133 – 勞潔

F134 – 盧韻雯

F136 – 莫水連

F138 – 蒲雅絲

F139 – 蕭汝群

F148 – 鄧龍華

F153 – 曾月嬋

F154 – 王方菊

F155 – 王小兵

F159 – 黃果竹

F160 – 黃翠英

F167 – 余文靜

F169 – 余秀玉

F172 – 楊大光

F174 – 楊巧瑤

F175 – 阮華深

F176 – 葉振芳

F178 – 譚田香

Ms Lui Yi Shan Angela (Society for Community Organisation)]]	Further Representers' representatives
Ms Sze Lai Shan]	

F5 – 新移民互助會

F6 – Sze Lai Shan

Ms Sze Lai Shan (新移民互助會)	-	Further Representer and Further Representer's representative
--------------------------	---	---

F22 – 鄒七妹

F25 – 張月明

Mr Tsui Chi Ming 張月明女士	-	Further Representer and Further Representer's representative
---------------------------	---	---

F24 – 周嘉華

Mr Law Wai Ming	-	Further Representer's representative
-----------------	---	--------------------------------------

F28 – Guan Hong Bo

Ms Guan Hong Bo	-	Further Representer
-----------------	---	---------------------

F35 – 劉月嬌

Mr Chan Pak Yu	-	Further Representer's representative
----------------	---	--------------------------------------

F36 – Li Hui Juan

Ms Li Hui Juan	-	Further Representer
----------------	---	---------------------

F38 – 林淑嫻

Mr Lee Kin Fung	-	Further Representer's representative
-----------------	---	--------------------------------------

F39 – Luo Ai Qing

Ms Luo Ai Qing	-	Further Representer
----------------	---	---------------------

F46 – 梁麗

Mr Ken Fung Ka Chun - Further Representer's representative

F61 – 孫金梅

Ms Chen Dan Dan - Further Representer's representative

F62 – 黃明鳳

Mr Chen To To David - Further Representer's representative

F65 – Wong Kwai So

Ms Wong Kwai So - Further Representer

F85 – 陳媛

Ms Liu Mei Hong - Further Representer's representative

F100 – 符金嬋

Ms Ling Man Lee - Further Representer's representative

F105 – 何水金

Ms Huang Xi Juan - Further Representer's representative

F111 – 高新松

Ms Lam Wai Suen - Further Representer's representative

F113 – 江卓琰

Mr Lam Kai Yam - Further Representer's representative

F116 – 劉惠英

Ms Liu Wan Jin - Further Representer's representative

F131 – 連翠珍

Ms Chui Pui Yan - Further Representer's representative

F140 – Shu Gui Qing

Ms Shu Gui Qing - Further Representer

F165 – Wong Chak Ming

Mr Wong Chak Ming - Further Representer

R1 – Yung Ming Chau Michael (District Councillor)

R860 – 姚啟光

Mr Yung Ming Chau Michael - Representer and Representers' representative

R204 – Law Kwun Chung

Mr Law Kwun Chung - Representer

R207/C541 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer/Commenter

R750 – 麥列誠

R755 – Shek William

R1095 – 黎梓恩

Mr Shek William - Representer and Representers' representative

R749 – 陳清朗

R759 – 陳兆陽

Mr Chiu Pit Tat - Representers' representative

R765 – 陳嘯行

R852 – 撐場大聯盟-陳智聰

R859 – 張寶珠

R1090 – Iris Lee

Mr Chan Chi Chung (撐場大聯盟) - Representer and Representers' representative

R854 – 文振邦

R1013 – Kwan Siu Lun

R1667 – Lam Tsz Kwan

Ms Lam Tsz Kwan - Representor and Representors' representative

R1653 – 盧日高

Mr Wong Chun Pan - Representor's representative

C542 – Hong Kong Rugby Union

Mr Poon Fu Kit Benson] Commentor's representatives

Mr Chiu Kwok Kwong]

6. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the background to the FRs. The further representors, representors, commentors or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn. She reminded the attendees that their oral submissions should be confined to the proposed amendments to the OZP which were the subject of the hearing. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each further representor, representor, commentor or their representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending further representors, representors, commentors or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, further representors, representors, commentors or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, further representors, representors, commentors or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting, and the Board would deliberate on the FRs in their absence and inform the further representors, representors and commentors of the Board's decision in due course.

7. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the FRs.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN briefed Members on the FRs, including the background of the OZP, the proposed amendment to

meet/partially meet some of the representations, the grounds/views/proposals of the further representers, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the further representations as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10389.

9. The Chairperson then invited the further representers or their representatives to elaborate on the FRs.

F1 – Professor Bernard Vincent Lim Wan-Fung (Chairman, Building Committee of Hong Kong Housing Authority)

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Professor Bernard Vincent Lim Wan-Fung and Mr Lionel Lau made the following main points :

- (a) the Government had already carried out technical assessments for the rezoning of the On Muk Street site (the site) for a proposed subsidised sale flat (SSF) development to demonstrate its technical feasibility;
- (b) HKHA was deeply concerned about the implication of setting a precedent to revert the zoning of the site, which was suitable for housing development, from “R(A)6” back to “O”;

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) the proposed SSF project would provide about 560 flats for a population of about 1,670. It had already taken into consideration developments in the vicinity and would not have adverse traffic, visual and environmental impacts on the surrounding, nor adversely affecting the current and future operation of the adjacent Kitchee Football Centre (KC). The site was suitable for housing development as adequate infrastructure and supporting facilities were available, including those retail and community facilities to be provided at Shek Mun Estate Phase II development;
- (d) the consultant had confirmed that the noise impact generated from KC would be minimal as KC was mainly used for football training and

spectators' stand was not available, hence a large number of spectators was not expected. Public addressing system would not be used;

- (e) the floodlights at KC were pointing towards the football pitches, which were not reflective in nature. KC would only be partially visible to some proposed SSF flats as most of the flats would be within the 'T-shaped' block facing the Siu Lek Yuen Nullah, On Muk Street Garden and On Muk Street. As those flats facing KC would be about 55m away, the glare impact could be mitigated by the building design;
- (f) single-block SSF development was not uncommon in Hong Kong and there were examples of having residential developments next to football fields, sports grounds and playgrounds. In view of the scarce land resource and pressing housing demand in Hong Kong, suitable housing sites should be fully utilised regardless of their sizes;
- (g) HKHA would ensure that the design of the proposed SSF development at the site would be compatible with the sports activities at the adjacent KC;
- (h) as the site was already formed and immediately available for development, flats could be made available within a relatively short period to meet the short-term demand. As SSF units would be available to public rental housing (PRH) tenants, some PRH units could be released to those applicants on the waiting list; and
- (i) given that there would not be any adverse impacts on the surrounding area, it would be a waste of the scarce land resource if the site was left idle, pending the comprehensive development of the adjacent KC upon its relocation.

F2 – Wan Man Yee & Lau Kwok Yu

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wan Man Yee and Dr Lau Kwok Yu made the following main points :

- (a) a vast number of people in Hong Kong was living in sub-divided flats where safety and hygienic conditions were poor. The situation did not meet the objective of the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131) (the Ordinance) in promoting the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community and more should be done to solve the problem;
- (b) there were over 280,000 applicants waiting for public housing. In March 2014, initial offer could be made to those applicants within 3 years' time, but the waiting time had increased to an average of 4.7 years at the end of 2017;
- (c) according to the Census and Statistics Department, there were about 91,800 households (210,000 persons) living in sub-divided flats with a median flat size of 10m². Such a crowded living condition had grave impact on their daily lives and adversely affected the physical, psychological and emotional development of children;
- (d) according to the Annual Demographia International Housing Affordability Survey, Hong Kong was the worst affordability city in housing for a consecutive 8 years. It was a fact that the number of applicants for SSF would continue to increase and the chance of getting a SSF unit had decreased from about 14:1 in February 2016 to 151:1 in November 2017. The ratio was even worst for 'White Form' applicants at 283:1;
- (e) about 20% of public housing development completed by HKHA in the past 5 years were small scale development with 600 flats or less. In view of the pressing housing need, HKHA should develop all sites made available to them regardless of their sizes;
- (f) the Long Term Housing Strategy (LTHS) had set a target of developing a total of 280,000 PRH and SSF units in 10 years. By proportion, a total number of 196,000 units should be provided for the period from 2015/16 to 2021/22. However, only about 100,300 units were built/committed

and extra efforts should be made to make up the deficit in public housing supply;

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (g) although the site was small in size, its availability for housing development was important for making up the LTHS target. About 50% of the 560 flats to be provided at that site would be available to ‘Green Form’ Applicants, who would vacate their PRH units for people on the PRH waiting list;
- (h) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), a minimum standard of 2m² of district and local open space per person should be provided. As there was ample open space provision in Sha Tin and Ma On Shan at about 3.8m² per person, the site could be used for SSF development without any significant adverse impact on the open space provision; and
- (i) SSF development and the adjacent KC could co-exist, thereby meeting the housing need of Hong Kong while retaining the football field. The zoning should be reverted back to “R(A)6” for residential development to catch up with the public housing development programme.

F36 – Li Hui Juan

12. Ms Li Hui Juan made the following main points :

- (a) she strongly objected to giving up housing development at the site and zoning it to “O” for open space use as there was a pressing demand for housing in Hong Kong. Sha Tin was spacious and could provide more housing units at suitable location to solve the housing problem;
- (b) many low-income families were living in sub-divided flats and the living conditions in those flats were very poor. There was a long waiting list

for PRH and the current waiting period was way beyond the 3-year target. People in the waiting list would be willing to take up any flat that became available. Land should be developed for residential use wherever possible to shorten the waiting time for a PRH flat; and

- (c) she was a single-parent and most of her income was spent on accommodation. The living conditions of families like hers would be greatly improved if more public housing could be developed.

F140 – Shu Gui Qing

13. Ms Shu Gui Qing made the following main points :

- (a) she was a single-parent with two kids and her family lived in a small sub-divided flats with very poor hygienic conditions. Her income was mostly spent on accommodation. Her daughter had no friends and became depressed;
- (b) the Government had set a target waiting period of 3 years for PRH allocation. She had been waiting for a much longer period but had yet to receive an offer; and
- (c) the Government should understand the difficulties of the low-income group and build more public housing to improve their living condition. Priority should be given to SSF development at the site while open space could be provided elsewhere.

F3 – Society for Community Organisation

F133 – 勞潔

F136 – 莫水連

F139 – 蕭汝群

F153 – 曾月嬋

F155 – 王小兵

F91 – 周碧貞

F134 – 盧韻雯

F138 – 蒲雅絲

F148 – 鄧龍華

F154 – 王方菊

F159 – 黃果竹

F160 – 黃翠英

F169 – 余秀玉

F174 – 楊巧瑤

F176 – 葉振芳

F167 – 余文靜

F172 – 楊大光

F175 – 阮華深

F178 – 譚田香

14. Ms Lui Yi Shan, Angela made the following main points :

- (a) the Society for Community Organisation mainly provided services and assistance to families living in sub-divided flats in Sham Shui Po. They wanted the society to be aware of the poor living conditions in those flats;
- (b) the main cause of the housing problem was a shortage in land supply. The Government should make good use of those land that were readily available for development within a short period of time;
- (c) the LTHS had set a target of providing a total of 460,000 housing units in the next 10 years, amongst which, there should be 200,000 PRH units and 80,000 SSF units. However, the actual flat production was lagging behind and applicants for PRH flats would have to wait longer;
- (d) as shown in some photos in their submission, the living conditions in sub-divided flats were very poor. There were cases that a PRH flat was offered after the applicant had waited for more than 9 years. It meant that kids in those families had to spend the entire childhood in very poor living conditions, which was undesirable;
- (e) the waiting time for single-person applicants was also very long and they had to wait at the end of the queue again under a different category if their marital status changed during the waiting period. There was an acute shortage of public housing supply and suitable housing sites should not be given up, simply because of their small size;

- (f) although the site was for SSF development, some PRH flats might be released to those in the PRH waiting list if affordable SSF could be made available to the existing PRH tenants to move up the housing ladder; and
- (g) when considering the proposed SSF development at the site, it was not necessary to take the adjacent KC as a constraint. In view of the pressing housing need and that the site was suitable for residential development, it was undesirable to delay the proposed SSF development, pending the relocation of KC.

15. Ms Sze Lai Shan made the following main points :

- (a) the living conditions in sub-divided flats were extremely poor. The site which was originally identified for SSF development could provide housing units to improve the living conditions of some of those families. The decision to revert the site back to “O” for open space development was unwise and it had ignored the poor livelihood of those people living in sub-divided flats;
- (b) the photos in her submission showing the daily life of tenants were taken recently. Sub-divided flats were the result of an acute shortage of housing supply. Even though the rent was high, the occupancy rate for a bed-space with board partition was 100%. The low-income group could only apply for a PRH flat to improve their living condition. While about 2,200 single-person PRH units were available annually, there were more than 100,000 people on the waiting list;
- (c) for most people at the grass-root level, a large proportion of their income was spent on accommodation and they had little to live on. Living in such a poor condition would generate social, health and psychological problems and the social cost would be high to deal with those problems; and

- (d) any delay in housing development would affect the well-being of the grass-root level and their housing rights. A balance should be struck between housing development and sports facilities and the consideration should be people-oriented.

F22 – 鄒七妹

F25 – 張月明

16. Mr Tsui Chi Ming made the following main points :

- (a) he and his family were living in a roof-top sub-divided flat of about 100ft². He had been waiting for a single-person PRH flat for 10 years, and had to wait for several years further after his wife and daughters re-united with him. It was very difficult and inconvenient for him, as in the case of many other families, to live in such a crowded condition; and
- (b) land in Sha Tin should be used for residential development, rather than for open space development. Many low-income families were desperate for a PRH flat to improve their living conditions. It was more important to meet the housing demand of those families than providing an open space or a football pitch.

F24 – 周嘉華

17. Mr Law Wai Ming made the following main points :

- (a) he lived in a bed-space within a sub-divided flat. People living in adjacent bed-spaces had an aggressive attitude and would fight over small issues. Some bed-space tenants were drug addicts and there was a high risk of fire if they fell asleep while smoking or taking drugs in the sub-divided flat; and

- (b) he was living in constant fear in such a condition and hoped that the Government would take care of the low-income group by building more public housing to improve their living condition.

F28 – Guan Hong Bo

18. Ms Guan Hong Bo made the following main points :

- (a) it was important to resolve the housing problem in Hong Kong and to provide public housing for the low-income families. Suitable housing site should be fully utilised;
- (b) she was a single-parent with 3 kids and she had been waiting for a PRH flat for many years. While it was important to develop sports and recreational facilities, it was equally important to provide public housing for the low-income families. Without a proper living place, it would not be possible to lead a healthy life; and
- (c) the need for housing and open space development should be balanced. Professor Lim (F1) and some further representers had already spoken on how the noise and glare nuisance from the adjacent KC could be mitigated. Their proposal should be adopted so that more SSF could be provided.

F38 – 林淑嫻

19. Mr Lee Kin Fung made the following main points :

- (a) he lived with his mother in a sub-divided flat in Sham Shui Po. The living condition was poor but they could not afford a better flat. With limited income, they needed a PRH flat to improve their living; and
- (b) as public housing developments were often opposed to, they would have to wait longer for a PRH flat. The proposed SSF development at the site would provide affordable housing for many families and in turn could

release some PRH flats for others. The proposed SSF development should be supported while alternative sites for open space/football pitch should be identified.

F35 – 劉月嬌

20. Mr Chan Pak Yu made the following main points :

- (a) the site should be used for public housing development; and
- (b) he lived with his parents in a flat in Sham Shui Po and the rent was high. As his father fell ill and could not work, there was less income for them and a cheaper flat was needed. The Government should build more public housing for the poor.

F39 – Luo Ai Qing

21. Ms Luo Ai Qing made the following main points :

- (a) she was a single parent living with his son and could only afford to live in a sub-divided flat of less than 100ft²;
- (b) the sub-divided flat was not big enough for them. They also suffered from hygienic problem as used adult diapers were thrown down from flats on upper floors and landed on the podium outside their flat. The poor living conditions had adversely affected the sleeping quality of her son and hence his study at school; and
- (c) the Government should build more public housing to improve the living conditions of those low-income families.

F5 – 新移民互助會

F6 – Sze Lai Shan

22. Ms Sze Lai Shan made the following main points :
- (a) a balanced approach should be adopted between public housing and football development. Considering the poor living conditions of those living in sub-divided flats and the acute housing shortage, the site should be developed for residential use as it would not affect the football activities at KC;
 - (b) new immigrants were often blamed for creating additional housing demand. In fact, most of them came to Hong Kong for family reunion. While the addition of new immigrant in the family might require a bigger unit, there would not be any significant increase in the overall housing demand; and
 - (c) the housing price and rent in Hong Kong were beyond the reach of many families, especially those in the low-income group. Many were living in sub-divided flats or bed-spaces with extremely poor living conditions. More public housing was needed to shorten the waiting time for a PRH flat. It was not humane to unnecessarily prolong the waiting time for a PRH flat by not developing the site;

F61 – 孫金梅

F62 – 黃明鳳

23. Ms Chen Dan Dan and Mr Chen To To, David made the following main points :
- (a) they were from a single-parent family living in a sub-divided flat of less than 50ft² in size. It was a shock that while the Government had difficulties in identifying suitable housing site, a site originally planned and found feasible for residential use was given up for open space development;
 - (b) it was unreasonable to ignore the housing need of 210,000 people living in sub-divided flats for the promotion of football; and

- (c) it was a minimal requirement that people should live in a decent flat. Public housing development providing shelter for those living in sub-divided flats was more important than developing a football field. More PRH flats were needed.

F65 – Wong Kwai So

24. Ms Wong Kwai So made the following main points :

- (a) she strongly objected to the Board's decision made on 22.9.2017 to revert the zoning of the site from "R(A)6" back to "O". The site should be used for public housing development;
- (b) in considering the zoning for the site, the acute housing demand in Hong Kong, in particular, the housing need of the grass-root level and shortage of land supply should be taken into account. The decision to rezone the site for open space development was unwise and against the wishes of the grass-root level; and
- (c) there was ample open space in Sha Tin and rezoning the site for open space development should not be a priority over housing development. While the long-term use of the adjacent KC site was yet to be determined, the site could be developed for residential use as phase one development. The Government should consider the grass-root people's right for a decent home.

F85 – 陳媛

25. Ms Liu Mei Hong made the following main points :

- (a) the Government should build more public housing for the low-income group as they were in need of PRH flat to improve their living condition;

- (b) she and her family were sharing a flat with others. As the flat was small in size, sharing the flat was inconvenient for both parties and there were occasional arguments;
- (c) their rented flat was sold recently and she feared that the new owner might vacate them. As her husband's income was unstable, they had nowhere to stay if they were evicted; and
- (d) her family had been waiting for a PRH flat for more than 5 years. The Government should not waste the land resource for open space development.

F105 – 何水金

26. Ms Huang Xi Juan made the following main points :

- (a) she and her family lived in a sub-divided flat. The rent was high but the living conditions were poor. Her husband's income was unstable and most of the income was spent on accommodation. They were in need of a PRH flat and had been waiting for a PRH flat for more than 5 years; and
- (b) she was surprised to learn that there were 210,000 people living in sub-divided flats. While acknowledging that there were difficulties in identifying housing sites, suitable housing site should not be given up for open space development as it would be unfair to those people on the waiting list for PRH flats.

F111 – 高新松

27. Ms Lam Wai Suen made the following main points :

- (a) the site should be used for public housing development;

- (b) she lived with her parents in Sham Shui Po and the rent was very high and they needed a PRH flat with lower rent to improve their living conditions; and
- (c) it was more important to provide housing for the low-income group than providing open space. The Government should consider carefully the relative importance between housing and open space development. More public housing was required.

F113 – 江卓瑛

28. Mr Lam Kai Yam made the following main points :

- (a) the site should be used for public housing development;
- (b) he lived with his parents in Sham Shui Po and the rent was very high and they needed a PRH flat with lower rent; and
- (c) while it was good to provide open space, it was more important to provide housing for people in need. As a lot of people were living in sub-standard accommodation, the Government should build more public housing for them.

F116 – 劉惠英

29. Ms Liu Wan Jin made the following main points :

- (a) she had been in Hong Kong for eight years and was now living with her son in a sub-divided flat. During the past eight years, she had moved seven times because of rent increase;
- (b) the hygienic condition of the sub-divided flat was poor and used diaper were thrown down onto the podium from upper floors. As the living

conditions were poor, she fell ill and her son had become temperamental;
and

- (c) more public housing was needed for the poor.

F131 – 連翠珍

30. Ms Chui Pui Yan made the following main points :

- (a) the living conditions of sub-divided flats were poor. However, the conditions of partitioned units or bed-space dwellers were even worse. There was no window for air ventilation and they had to face fire safety and security problems;
- (b) the site was zoned “O” since the era of Urban Council, but the open space was never developed. While noting some residents’ aspiration for more open space, there was no pressing need for open space as there was other public parks such as On King Street Park in Sha Tin. However, there was pressing housing need for the low-income families;
- (c) the site was formed, served by infrastructure and located near Shek Mun Station. As suitable housing sites that could be readily developed in the short to medium term were scarce, the site should be developed for SSF. About 560 flats could be available in a few years’ time to improve the living conditions of many families; and
- (d) providing public housing was an important means in resolving poverty problem. There was a case that an applicant had waited for more than 7 years for a PRH flat. During the long wait, the number of members in that family grew while the living area was reduced due to increasing rent. The site was important to people in providing a solution to improve their living condition.

F165 – Wong Chak Ming

31. Mr Wong Chak Ming made the following main points :

- (a) he came from a single-parent family and his mother worked part-time with low-income. They lived in a sub-divided flat and had to share a kitchen and a bathroom with others, which was very inconvenient;
- (b) it was not reasonable to rezone the site, which was originally planned for SSF development, to open space as there was ample open space in Sha Tin. The housing need of 560 families was sacrificed; and
- (c) the site should be reverted back to “R(A)6” for public housing development.

32. The Chairperson said that the further representers or their representatives attending the meeting had made their presentation. She then invited the original representers and commenters to make their presentation. She appealed to the representers/commenters to keep their presentations concise and not repetitive so that the presentation and question session could be completed before lunch.

[Mr Franklin Yu left the meeting at this point.]

R765 – 陳嘯行

R852 – 撐場大聯盟-陳智聰

R859 – 張寶珠

R1090 – Iris Lee

33. Mr Chan Chi Chung made the following main points :

- (a) the Board’s previous decision made on 22.9.2017 to revert the zoning of the site from “R(A)6” to “O” had already taken a people-oriented approach and was considered appropriate;

- (b) it was recognized that there was a pressing housing demand in Hong Kong, especially for the grass-root level and the Government should proactively identify suitable sites for housing development. However, the 560 flats to be provided at the site was insignificant and could easily be absorbed in developments at other sites;
- (c) the On Muk Street site was not suitable for residential development from traffic and environmental points of view. If the adverse impacts were ignored and the site was developed for residential use, the future residents at the site would suffer; and
- (d) there were other alternatives for housing development and the site was not the only choice.

R204 – Law Kwun Chung

34. Mr Law Kwun Chung made the following main points :

- (a) sports provision and housing need for the grass-root level should not be placed on an opposing position to each other;
- (b) to resolve the housing problem for the low-income group, the public/private housing mix should be set for 70:30 or even 80:20. The low rental rates of public housing estates should be maintained upon their redevelopment;
- (c) apart from the high rental rate for sub-divided flats, unreasonably high electricity and water rates were often charged by landlords. Consideration should be given to imposing rent control and relevant charges should also be monitored;
- (d) providing sports facilities for the low-income group was just as important as meeting their housing needs. Sports activities such as football was

beneficial to the children both physically and mentally, and could help those participants to cope with their stress;

(e) the proposed single-block SSF development at the On Muk Street site would be subject to noise nuisance and glare problem from the adjacent KC. There was a general perception that the proposed SSF development at the site would eventually lead to the eviction of KC. As KC had been providing football training at that location, the site should be retained for open space use; and

(f) instead of providing 560 SSF units at the site or a total of 2,000 units if the adjacent KC site was developed together, alternatives such as redeveloping the 170 ha Fanling Golf Course for residential use should be explored. The golf course was serving only about 2,600 golf club members but could provide at least 46,000 units if it was redeveloped for residential use. Far more number of families could benefit in that case than developing the On Muk Street site.

R1 – Yung Ming Chau Michael (District Councillor)

R860 – 姚啟光

35. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and video clips, Mr Yung Ming Chau, Michael made the following main points :

(a) he was a Sha Tin District Council (STDC) member and the Vice-chairman of the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) of STDC. While noting the housing need of the grass-root level, STDC had raised concerns on further residential developments in Sha Tin without correspondingly improving the road/transport network and the provision of government, institution or community (GIC) and sports facilities. Sha Tin had the highest number of population amongst the district council areas. It would be unfair to the existing residents if additional population was introduced to Sha Tin but the provision of various facilities could not match the population increase;

- (b) the Development and Housing Committee of STDC had previously passed two motions unanimously to urge the Government to review the overall planning of Sha Tin, to retain the open space on both sides of Shing Mun River, to consider the transformation of Shek Mun into a business area, to avoid in-fill residential development, and not to plan for further residential development in Sha Tin prior to the improvement of road/transport network and provision of more GIC and sports facilities;
- (c) according to the information submitted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) to TTC of STDC in January 2017, the 2016 morning peak hour traffic flow in Sha Tin was near saturation. As seen from a video clip extracted from You Tube, traffic was heavy at A Kung Kok Street towards Tate's Cairn Highway and traffic congestion was observed at the roundabout near On Muk Street. The road condition could not cope with further residential development at On Muk Street;
- (d) there were already other PRH and SSF developments in Tai Po and Ma On Shan, e.g. the SSF development along Ma On Shan Bypass near Tai Shui Hang. STDC was very considerate indeed for not raising any objection to those developments, even though the road infrastructure had not been improved. The overall increase in the number of units in those developments would be more than enough to offset the 560 SSF units to be provided at the On Muk Street site. Although there was a genuine housing need for the grass-root level, the site was not suitable for housing development in view that the site was near an industrial area and On Muk Street was congested due to illegal parking;
- (e) there were three single-block SSF developments in Sha Tin in Areas 4C, 4D and 31 near Mei Tin Estate, Mei Lam Estate and Hin Keng Estate respectively. In-fill, single-block development was piecemeal, lacking facilities and had no synergy effect. The management and maintenance fees would also be very high; and

- (f) HKHA's proposal at the site was simply aiming at meeting the flat production target without considering the provision of other supporting facilities. The Board's previous decision to revert the zoning of the site to "O" had comprehensively taken into account other considerations such as traffic, noise and glare impact, and GIC provision. Open space was planned on the waterfront of Shing Mun River as a buffer to development. There was no rush in developing the site and the future use of the site and its adjacent KC site should be considered in a comprehensive manner.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left the meeting at this point.]

R1653 – 盧日高

36. Mr Wong Chun Pan made the following main points :

- (a) he objected to the proposed rezoning of the site to "R(A)6" and considered that the Government was just trying to meet the flat production target without a long-term plan for the area. There was no consideration of the impact of the additional population on the area nor any assessment on the development capacity of the area;
- (b) Sha Tin had a population of about 700,000 and was the highest amongst various districts. The additional population generated from the proposed SSF development at On Muk Street, Shui Chuen O Estate and residential development above Tai Wai Station would have significant impact on the transportation system. The Ma On Shan Rail was already over-crowded and it was already difficult to board a train at Shek Mun Station and City One Station. An increase in population would mean that the existing facilities would be further stretched to their limits. The welfare of the existing residents should be considered;
- (c) the site was adjacent to the congested Shek Mun industrial area with lots of illegal kerbside parking. The site was small in size and was more suitable for a civic centre. There was inadequate open space and indoor

games hall in Sha Tin and it was worried that KC would be evicted because of its noise and glare nuisance on the future residents if SSF was developed at the site. Local residents' request for a quality living environment should be taken seriously by avoiding rezoning "O" for residential development;

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok left the meeting at this point.]

- (d) Sha Tin needed more school for the additional population. There was no youth centre to provide services to the youth. There was no market at Mei Tin Estate and the transport facilities at Shui Chuen O Estate were poor. More residential development would bring additional population to Sha Tin and the quality of living of residents would become worse, which was not in line with the planning vision for a livable city; and
- (e) KC was important to Sha Tin as it worked with some secondary schools and the Chinese University of Hong Kong in football training programmes. KC was well equipped and Sha Tin needed more such facilities as KC to foster a sense of belonging.

R854 – 文振邦

R1013 – Kwan Siu Lun

R1667 – Lam Tsz Kwan

37. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lam Tsz Kwan made the following main points :

- (a) allocation of land for private or public residential development was beyond the control of HKHA. In the past, many GIC or public housing sites had eventually been developed for private residential use upon redevelopment. The crux of the problem was the land resource allocation;

- (b) she agreed with the approach in adjusting the public/private housing mix ratio and the development intensity of some new development areas. Consideration could also be made to incorporating public housing or SSF development in new development above railway stations or depots such as the Kam Sheung Road Station and the Pat Heung Depot. Consideration should also be made to slightly increasing the overall plot ratio of development above the Pat Heung Depot for incorporation of some SSF. It would be more desirable to concentrate development in developed areas than spreading the development towards “Green Belt” zones and country parks;
- (c) about 108 blocks of private residential buildings were planned at the Siu Ho Wan Depot site. As the flat production target for private residential development had already been met, opportunities should be made in designating that site for public housing or SSF development. The On Muk Street site was small and the number of SSF units to be provided could easily be compensated; and
- (d) there was no supporting facilities in the vicinity of the site and the small scale SSF development could not generate adequate population to support retail shops and restaurants. Developing a single-block SSF building without supporting facilities at that site would create problems for the future residents living there.

R749 – 陳清朗

R759 – 陳兆陽

38. Mr Chiu Pit Tat made the following main points :

- (a) Sha Tin had the highest population amongst the 18 district council areas and the population density at 9,600/km² was higher than the average population density of Hong Kong. People living in Sha Tin would feel the pressure as the shopping centres and restaurants were crowded and it was getting more difficult in catching public transport to go to work.

The quality of living of the existing residents would be adversely affected, and those additional population would also suffer; and

- (b) although the Government should build more PRH and SSF to improve the living conditions of those in need, there should be a long-term strategy to solve the housing problem instead of just going for piecemeal in-fill development which was undesirable and problematic as there were insufficient supporting facilities. Instead of developing the site, the Government should have long-term planning to identify larger sites for development.

R750 – 麥列誠

R755 – Shek William

R1095 – 黎梓恩

39. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Shek William made the following main points :

- (a) living in a small sub-divided flat was very stressful. Although he wanted to have his own flat, he objected to the proposed SSF development as the project was problematic;
- (b) the management fee of a single-block SSF development such as Mei Pak Court in Tai Wai at about \$1,349 for a 447ft² flat was high, which was equivalent to the monthly rent of a PRH flat. It surpassed that of some private residential developments near Shek Mun and would be a burden for the future residents;
- (c) there would be glare problem at the site from the adjacent KC as light would be reflected from the football fields. The site was isolated as it was bounded by the Shek Mun industrial area, open space and the river channel. Future SSF residents returning home at night would have security problem;

- (d) the area was congested with heavy traffic serving the industrial area, and the nearby streets were illegally parked with heavy goods vehicles. There was no corresponding improvement to the road network and infrastructure facilities in Shek Mun to match with the new developments in the area;
- (e) the proposed isolated single-block SSF development near the river front would have adverse visual impact on the surrounding area. It was taller than the adjacent Evergain Building and was not in line with the stepped building height profile of Shek Mun Estate Phase II nearby. The T-shaped building block design would also have adverse impact on the air ventilation inland;
- (f) the population in Sha Tin was the highest amongst the 18 district council areas. Currently, there were six on-going PRH/SSF developments in Sha Tin while several PRH developments had been committed. Together with other private residential developments, there would be an addition of about 21,700 flats in Sha Tin. New developments should be directed to other new towns including Tsuen Wan, Tuen Mun and Yuen Long;

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang left the meeting at this point.]

- (g) with a population of about 650,000 in Sha Tin, the planned local open space could only meet the requirement of the existing population in Sha Tin. He doubted the argument that there was surplus open space in Sha Tin. The open space at the site should not be given up for SSF development;
- (h) according to information presented to the Legislative Council on the traffic flow in various road tunnels, the tunnels connecting Sha Tin and the urban area were operating beyond or near their capacities. Sha Tin could not cope with the additional traffic generated from new developments; and

- (i) PlanD had identified 210 pieces of land with potential for residential development, amounting to about 237,000 flats in the 10-year period from 2018/19 to 2027/28. The 560 flats to be provided at the site was insignificant. The traffic and environmental impacts and other possible problems of developing the site should be considered altogether instead of focusing only on meeting the flat production target.

40. With the consent from the Chairperson, Mr Chan Chi Chung (R852) read out the submission of Hon Alvin Yeung, Legislative Council member who represented Mr Justin Chin (R1599) and the main points were :

- (a) he objected to the rezoning of the On Muk Street site from “O” to “R(A)6”;
- (b) according to the 2016 by-census, the population of Sha Tin was about 659,000, the highest amongst the district council areas. Further development in Sha Tin without first addressing the traffic issue and inadequate provision of community facilities would create irreversible problems, which would be a burden to the society; and
- (c) instead of making the grass-root level and the youth competing for the site, the Government should give priority to developing the brownfield sites in the territory to resolve the housing shortage problem. In that respect, the Government should commit a strategy to expedite the development of brownfield sites, compile and make available a database on all brownfield sites in Hong Kong.

41. Mr Chan Chi Chung (R852) then showed some pictures of the glare effect of KC, traffic congestion and illegal parking at On Muk Street and made the following main points :

- (a) he was not against the provision of SSF development to meet the housing demand. However, the site was not suitable for residential development because of traffic congestion and illegal parking at On Muk Street, glare and noise nuisance from the adjacent KC and lack of supporting facilities

such as market. It would be unfair to the future residents if they had to suffer from these problems unnecessarily;

- (b) apart from housing, the grass-root level also required recreational facilities for their physical and mental well-being. KC had provided such a facility for them. KC also provided football training for secondary school students; and
- (c) Sha Tin had already contributed towards the provision of public and private residential developments. The population capacity of Sha Tin should be considered. Alternatives such as developing brownfield sites and the Fanling Golf Course, or reclamation at Ma Liu Shui that could provide significantly more residential units should be considered.

R207/C541 – Mary Mulvihill

42. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points :

- (a) people who moved to live in Sha Tin had an aspiration for a better living quality in a new town in terms of better air quality and more sports and recreational facilities. The site was originally zoned “O” for providing a continuous open space alongside the riverbank, which was a unique character of Sha Tin. It should not be mistaken that a housing site was taken away for open space development;
- (b) the open space provision set in HKPSG was a minimum requirement. It was unreasonable that the minimum standard was used as an excuse for grabbing the site for residential development. While there was an increase in population in Sha Tin, the rezoning of the site from “O” to “R(A)6” would result in a decrease in open space provision;
- (c) the proposed single-block SSF development would have adverse implications on the public’s aspiration for better living quality and keeping the riverside open space intact;

- (d) there was inadequate action taken against the illegal parking problem. The Government had not addressed the pressure of the daily intake of 150 new immigrants on housing requirement. It refused to tackle the housing problem by resolving issues regarding brownfield sites, the land bank held by private developers and the Small House Policy;
- (e) it was reported in a newspaper that the Mass Transit Railway Corporation had adjusted the tendering process for the development of the Wong Chuk Hang site to avoid a glut. There was no reason why that site could not be taken back for public housing development;
- (f) the Board had made the right decision in reverting the zoning of the site back to “O” as an isolated single-block SSF development along a continuous open space would be undesirable from landuse planning point of view, not cost-effective and not in-keeping with the surrounding area. While public housing development was important to meet the housing need of the society, it should not be an over-riding consideration irrespective of the specific circumstances of the site;
- (g) while a balance should be struck between public housing and open space development, there was also a need to strike a balance between land disposed of for private residential development and public housing development; and
- (h) as the future residents would be subject to glare and noise nuisance, the adjacent KC would eventually be driven out of the area. As a lot of sites zoned “O” were not implemented, consideration should be given to swapping the site with other sites zoned “O” for the proposed SSF development.

C542 – Hong Kong Rugby Union

43. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Poon Fu Kit, Benson made the following main points :

- (a) the Hong Kong Rugby Union (HKRU) supported the rezoning of the site to “O” and considered that the Board’s decision on 22.9.2017 was correct and rational by not agreeing to the piecemeal rezoning of the site for residential development;
- (b) more sites for sports and recreation for the public were needed in Sha Tin. While the Leisure and Cultural Services Department had no programme of developing the site, HKRU could contribute to developing the site for rugby use if the site was offered to them. The Tin Shui Wai rugby pitch was developed under a short-term tenancy (STT) and had produced a player to join the Hong Kong National Sevens Team;
- (c) KC was the main occupier of the “O” zone covering the riverfront in Shek Mun and it shared its facilities with other organisations including HKRU. If the site was developed for SSF, the adjacent KC would be under threat of relocation;
- (d) there was a significant increase in the number of rugby teams as well as the number of female players since 2010. However, there was an under-supply of sports facilities and the demand for sports sessions could not be met by the existing facilities. The demand for community games was expected to grow by 53% by 2025 and there would be an even greater shortfall in provision of sports facilities;
- (e) while there was an overall housing demand in Hong Kong on a territory-wide basis, housing development at the site was not suitable in the local context;

- (f) the Government was promoting sports development and the rezoning of the site for residential use would remove the opportunity to meet the growing community expectation for an open space;
- (g) the rezoning of the site for residential development was piecemeal and the proposed SSF development would not provide a quality living environment for its future residents. The number of 560 SSF flats to be provided was not significant and could be accommodated at other housing sites. To take away the site for residential development would have negative impact on youth development; and
- (h) there was inadequate sports facilities in Sha Tin. The site should be kept for developing a permanent open space, or be offered to KC or other national sports associations for sports use.

44. Mr Chiu Kwok Kwong, the Head of the External Affairs of HKRU, added that while there was a pressing demand for housing, the growth of the youth generation was just as important. HKRU hoped to encourage the youth to communicate with the outside world through sports activities. HKRU considered that the site should be retained for open space use.

[Dr Lawrence S.K. Li arrived to join the meeting during the Q&A session.]

Question and Answer Session

45. The Chairperson said that the presentations from the further representers, representers, commenters and their representatives were completed and Members would be invited to ask questions on the presentations. She further explained that the Q&A session was for Members to direct their questions to the government representatives, further representers, representers, commenters or their representatives, but it was not meant to be an occasion for attendees to debate amongst themselves. She then invited questions from Members. The Chairperson and some Members had the following questions :

- (a) whether KC had indicated any future plan on its operation, and whether the reprovisioning of KC was still on-going;
- (b) in the event that a reprovisioning site for KC was available, whether the existing KC site would be rezoned for development;
- (c) whether the site formed part of the site currently used by KC and whether the operation of KC would be affected by the rezoning of the site to “R(A)6” for the proposed SSF development;
- (d) the operation hours of KC and whether the SSF development would be affected by the noise impact and glare from KC;
- (e) whether the site was suitable for SSF development in view of the comments regarding the lack of supporting facilities in the area, traffic congestion and fire safety issues, i.e. the site would not be accessible to fire engines due to illegal parking blocking the access, as claimed by some representers;
- (f) whether the traffic congestion problem in Sha Tin was a territory-wide problem, with traffic tailing back from the Lion Rock Tunnel along Tolo Highway;
- (g) whether the area adjacent to the On Muk Street site was a business area;
- (h) as some representers considered that the site was not conducive to residential development, whether the proposed SSF development in such an environment would be welcomed by the grass-root community; and
- (i) the development programme of proposed SSF at the site and whether measures would be incorporated in the design to minimise the impact on the adjacent KC site.

46. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN made the following points :

- (a) STDC was consulted in 2014 on a proposal involving the development of the site and the adjacent KC site for public housing development. However, the proposal was revised to include only the SSF development at the site while allowing KC to continue its operation in the adjacent site under a STT until a decision on KC's re-provisioning was made. The proposed SSF development at the site would not be conditional upon the redevelopment of the KC site;
- (b) KC had submitted a letter to PlanD on 24.1.2018 to express its wish to extend its facilities to the site and requested consideration of the further representations by the Board be deferred. However, as the plan-making process was subject to the provisions of the Ordinance, KC's request could not be acceded to;
- (c) to cater for the need for sports facilities, the Home Affairs Bureau had recently provided policy support for the development of a permanent football centre. A site search exercise was being conducted to identify a suitable site for permanent relocation of KC. There was no plan to rezone the KC site pending the identification of a permanent relocation site and the drawing up of relocation arrangements;
- (d) the KC site was currently zoned "O". In the event that KC was relocated, the future use of the released site could be subject to further consideration by the Board;
- (e) the site did not form part of the site occupied by KC and its development would not affect the operation of KC. It had been demonstrated that the proposed SSF development and the football field at KC could co-exist without any technical problem;
- (f) Shek Mun to the northeast of the site was zoned "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Business". While there were godowns and logistics operation in the vicinity of the site, the area was being transformed into a

business area with new commercial buildings and shopping malls, including a data centre of a bank;

- (g) there were a hotel and a supermarket in the vicinity of the site. In addition, adequate recreational and community facilities would be provided in Shek Mun Estate Phase II, which would be about 350m away from the site. Future SSF residents could easily reach those facilities at Shek Mun Estate Phase II across the road. The facilities to be provided would include children playgrounds, badminton courts, basketball courts, some retail floorspaces with wet market stalls, a nursery/kindergarten, a social security field unit, a residential care home for the elderly cum day care unit, a supported hostel for mentally handicapped persons and a child care centre;
- (h) traffic congestion was a territory-wide problem during peak hours. However, the traffic impact assessment (TIA) submitted by HD had demonstrated that there was no adverse traffic impact from the proposed SSF development and the Transport Department had no adverse comment on the TIA. As the site was located within 250m from a MTR station, residential development was a suitable use;
- (i) whether enforcement action should be stepped up against the illegal parking along On Muk Street and whether the illegal parking would block the access for fire engines would be considered by relevant departments; and
- (j) KC operated from 8:30am till 11:00pm everyday and football training was organised in sessions. As explained by HKHA (F1), the disposition and set back of the proposed SSF development would help mitigate the noise impact and glare from KC.

47. Regarding the development programme and the design of the proposed SSF, Mr Lionel Lau, representative of F1, replied that if the Board agreed to rezone the site to “R(A)6” and that the plan-making process could be completed in June 2018, construction works could

commence in the 3rd or 4th quarter of 2018 for completion by May 2022. The design of the proposed SSF would take into consideration the operation of the adjacent KC and would incorporate mitigation measures to minimise the impact on KC during construction.

48. Regarding whether the living environment of the proposed SSF development at On Muk Street would be acceptable to the grass-root community, Ms Huang Xi Juan, the representative of F105 responded that she would be pleased to be able to live in the area. Her relative had moved to Shui Chuen O Estate recently and was very happy about the living environment. While some representers considered that Sha Tin was already densely populated and additional residential development should not be allowed, the living conditions of those people in sub-divided flats in Sham Shui Po were far worse. They deserved a better living environment.

49. In response to a Member's question on the plan making process, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN said that the site was originally zoned "O" on the OZP. On 13.1.2017, the OZP was gazetted under section 5 of the Ordinance. After considering representations and comments on the OZP, the Board agreed on 22.9.2017 to revert the zoning of the site from "R(A)6" back to "O". The proposed amendment was notified in the gazette according to the provisions of the Ordinance and a total of 186 FRs were received. The current hearing session was to consider those FRs before the Board would make a decision on the zoning of the site. The Chairperson added that the Board's decision on the zoning of the site after considering the FRs was the final step and the OZP would then be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council for approval in due course.

50. Noting that some further representers had mentioned their difficulties and the extremely poor living conditions of sub-divided flats, a Member asked whether those who had raised concerns on the incompatibility of the site for residential development would change their minds. In response, Mr Chan Chi Chung (R852) said that the site was not suitable for residential use as the only access, i.e. On Muk Street and the roundabout nearby, was congested. The site was adjacent to KC and the outdoor football fields would inevitably be affected, no matter whether mitigation measures would be adopted. Mr Yung Ming Chau Michael (R1) added that future residents of the proposed SSF, who spent their life-time savings on buying the flat, would be trapped if the living environment at the site was not satisfactory. As more than 560 SSF flats had been provided at other housing sites in Sha Tin,

it would be better to postpone that piecemeal development, pending a more comprehensive planning together with the adjacent KC site upon its relocation.

51. In response to the Chairperson's question, Ms So Oi Tsz Teresa, a representative of F1, said that the mission of HKHA was to construct affordable housing for those in need wherever suitable sites were allocated to them, including those on top of railway stations and depots. The proposed SSF development at the site was important to enhance housing supply in the short to medium-term. It had been clearly stated that the concerned SSF would be developed independent from the future use of the adjacent KC site.

52. As Members had no further question, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the further representations on the draft Sha Tin OZP had been completed. She thanked the government representatives, the further representers, representers, commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would deliberate on the further representations in their absence and would inform them of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives, the further representers, representers, commenters and their representatives left the meeting at this point.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 2:30 p.m.]

53. The meeting was resumed at 3:30 p.m.

54. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting :

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)
Transport Department
Mr Ricky W.K. Ho

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr C.F. Wong

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

Deliberation Session

[Closed Meeting]

55. The Chairperson invited Members to express their views on the further representations on the proposed amendments to the draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/33 (the draft OZP).

Housing Needs Vs Comprehensive Development

56. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Secretary recapitulated that when the OZP incorporating amendment to rezone the On Muk Street site (the Site) from "Open Space" ("O") to "Residential (Group A) 6" ("R(A)6") for public housing development was gazetted under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), 932 adverse representations and 4 comments on the proposed amendment were received. After considering the representations and comments, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided on 22.9.2017 to uphold/partially uphold 932 representations by rezoning the Site from "R(A)6" back to "O" on the consideration that it was premature to rezone the Site from "O" to "R(A)6" in isolation, when the longer term land use planning for the adjoining "O" site currently occupied by Kitchee Football Centre (KC) was uncertain. A majority of Members were of the view then that the long-term use of the Site should be considered in the context of the use of the wider area and should be reviewed comprehensively with the entire strip of "O" zone along the river channel when the way forward regarding relocation of KC became clearer. The proposed amendment (Amendment Item A) to the draft OZP (i.e. rezoning the Site from "R(A)6" to "O") was exhibited for public inspection under section 6(C)2 of the Ordinance on 13.10.2017 and a total of 186 valid further representations, all objecting to the proposed amendment, were received. The Planning Department considered that the Site was suitable for residential use at the time of consideration of the representations/comments, and its view remained unchanged at the consideration of the further representations as detailed in the Paper.

57. A Member said that a balance should be struck between housing need of the society and the potential impacts on the local community. Given Sha Tin was relatively less congested as compared with most of the urban areas, and residential development at the Site would not cause insurmountable problems to the surrounding environment,

priority should be given to public housing development in view of the severe housing shortage. While a comprehensive planning for the future development along the whole strip of the riverbank would be desirable, a pragmatic approach of phased development was considered more appropriate to meet the imminent public housing needs.

58. A Member remarked that the Site and the adjacent KC site were originally comprehensively planned for public housing development to meet the housing need in the short-to-medium term. Since the rezoning of the KC site was postponed until its relocation arrangement was settled, the proposed development could be implemented by phases with the Site developed as an early phase to meet the imminent public housing need. Single-block development was not uncommon in Hong Kong and its cost-effectiveness should not be an overriding concern.

59. A Member said that the Government should make every effort to increase housing supply to provide affordable housing for the grassroots. Whether the proposed subsidized sales flats (SSF) development was a single-block development should not be a major concern. The Member supported the “R(A)6” zoning for the Site to facilitate SSF development provided that the KC site would not be developed for housing before its relocation arrangement was settled.

60. The Vice-chairperson said that both the views for and against SSF development at the Site had been heard at the meeting. The Board should be able to make an informed decision to balance the interests of both sides. In view of the pressing housing need and given that the operation of KC would not be affected by the proposed development, bundling the uses of the Site and the KC site together for consideration was not necessary and would be undesirable, as it would delay the implementation of the planned SSF development at the Site.

61. A Member said that the proposed single-block SSF development would not go against the comprehensive planning approach as land use planning was an on-going process. If time dimension was taken into consideration, the proposed SSF development at the Site would not be considered as a development in isolation. Should the relocation arrangement for KC be settled, the KC site could form an extension of the public housing development in future. Another Member said that apart from the views raised by the

representers/commenters/further representers, Members would also consider the need and expectation of the society, and make a decision based on Members' judgement exercised in good faith, supported by Members' expert knowledge, experiences and interaction with the community.

Co-existence between SSF Development and Sports Facilities

62. The Vice-chairperson and some Members considered that the proposed SSF development and KC's facilities could co-exist on separate sites. It was noted that a number of design measures such as setback and façade orientation had been proposed for the SSF development to mitigate the potential noise impacts and glare from KC. There would not be any adverse impact on one another.

63. A Member said that while some representers/commenters were worried about the interface problems with KC, it was not a valid ground against the SSF development at the Site. Another Member said that as KC had made contributions to football training and development in Hong Kong, its role should be recognized and a permanent reprovisioning arrangement was supported. The KC site should not be developed before the reprovisioning arrangement was settled.

64. The Vice-chairperson said that should KC be relocated at a later stage, the land use zoning of the KC site could be reviewed taking into account the views of the stakeholders and there would be scope to enhance the public housing development. Should the KC site be proposed for public housing development, rezoning of the site would be required.

Technical Feasibility

65. The Vice-chairperson and some Members considered that the Site was suitable for SSF development as it was located in close proximity to public transport facilities and new retail and social welfare facilities would be provided in Shek Mun Estate Phase II which was about 350m from the Site. Regarding the problems raised by some representers such as illegal parking on On Muk Street, they could be addressed by traffic management measures and enforcement actions. No other insurmountable technical

problems had been identified in the technical assessments.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left the meeting during the deliberation session.]

Changing Circumstances

66. Members noted that the Site was proposed to be rezoned from “R(A)6” back to “O” upon consideration of the representations and comments. The representations and comments received then were objecting to the rezoning of the Site for public housing development. At today’s hearing, the further representations were in support of the “R(A)6” zone, mainly on grounds of pressing housing need, no insurmountable technical problems, and that the operation of KC would not be affected by the proposed SSF development. After considering the views of the further representers/representers/commenters, Members generally agreed that the SSF development should be de-linked from the development on the KC site. As it would take time to settle the permanent reprovisioning arrangement for KC and there was no definite programme, the proposed SSF development at the Site should be pursued without further delay to address the acute public housing demand and the “R(A)6” zoning was appropriate to facilitate its development. While the SSF development might be a single-block development at this juncture, the longer-term planning of the KC site could be reviewed upon its relocation.

67. After further deliberation, the Board decided to uphold further representations No. F1 to F186 and not to amend the draft OZP by the proposed amendment under Amendment Item A for the following reasons:

- “(a) the Site is formed and located in proximity to MTR Shek Mun Station and supporting retail facilities in Shek Mun, it is considered suitable for public housing development to meet the housing needs in the short-to-medium term. The findings of the technical assessments had demonstrated that the proposed development is acceptable on traffic, visual, air ventilation and environmental aspects. The current traffic problem can be addressed by appropriate traffic management measures;

- (b) public housing development shall be accorded with high priority and suitable housing sites shall be made available timely for development to meet the acute public housing need. While a single-block subsidized sales flats development at the Site might not be the most desirable, a pragmatic approach shall be adopted and development at the Site shall not be delayed pending a more comprehensive development plan without a definite programme;
- (c) the district and local open spaces and a range of government, institution or community facilities are generally sufficient to meet the local needs in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Besides, a 20m-wide public riverside promenade along the Siu Lek Yuen Nullah has been retained as open space for public enjoyment; and
- (d) the current rezoning will not affect the operation of Kitchee Football Centre (KC) or pre-empt future discussions regarding relocation of KC. With the provision of appropriate design and mitigation measures, the proposed public housing development and KC are not incompatible uses.”

68. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:10 p.m.