

**Minutes of 1179th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 25.7.2018**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

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

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Raymond W.M. Wong

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

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Dr F.C. Chan

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

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
Mr Kevin C.P. Ng (a.m.)
Ms April K.Y. Kun (p.m.)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board
Ms W.H. Ho (a.m.)
Ms. Anissa W.Y. Lai (p.m.)

Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Kam Tin South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-KTS/14

(TPB Paper No. 10443)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

1. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for being associated/having business dealings with the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) (i.e. the consultant commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) under the Agreement "Site Formation and Infrastructural Works for the Initial Sites at Kam Tin South, Yuen Long – Investigation, Design and Construction" in preparing technical assessments supporting the proposed housing sites in Kam Tin South), Masterplan Limited (Masterplan) (R3/C3), Albert So Surveyors Ltd. (ASL) (i.e. Noble Phoenix Investments Limited (R2)'s representative), Woo Kwan Lee & Lo (i.e. Hover Joy International Limited (R1)'s representative), Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R318), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK) (R319) and Ms Mary Mulvihill (R320/C132):

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning
(*as Director of Planning*) Committee (SPC) and Building
Committee of HKHA

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - being a representative of the Director of
(*as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs who was a member of SPC*
Home Affairs Department) and Subsidized Housing Committee of
HKHA

- Professor S.C. Wong
(Vice-chairperson)
- having current business dealings with AECOM, being the traffic consultant /engineering consultant of AECOM and a member of the Advisory Committee for Accredited Programme of MTR Academy
- Dr C.H. Hau
- having current business dealings with AECOM, the institute he served having current business dealings with HKHA and being a former member of the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWF-HK
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho
- having current business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL and past business dealings with AECOM and ASL
- Mr K.K. Cheung
Mr Alex T.H. Lai
-] their firm having current business
] dealings with HKHA and MTRCL, and
hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis
from time to time
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen
- being a member of the Board of Governors of the Arts Centre, which had collaborated with the MTRCL on a number of arts projects
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon
- his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu
- having current business dealings with AECOM, Masterplan and MTRCL and past business dealings with HKHA

- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA, AECOM and MTRCL
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being Director (Development and Marketing) of Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which was currently in discussion with HD on housing development issues and having current business dealings with Woo Kwan Lee & Lo

2. Members noted that Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members agreed that as the interest of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan was direct, he should be invited to leave the meeting. As Professor S.C. Wong, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Franklin Yu and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no direct involvement in matter related to the representation sites, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting. Members considered that the interest of Mr Peter K.T. Yuen was indirect and agreed that he could stay in the meeting. Members also noted that Dr C.H. Hau and Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting.

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the 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 representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

4. The following government representatives and its consultant, representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

Ms Ivy C.W. Wong - Senior Town Planner/Yuen Long East

Housing Department (HD)

Ms Cindy S.Y. Lee - Senior Planning Officer 1 (SPO1)

CEDD

Mr Desmond C.K. Lam - Chief Engineer/West 1 (CE/W1)

Miss Jacqueline W.C. Cheung - Senior Engineer/4 (SE/4)

Mr Daniel Y.K. Chan - Assistant Engineer/1 (AE/1)

Representatives of AECOM, CEDD's consultant

Mr Vic Pun - Associate

Representers, Commenters and their representatives

R2 - Noble Phoenix Investments Limited

Noble Phoenix Investments Limited –

Mr Chan Karm] Representer's representatives

Mr Chan Kwong Wa Gary]

Mr Chan Man Hon Dennis]

Albert So Surveyors Limited –

Mr So Chun Hin Albert]

Mr Wong Cheuk Wai Raymond]

Mr Cheng Wai Lam Rock]

R3 / C3 - Masterplan Limited

C2 - Roger Nissim

C4 - Ruy Barretto

Masterplan Limited –

Mr Ian Thomas Brownlee

] Representers' and Commenters'

Ms Wong Oi Chu

] representatives

R9 - Chu Hoi Dick

Hon Chu Hoi Dick

- Representer

R11 - Lai Kwok Ho

R14 - Lai Wing Lam

Mr Lai Kwok Ho

- Representer and Representer's
representative

R15 - 王興

R55 - 蔡雪華

R67 - Chan Lai Ping

R71 / C110 - Cheng Yu Chai

R72 / C109 - Cheng Yu Ching

R73 / C113 - Cheng Yu Kiu

R74 / C111 - Cheng Yuet Mei

R75 / C112 - Cheng Yuk Ho

R92 - Fong Mei Ha

R95 - G Lam

R96 - Ho Kit Yee Carol

R104 - Kan Man Fung

R120 - Lai Yu Chung

R126 - Lam Hiu Yeung

R131 - Lau Hoi Tong

R137 - Lee Mei Yuk

R151 - Lin Ho Ching

R152 - Lin Ho Hing

R158 - Luk Ka Man

R168 - Natalie Kwok

R180 - Siu Yat Lok

R204 - Wing Sum Wong

R218 - Wong Shuk Chun

R220 - Wong Suet Mui

R234 / C108 - YYY Yin

R235 / C129 - 田嘉良

R236 / C130 - 田演霞

R237 / C128 - 田錦國

R241 - 何詠詩

R245 / C119 - 李群珍

R246 / C122 - 李衛紅

R254 / C80 - 徐代棟

R261 / C117 - 張錦祥

R262 / C126 - 張賽冰

R263 / C107 - Tso Kwun Mui

R264 / C74 - Leung Tak Ming

R271 - 陳仲洋

R272 / C115 - 陳志來

R273 / C116 - 陳志華

R275 - 陳若琪

R280 - 黃漢桑

R282 / C124 - 彭韻詩

R285 / C118 - 馮佩涼

R288 - 黃伊婷

R294 - 葉奕珊

R296 - 趙俊名

R301 - 鄧森

R306 - 賴東有

R308 - 賴運芬

R310 / C121 - 賴應洪

C13 - Yip Yik Shan

C84 - 陳凱姿

C86 - Yeung Wing Chi

C89 - Ng Chek Hang

C91 - Clara Tam

C93 - Chan Shui Fai

C95 - Rita

C97 - Jason Chan

C99 - Vivian Cheung

C101 - Chung Ka Wing

C103 - Cherry

C105 - Mole Yeung

C114 - Lam Hiu Yeung

錦田南關注組 -

Mr Leung Tak Ming

Ms Tso Kwun Mui

R16 - Tsui Shuk Kam

Ms Tsui Shuk Kam

R274 - 陳松歡

R276 - 陳倩玉

R281 / C123 - 彭裕康

R284 / C79 - 馮正芝

R286 - 馮錦賢

R289 - 黃伊雯

R295 - 趙俊充

R300 - 鄧妙蓮

R303 - 鄭錦珊

R307 / C120 - 賴金玲

R309 - 賴潔珍

R311 / C125 - 羅惠芳

C78 - 徐淑琴

C85 - Samuel Lai

C87 - K Y Chan

C90 - Joanne Tsang

C92 - Siu Tin

C94 - Ka Lok

C96 - Peter Wong

C98 - Ivan Lam

C100 - Yiu Wai Tung

C102 - Cherry Wong

C104 - Chan Wai Sum

C106 - 梁日信

C127 - 何詠詩

] Representers, Commenters and

] Representers' and Commenters'
Representatives

- Representer

R29 - Lok Kwok Kwan

Ms Lok Kwok Kwan - Representer

R32 - Chan Chun Yau

R34 - Ho Chun Pun

R36 - Ho Mei Mei

Mr Yuen Yick Shing

R33 - Yuen Xiao Qiao

R35 - Yuen Tsun Kit

R37 - Yuen Yick Shing

- Representer and Representatives' representative

R38 - Ho Leung Kuen

Mr Ho Leung Kuen - Representer

R53 - Tse Shun Leung

Mr Tse Shun Leung - Representer

R320 / C132 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

5. 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 representations and comments. The representers, commenters or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer, commenter or his representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government's representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives. After the Q&A session, government's representatives, the representers, commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting; and the Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

6. The Secretary reported that a jointly signed letter from 110 affected residents of Ng Ka Tsuen (吳家村) and Sze Pai Shek (四排石) in Kam Tin South was received on 23.7.2018. The affected residents raised objection to the draft Kam Tin South (KTS) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-KTS/14 (the draft OZP) on the grounds mainly related to the impacts of the proposed amendments on their existing living, and the compensation and rehousing issues. As the letter was received after the statutory publication period, it should be treated as not having been made under section 6(3)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

7. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments.

8. Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in the Paper.

[Dr C.H. Hau arrived to join the meeting during DPO/ FS&YLE's presentation.]

9. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations and comments.

R2 - Noble Phoenix Investments Limited

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr So Chun Hin Albert made the following main points:

- (a) he was representing R2, the owner of lot numbers 547 RP (Part), 550 RP and 551 in D.D. 106 in Tung Wui Road, Kam Tin (i.e. part of the representation site under Item A3 (Item A3 site)), to raise objection to the draft OZP with respect to the planning intention of public housing developments on the site. R2 was of the view that private developments should also be allowed at the site;

- (b) whilst R2 was not only the landowner of the concerned private lots (4,934m²/46.3% of the site), but also the previous landowner of part of the adjoining land (4,230m²/39.7% of the site) which was resumed by the Government for road works in 2001. However, those resumed land had not been used for the implementation of Tung Wui Road;
- (c) while 'flat' and 'house' uses were always permitted within the "Residential (Group A)" "R(A)" zone on the Notes of the draft OZP, there was no restriction for exclusive use of the site for public housing development. The intention to provide medium-density public housing at the site was only included in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft OZP;
- (d) Mr Chan Karm, one of R2's representatives, was over 90 years old and was one of the owners of Lot 550RP since 1970 before selling the land to R2 in 1998. The private land was for agricultural use under Block Government Lease. A factory, which had been operating at the site for more than 40 years with more than 20 employees, was currently on private and government lands under short-term wavier and short-term tenancy respectively. If the site was resumed for public housing development, the employees might lose their job;
- (e) Mr Chan had expressed his intention for development at the site for more than 10 years. Section 16 and section 17 applications for developing the site for private housing propose had been submitted in 2016 and 2017 respectively, but the applications were rejected by the Board. While he appreciated the need for land for public housing, private housing demand was equally important;
- (f) R2 had submitted an application to the Lands Department (LandsD) in 2004 for the re-grant of the unused government land. However, LandsD had not given any reply since 2014 and there was no final decision on the re-grant application. There was adequate legal basis for R2 to apply for the re-grant of unused government land because section 37 of the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) stated that before

disposing of any land resumed under that Ordinance to any other person, the Government should give proper consideration to offering that land back to the person from whom it was resumed. As R2's land was no longer needed for road works but would be used for housing development instead, the Government should give proper consideration to offering the resumed land back to R2 for private housing development; and

- (g) the Board was urged to allow private developments at the site on the grounds that R2 had the right and intention for development, the re-grant application had yet to be determined, flexibility had been provided for both private and public housing developments in the "R(A)" zone and there was shortage in private housing supply.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting during the presentation by R2's representative.]

R3 / C3 - Masterplan Limited

C2 - Roger Nissim

C4 - Ruy Barretto

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Thomas Brownlee made the following main points:

Urban Planning Considerations

- (a) amongst 14 sites identified in the Land Use Review for Kam Tin South and Pat Heung (LUR), only two sites along the West Rail Kam Sheung Road Station (KSRS) had been rezoned in 2015 and another three sites near KSRS were proposed for public housing development in this round of OZP amendments. Without including the other sites identified in the LUR, the area covered by the present OZP amendments was too small to encourage good planning and increase the housing supply in a reasonable time frame. The rezoning of only three sites for public housing development by the Government might result in an undesirable housing mix and would deprive the Board of the opportunity to consider the

development projects in a holistic and comprehensive manner;

- (b) KTS, which was now served by West Rail (WR) and would be served by the Northern Link (NOL), should not be positioned as a rural town but a new development area (NDA). The proposed plot ratios (PRs) for development sites in KTS were generally lower than those in other NDAs which was a waste of valuable land resources. The continuously escalating property price in the past decade meant that the Government should be determined and acted quick to increase housing land supply. The identified housing sites in KTS should be considered for higher density developments by rezoning in one-go;
- (c) it was noted that a number of housing sites in some OZPs including Tuen Mun East, Tai Po and Ma On Shan had been up-zoned in the past. The piece-meal up-zoning of individual sites in an ad hoc manner was undesirable;
- (d) although the rezoning proposals were supported by a number of technical assessments, it was noted that the purpose and intention for the development of a high quality urban centre had been lost against the need to complete all of the normal technical submissions. There was no apparent vision as to what could be achieved by creating a conceptual framework for the area, and there was also no special features which would give this new development a unique urban character of its own. The outcome was likely to be just another typical Hong Kong style development;

An Alternative Framework

- (e) when the LUR was completed in 2014, Masterplan Limited had made submissions urging the Government to increase the development intensity of the area to optimize land use and development. As most of the areas in KTS were within 1 km radius of KSRS and about 10-15 minutes' walk, a transit-oriented development concept with high density development around KSRS should be proposed. District and local

centres could be formed at places of special characteristics such as areas in proximity to KSRS, intersections of two water courses and a heritage building, with support of services and facilities. A continuous development zone, excluding well-established villages and the areas that were unsuitable for development, could be formed in a compact area where infrastructural services could be provided and foster growth. This concept was adopted in Toa Payoh Town Centre in Singapore;

- (f) making reference to Daxue Road in Shanghai, it was proposed that new connective spines with a mix of public and private housing developments, retail uses and community facilities should be provided between the district and local centres to facilitate movement of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. The existing water channels could be transformed into a natural river to create a green/blue movement network and an extensive public realm. This could help prevent the central area near KSRS from being dominated by huge public housing developments in the traditional approach. Successful examples of this type of development concept could be found in Singapore (Bishan Park) and South Korea (Cheonggyecheon River Park);

Territorial-wide housing issues

- (g) the six housing measures announced by the Chief Executive in late June 2018 could not help resolve the acute housing problem. The conversion of private land for public housing development would involve high resumption cost and long lead time to deal with objections and site clearance which was not conducive to resolving the housing problem. Instead, the Board should consider unleashing the potential of private agricultural land by rezoning the land to appropriate land use zones under a guiding development framework. If a holistic approach was adopted to make use of the existing land resources including both the government and private land, the private land owners would be willing to help accomplish the housing supply objectives under a public-private partnership (PPP) approach. This approach could ensure a quick supply of housing land and avoid the need to intrude into the land of the country

parks for housing development;

- (h) the proposed development in KTS had deviated from the planning concept in Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" study (2030+ Study) for a liveable high density city and creating capacity for infrastructural and community facilities. The low development intensities proposed in the LUR actually suppressed capacities and development potential of the sites. Infrastructural capacities could be increased upon carrying out multi-disciplinary studies and should not be a justification for low development intensity. For a proper and comprehensive planning, the Board should first decide on the optimum land use and target population for KTS with a view to creating capacity, and the infrastructural facilities should be provided/improved to help accomplish the planning objectives;

Proposals to meet the representation

- (i) similar concerns on low development intensity had been raised in the hearing of the Draft Hung Shui Kiu and Ha Tsuen (HSK) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/HSK/1. While the Board considered that the development parameters including the PR stipulated on the HSK OZP should not be amended, it was agreed that the ES of the OZP should be revised to facilitate possible further increase in development intensity subject to technical feasibility studies in the long run. Similar approach could be considered here for KTS OZP;
- (j) in response to the alternative framework proposed by R3, PlanD had adopted the standard reply that no technical assessment had been submitted by the representer to support the feasibility of the proposed development. It was unrealistic to expect that the representer would have the time and resources to conduct technical assessments similar to those of the Government. Instead, PlanD should be requested to submit a comprehensive planning framework for KTS covering all the sites identified in the LUR with a comprehensive planning and engineering feasibility study for options with higher development density as well as

implementation measures; and

- (k) the Board should consider the paradigm shift from the traditional “demand-led” approach to “capacity-creating” approach for urban planning. While planning should be comprehensive, implementation of the development sites could be carried out by phases to tie in with the provision of infrastructural facilities. After the development framework was in place, the private sector could be involved by adopting a PPP approach to release more land for residential use.

R11 - Lai Kwok Ho

R14 - Lai Wing Lam

12. Mr Lai Kwok Ho made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in the Item A3 site for about 50 years. He objected to the proposed development at the site. He was of the view that housing land supply should be increased by developing brownfield sites, Shek Kong Airfield or by reclamation so that the impact on the existing residents could be minimized;
- (b) given the building height (BH) restriction of the nearby Shek Kong Airfield, the development intensity at the rezoning sites could not be optimized and thus the proposed public housing developments were not cost-effective. As such, resources should be put on other development sites to address the acute housing problem;
- (c) given the upsurge of population in the Tuen Mun and Yuen Long area, the rezoning sites should be retained for the development of organic farms for education purpose or as greening areas;
- (d) the residents in the Tuen Mun and Yuen Long area needed to go to the urban area to make a living but the existing railway and road infrastructure facilities were already saturated. He doubted if the transport infrastructure facilities were able to cope with the additional traffic demand;

- (e) most of the residents in the area including his parents were farmers and elderly, who could not adapt to changes in the living environment easily. Taking his family as an example, it was a large family with three generations including his mother, three sons, a domestic helper, one dog and three cats. They could not be accommodated in a typical public housing unit; and
- (f) suitable land should be reserved for village re-provisioning to allow the local residents to continue their existing living style elsewhere. Most of the local residents would welcome this option even if the allocated land was smaller than the existing one. The need of the existing residents should be adequately taken care of before rezoning the sites for new developments. If the Board did not take the initiative to reserve land for such purpose, other government departments would not take follow-up actions.

R16 - Tsui Shuk Kam

13. Ms Tsui Shuk Kam made the following main points:

- (a) while she appreciated the need of the Government to provide public housing, the affected residents should be adequately compensated or offered with various options such as rehousing in the same district, land exchange to maintain a similar living condition, having priority to buy home ownership scheme flats or move to public housing estates, as well as waiving the stamp duty for the purchase of the second property;
- (b) if the land resumed was used for public housing development rather than private housing, the affected residents might feel that their sacrifices were justified. To recognize the contribution of the local residents, it was suggested to name the future public housing estate as “吳家村/邨” or something of similar meaning; and

- (c) her parents had been living in the area for several decades. As her parents had worked very hard to make a living when they were young, she hoped that they could continue to live in their existing house for the rest of their lives.

14. Ms Lok Kwo Kwan supplemented the following points:

- (a) as the elderly had been living in the area for a long time, their wishes to stay in the community for the rest of their lives should be respected;
- (b) if the land was resumed for public housing development, its development potential should be fully optimized to provide more flats. Besides, she queried why the Shek Kong Airfield site could not be used for development; and
- (c) in the local residents forums on land resumption and clearance issues, they had reached a consensus that their sacrifices to facilitate public housing development should be reasonably compensated by the Government through the provision of a rehousing site.

15. Mr Lai Kwok Ho supplemented that he was Ms Tsui Shuk Kam's neighbour. He reiterated that the Government should provide proper rehousing options to the existing residents before putting forward new development proposals.

R29 - Lok Kwok Kwan

16. Ms Lok Kwok Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) she grew up in the area and could speak for most of the local residents. There were about 10-20 households that would be affected by the Government's clearance exercise. Most of the households wished to be rehoused in public housing estates;
- (b) she had attended a briefing session organized by the Yuen Long District Council (YLDC) on the enhanced ex-gratia compensation and rehousing

arrangements. While the enhanced arrangements including the rehousing for affected eligible squatter households in dedicated rehousing estates in the same district seemed to be attractive, the existing occupants might not be benefited as the maximum income limit for application of public rental housing (PRH) was very harsh. To take her family as an example, the income of a working couple had already exceeded the maximum income limit;

- (c) there was a lack of clear information on the Government's latest policy. Although her father-in-law wished to change the ownership of the land and house to his children, he could not do so due to policy changes and unclear information provided by LandsD;
- (d) while the local residents were willing to move out to facilitate public housing development, she doubted if they would be compensated fairly and if there were options for them to choose. There were five rooms in her existing house where she kept her cats and dogs. Besides, her two sisters were also living in the nearby area. Given the upsurge of property prices in the past years, it was impossible for them to buy a flat with reasonable size with the ex-gratia compensation. Her existing living quality would be substantially affected even if she was allocated with a PRH unit; and
- (e) the Government's previous policy to provide village reprovisioning option to the affected occupants should be continued so as to avoid the potential conflicts created in the land resumption and clearance exercise similar to that happened in Choi Yuen Tsuen. They requested the provision of alternative options such as village reprovisioning or land exchange such that they could continue their existing life style. They were willing to accept a reprovisioning site which was far away and not well served by transport infrastructure facilities.

R32 - Chan Chun Yau

R34 - Ho Chun Pun

R36 - Ho Mei Mei

R33 - Yuen Xiao Qiao

R35 - Yuen Tsun Kit

R37 - Yuen Yick Shing

17. Mr Yuen Yick Shing made the following main points:

- (a) he came from a large family with three generations currently living in Ng Ka Tsuen. The land was bought by his parents-in-law who were now old with low mobility and domestic helpers were needed for intensive care. Their existing house was large and the local community network was good. It would be very difficult for them in particular the elderly to get used to the new living environment; and
- (b) given the typical PRH flats were small and could not cater for their needs, he suggested that a small number of flats in the proposed public housing development in the area should be reserved for rehousing the affected occupants of Ng Ka Tsuen such that the existing social network could be maintained. Larger flats could be provided in the lower floors of the public housing blocks for families with special needs.

R38 - Ho Leung Kuen

18. Mr Ho Leung Kuen made the following main points:

- (a) he came from the same family of Mr Yuen Yick Shing and was the youngest son of the land owner. His parents, who were more than 90 years old, had five children. The six families were currently living in an area of about 10,000 square feet. According to the proposed PR of 3, the gross floor area (GFA) that could be produced at their site was about 30,000 square feet. However, if the land was resumed, the ex-gratia compensation was about \$14 million according to a rate of \$1,400/square feet, which was merely enough for them to buy a 30-year old flat of about 1,000 square feet which was insufficient for accommodating the six families; and
- (b) they were victims in the development process and had not been treated fairly. Although the ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements had been enhanced, it was worse than those offered in other cities such as

Shenzhen. He could not understand why the Government would address the housing problems of a stratum of people at the expense of another group of people. For a fair compensation, the Government should consider reserving a whole storey of flats in the future public housing estate for their families.

R9 - Chu Hoi Dick

19. Hon Chu Hoi Dick made the following main points:

Agricultural land

- (a) Kam Tin and Pat Heung were important agricultural areas in Hong Kong. About 50% of the accredited organic farms in Hong Kong were located in the area, including two large organic farms. In the planning of large-scale developments in the area, due consideration should be given to the adverse impacts on the existing agricultural activities;
- (b) while the ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements had been enhanced for domestic occupants in squatters and open-air/outdoor business undertakings, the extra-gratia allowances (EGA) for the farmers had not been improved. The assessment mechanism of the EGA revealed that agricultural operation was not considered as an industry by the Government. Besides, no guarantee had been given by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) to the farmers to help them secure land to continue their farming operations;
- (c) the proposed amendments to the KTS OZP would also affect the agricultural land in the surrounding areas including those to the north of Pat Heung. If no comprehensive policy to protect agricultural lands including designating more Agricultural Priority Area was available, the agricultural land in KTS and the nearby areas would turn into brownfield sites very quickly;

Rehousing arrangement

- (d) the Government did not consider the option of village reprovisioning for the affected occupants due to its concern over the ineffective use of valuable land resources. However, only a very small area would be required for village reprovisioning. Taking Choi Yuen Tsuen as an example, the total area resumed was about 27 ha while the area for village reprovisioning was only 1.5 ha. As Ng Ka Tsuen was relatively large, the Government should liaise with the rural committee and Heung Yee Kuk with a view to providing the option of village reprovisioning to the affected occupants;

Transport

- (e) while the future population of the New Territories North (NTN) would be increased by about 700,000, the Government was reluctant to answer whether the transport infrastructure facilities would be able to cope with the increasing traffic demand. The planned transport infrastructure development up to 2030 was unsatisfactory and the local residents were not provided with a holistic picture on future transport infrastructure planning. Apart from Hung Shui Kiu (HSK) NDA, the Board should consider providing employment opportunities in every NDA so as to reduce daily commuting trips to the urban area; and
- (f) the division of work within the Government had resulted in piecemeal planning without thorough consideration on the needs of the local residents. For example, no public toilet was provided in Tai Lam Tunnel Bus Interchange despite the very busy daily pedestrian flow. Should the proposed amendments be approved, the Board should exercise its power to impose conditions to request the government departments to undertake appropriate measures to reduce the adverse impacts on the local residents such as designation of Agricultural Priority Area, village reprovisioning by cottage (平房式搬遷安排) and reasonable compensation arrangements.

R53 - Tse Shun Leung

20. Mr Tse Shun Leung made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in Kam Tin for more than 50 years. Due to the lack of consultation, he only knew about the proposed developments in the area at a very late stage. The current practice of consulting the local residents after the plan was almost finalized was unacceptable. While the local residents were willing to move out to facilitate public housing development, they should be provided with reasonable compensation options such as in-situ rehousing;
- (b) while his father wished to change the ownership of the squatter to him in previous years, he was advised by LandsD that there was no need to change the ownership. However, when he applied again for the change in ownership in 2014, he was told that the policy had already been changed and his application could not be processed. He doubted if the affected residents had been adequately consulted regarding changes in relevant policies;
- (c) as the agricultural lands in the area were of high quality, the Government should consider formulating comprehensive and sustainable agriculture development strategy rather than setting up of agricultural parks which were symbolic in nature; and
- (d) as many of the affected residents could not manage to attend the hearing and make oral submissions to the Board, he would like to submit a jointly signed letter from the affected residents for the Board's consideration. The content of the letter was similar to the views raised by some representers/commenters and no new point was raised.

21. The Chairperson said that as the letter was submitted after the statutory publication period, it should be treated as not having been made under the Ordinance. Nevertheless, it was noted that the concerns covered in the letter were similar to those raised by some representers and commenters in the hearing.

R320/C132 - Mary Mulvihill

22. With the aid of the visualizer, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

Development constraints

- (a) according to the representation of MTRCL, Items A1 and A2 sites were located within noise sensitive area susceptible to noise impacts from railway operation and were not suitable for housing development. In particular, the Item A2 site was sandwiched between the WR track and Tsing Long Highway and would be subject to severe noise nuisances. The Board should give due consideration to the noise concern and impose relevant requirements for the proposed developments to mitigate the noise impacts;
- (b) the connectivity between the Item A2 site and the other public housing sites was very poor as they were separated by the WR track. Given the lack of synergy between the three proposed public housing sites, she doubted if the Item A2 site was planned for home ownership scheme (HOS) rather than public rental housing. If that was the case, it should be made known to the public and the Board as early as possible;

GIC facilities

- (c) one of the objectives of the “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” (Hong Kong 2030+) was to provide space with buffer to improve livability, including enhanced home space, community facilities and open space, which was important to meet the needs of the growing elderly population. However, there was currently a lack of community, supporting and recreational facilities as well as employment opportunity in KTS. The proposed GIC facilities (about 1 ha) and two primary schools were not adequate to cater for the needs of the additional population of about 25,000 in the area. Regarding the deficit of

district open space, it was not sensible to say that the residents could go to the parks in other districts. Besides, she doubted when the 7 ha Riverine Park would be realized as it was still subject to further study;

- (d) in responding to her representation, PlanD had stated that the proposed strategic directions under Hong Kong 2030+ were generally visionary in nature and not applicable to the current zoning amendments on the KTS OZP, which she considered was unacceptable. She queried why the recommendations of Hong Kong 2030+ were not applicable to the proposed developments in KTS, which would be completed around 2030. She urged PlanD to incorporate standards for the provision of elderly care facilities in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), and those standards should be applicable to both public housing developments as well as other types of developments;

Comprehensive planning

- (e) the current planning for KTS merely put public housing on all available sites with limited community facilities; it was piecemeal and unsatisfactory. A comprehensive planning should be formulated before detailed development proposals were recommended; and
- (f) the future town centre should be located at KSRS and the adjacent public transport interchange, rather than at the Items A1 to A3 sites which were surrounded by village type developments and open storage uses. Sufficient commercial activities and community facilities should be provided in the town centre to cater for the needs of the growing population as well as for employment generation. PlanD should formulate a comprehensive planning framework for a new town development such that public housing estates could be put in the right places with commercial and supporting facilities developed before population intake.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui left the meeting at this point.]

R15 - 王興

R67 - Chan Lai Ping

R72 / C109 - Cheng Yu Ching

R74 / C111 - Cheng Yuet Mei

R92 - Fong Mei Ha

R96 - Ho Kit Yee Carol

R120 - Lai Yu Chung

R131 - Lau Hoi Tong

R151 - Lin Ho Ching

R158 - Luk Ka Man

R180 - Siu Yat Lok

R218 - Wong Shuk Chun

R234 / C108 - YYY Yin

R236 / C130 - 田演霞

R241 - 何詠詩

R246 / C122 - 李衛紅

R261 / C117 - 張錦祥

R263 / C107 - Tso Kwun Mui

R271 - 陳仲洋

R273 / C116 - 陳志華

R275 - 陳若琪

R280 - 黃漢燊

R282 / C124 - 彭韻詩

R285 / C118 - 馮佩涼

R288 - 黃伊婷

R294 - 葉奕珊

R296 - 趙俊名

R301 - 鄧森

R306 - 賴東有

R308 - 賴運芬

R310 / C121 - 賴應洪

C13 - Yip Yik Shan

R55 - 蔡雪華

R71 / C110 - Cheng Yu Chai

R73 / C113 - Cheng Yu Kiu

R75 / C112 - Cheng Yuk Ho

R95 - G Lam

R104 - Kan Man Fung

R126 - Lam Hiu Yeung

R137 - Lee Mei Yuk

R152 - Lin Ho Hing

R168 - Natalie Kwok

R204 - Wing Sum Wong

R220 - Wong Suet Mui

R235 / C129 - 田嘉良

R237 / C128 - 田錦國

R245 / C119 - 李群珍

R254 / C80 - 徐代棟

R262 / C126 - 張賽冰

R264 / C74 - Leung Tak Ming

R272 / C115 - 陳志來

R274 - 陳松歡

R276 - 陳倩玉

R281 / C123 - 彭裕康

R284 / C79 - 馮正芝

R286 - 馮錦賢

R289 - 黃伊雯

R295 - 趙俊充

R300 - 鄧妙蓮

R303 - 鄭錦珊

R307 / C120 - 賴金玲

R309 - 賴潔珍

R311 / C125 - 羅惠芳

C78 - 徐淑琴

C84 - 陳凱姿

C85 - Samuel Lai

C86 - Yeung Wing Chi

C87 - K Y Chan

C89 - Ng Chek Hang

C90 - Joanne Tsang

C91 - Clara Tam

C92 - Siu Tin

C93 - Chan Shui Fai

C94 - Ka Lok

C95 - Rita

C96 - Peter Wong

C97 - Jason Chan

C98 - Ivan Lam

C99 - Vivian Cheung

C100 - Yiu Wai Tung

C101 - Chung Ka Wing

C102 - Cherry Wong

C103 - Cherry

C104 - Chan Wai Sum

C105 - Mole Yeung

C106 - 梁日信

C114 - Lam Hiu Yeung

C127 - 何詠詩

23. Ms Tso Kwun Mui made the following main points:

- (a) she was a farmer and was operating an organic farm in the area. Although her income was low, she enjoyed the farming activities which could provide organic food to herself and the consumers. If the land was resumed for public housing development, she could not afford high rent at another location to continue the organic farm operation; and
- (b) as she had already invested a lot of money in her farm, the compensation provided by the Government would not be able to cover her loss. The Government should provide another piece of agricultural land with reasonable rents for her to continue the farming operation.

24. Mr Leung Tak Ming said that the arrangement of the hearing was unfair to the local villagers as most of them could not afford to take leave from work to attend the hearing. He played a sound recording of Ms Tse who could not attend the hearing. The main points made by Ms Tse were as follows:

- (a) she had been living in the area for more than 50 years as the rent was low and the air quality was good. She was currently living with her children and grandchildren who were studying in Kam Tin. They had paid renovation cost for their house and could not afford to move to the public

housing estate due to higher rents. If they were forced to move out of the village, she could not maintain the existing life style and take care of her grandchildren; and

- (b) the existing traffic condition in KTS was poor and the WR was very congested during peak hours. The Government should postpone the land resumption and proceed with the new town development in KTS after the transport infrastructure was improved.

25. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Leung Tak Ming made the following main points:

Comprehensive planning

- (a) among the 14 potential sites identified for housing development under the LUR, the ratio of public to private housing was about 1:1, which was lower than that recommended in the Long Term Housing Strategy (6:4) or suggested by the concern groups (7:3 or 8:2). If the village type developments were taken into account, with the housing mix currently proposed, KTS would be dominated by private housing which could not meet the needs of the grassroots;
- (b) according to the latest planning in the Yuen Long (YL) area, the future population would be increased by several hundred thousands of people. However, most of the residents would need to commute across districts to work due to the lack of local employment opportunities. Currently, the loading of WR had already exceeded its carrying capacity. Even though the Government claimed that the carrying capacity of WR would increase by 37% after the enhancement of the services and the commissioning of the “East-West Corridor”, it could hardly accommodate the additional service demand generated by the additional population. The Transport Department (TD) estimated that with the completion of Route 11, the southbound hourly vehicular flow of Tai Lam Tunnel during morning peak hour would reach 6,100 in year 2036, which would exceed the designed capacity. As the traffic in North West New Territories (NWNT) was

already overloaded, no more population should be accommodated before the transport services were improved;

- (c) land was still available for public housing development such as military sites, vacant government land, topside development above KSRS and those in the land sale list. Priority should be given to developing those sites for public housing development instead of the Items A1 to A3 sites, which could also reduce the development pressure in Ng Ka Tsuen and Sze Pai Shek. The current planning to improve the living environment of the grassroots at the expense of the non-indigenous villagers was erroneous and would result in conflicts in the society;
- (d) a comprehensive planning should not only aim at providing housing units, but also providing adequate transport infrastructure facilities and employment opportunities to meet the needs of both the existing and future population;

Compensation issues

- (e) while the Government had recently announced the enhanced ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for eligible domestic occupants in squatters and business undertakings affected by Government's clearance exercises, he noted from the speech of Hon Bernard Charnwut Chan (the convenor of the non-official members of the Executive Council) that the new measures were mainly aimed at releasing more land to facilitate housing developments, and not for providing proper rehousing for the affected occupants. Besides, the rehousing estates to be developed and managed by HKHS would have higher rents than those managed by HKHA;
- (f) although the maximum cash EGA had been increased to \$1,200,000, the actual amount that the eligible households could receive was more or less the same as the current amount given the eligible criteria had also been changed. According to his understanding, only a limited number of households could receive the maximum EGA. The Government should provide the actual number of eligible households who could receive the

maximum EGA to avoid misleading the public;

- (g) the Government's rehousing arrangements had not taken into account the historical background and social network of the existing villages nor provided the option of village reprovisioning to allow the villagers to maintain their existing life style. The Government should provide more rehousing options for the affected households in Ng Ka Tsuen and Sze Pai Shek such as reserving an area of about one to two hectares for village reprovisioning. Besides, there was also a concern on differential treatments between indigenous and non-indigenous villagers;

Impact on agricultural land

- (h) the development pressure in KTS would drive up the rents of agricultural land and adversely affect agricultural development in the area. The existing EGA for farmers was underestimated due to the adoption of wholesale price rather than retail price for the agricultural products and the exclusion of the setting up cost for the farm. In the recent review of ex-gratia compensation arrangements, the EGA for farmers had not been improved, which demonstrated that the Government's agricultural policy had not been followed through. The Agri-Park also could not meet the needs of the affected farmers as they were not located in the same district and the rents were high. Given the local community network was important for the farms' operation, the affected farms should be reprovisioned in the same district;

Impact on animals

- (i) as most of the villagers were keeping pets, the Government should not ignore the adverse impacts of clearance exercise on the affected animals. Due to the limited spaces of the Animal Management Centres of the AFCD, the abandoned animals would be euthanised after four days if they could not be re-homed. He doubted if it was the vision of the planning of the NDA if it would result in a massacre of animals and the villagers' feeling would be hurt due to the forced separation with their pets; and

- (j) the Board should not approve the rezoning proposals before a comprehensive planning was formulated to address the above-mentioned problems.

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

Development Intensity

27. Some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) why a PR of 3 was proposed for the public housing sites; and
- (b) given the BH restriction, whether the development intensity of the proposed public housing developments could be increased beyond PR of 3, for example, by adding more housing blocks with proper layout and design by HD;

28. In response, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer/PowerPoint slides:

- (a) while it was the Government's intention to optimize land use and increase housing supply, the Items A1 to A3 sites were subject to maximum BH of 69mPD, which was the airport height restriction of the nearby Shek Kong Airfield. Besides, there were infrastructural constraints in the area particularly the limited capacity of the sewage treatment facilities. According to the broad technical assessments of the LUR, while there was no insurmountable problem for the development of the 14 potential

housing sites, the housing sites had to be implemented by phases in view of the infrastructural constraints. To meet the pressing demand for housing supply, two WR sites (i.e. KSRS and Pat Heung Maintenance Centre) were rezoned first as no substantial infrastructure improvement works would be required. The three proposed public housing sites, the current amendment items, could also be implemented at an early stage to meet the acute public housing demand taking into account its close proximity to KSRS and the available infrastructural capacity in the area. The PR of 3 was considered appropriate for the public housing developments. The development of the remaining nine potential housing sites as proposed under the LUR would be subject to further technical assessments in particular on the provision of supporting infrastructures. Subject to demonstration of the technical feasibility, rezoning proposal for the remaining sites would be submitted to the Board for consideration;

- (b) as land within the public housing sites would need to be reserved for internal roads, local open space and community facilities where appropriate, it might not be possible to increase the number of housing blocks; and
- (c) the proposed public housing developments with a PR of 3 and a BH of 17 storeys had already reached the maximum BH of 69mPD. Taken into account the various development constraints, a PR of 3 was considered as the optimum development limit. Notwithstanding that, flexibility had been incorporated into the Notes of the “R(A)” zone in the OZP in that public vehicle park, social welfare facilities and other GIC facilities as required by the Government could be exempted from PR calculation.

29. Ms Cindy S.Y. Lee, SPO1, HD, supplemented that given the scarce land resources, HD would seek to optimize the development potential of each public housing site where planning and infrastructure permitted and without unduly compromising on environmental quality. HD, together with relevant government departments, would further explore the feasible ways to maximize the development intensity of the proposed public housing sites.

30. Some Members asked whether the primary constraint for increasing development intensity in KTS was the BH restrictions or infrastructure capacity. Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin responded that the development intensity in KTS was primarily constrained by the BH restrictions due to the presence of the Shek Kong Airfield.

31. Some Members asked if infrastructure capacity was not the primary constraint, why the development intensity could not be increased. In response, Mr Ian Brownlee said that the fundamental problem for the low development intensity was the adoption of a wrong planning approach. PlanD had made an assumption of a PR of 3 for the proposed developments at the very beginning, and then carried out technical assessments to ascertain the feasibility of the proposed development intensity. However, their submission in 2014 had demonstrated that a PR up to 5 or 6 could be achieved within a BH restriction of 69mPD, and a population of about 140,900 could be accommodated, which was larger than 90,000 as estimated by PlanD. Besides, it was noted that a PR of 5 could be achieved by a 12-storey residential development with basement carpark and retail facilities on ground floor in Hung Shui Kiu. As such, he could not see the reason why a higher PR could not be allowed in KTS. He was of view that PlanD should be requested to review the development intensity of the area, starting from answering the questions of what PR could be achieved at a BH restriction of 69mPD and what supporting infrastructures were required for the proposed developments. If the supporting infrastructure capacity could not cater for the proposed developments, a timeframe should be set for the implementation of the required facilities.

32. In response to the Chairperson's question on the estimated completion time for the proposed public housing developments, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin said that if the proposed PR was reviewed, more time would be required and the first phase of the proposed public housing developments might not be able to be completed by 2025/26. Besides, in considering the amount of floor space that could be accommodated within a BH restriction, the existing site formation level would also need to be taken into account. It should be noted that some of the proposed public housing sites were located on slopes with future site formation levels ranging from about 7 to 11 mPD.

33. A Member asked whether a higher PR should be stipulated in the OZP given the BH restrictions might be relaxed in future. In response, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin said that should there be opportunities to increase the PR beyond 3 subject to demonstration of technical feasibility, there was mechanism for the project proponents to submit a s.16

application for minor relaxation of PR restriction or rezoning application to amend the PR restriction on the OZP. However, without the support of technical assessments, there was no basis to increase the PR restriction at the moment.

Comprehensive Planning

34. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) the planning concept for the future developments in KTS;
- (b) whether adopting the concept of rural township for KTS was due to the BH restriction of Shek Kong Airfield;
- (c) how the quality of developments in KTS could be enhanced;
- (d) whether consideration would be given to integrating agricultural land into the township development;
- (e) whether local employment opportunities had been planned in KTS to reduce the need for the local residents to work cross districts;
- (f) whether there was timetable for further study on the technical feasibility of the nine remaining housing sites;
- (g) the total planned population for KTS area; and
- (h) whether feasibility study for comprehensive development had been conducted for the whole Kam Tin area.

35. In response, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer/PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the original planning intention for KTS was primarily for the improvement and upgrading of the existing rural areas through redevelopment of

existing temporary structures into low-rise, low-density residential developments. In order to capitalize on the development potential of KSRS, the LUR had been conducted and a number of potential housing sites were identified for up-zoning to facilitate development and redevelopment. Given the above background, the planning concept for KTS was mainly a rural township development rather than a new town or a NDA development. Areas above KSRS were planned for residential development with provision of commercial/ retail and supporting facilities while areas in close proximity to KSRS were planned for public housing developments. “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zones were also proposed near KSRS for the provision of a GIC complex, a sports centre and two primary schools to serve the KTS area. Details of the GIC facilities to be accommodated would be subject to further study at the detailed design stage;

- (b) while HK 2030+ had identified a number of strategic growth areas such as Yuen Long South and Hung Shui Kiu, KTS as a whole was dominated by rural type developments with a large area of agricultural land. Given the existing context, the overall planning intention was to preserve the agricultural land while capitalize on the development potential of KSRS for a rural township development. As to whether the development potential of KTS could be further enhanced if Shek Kong Airfield was relocated, the Government would not be able to comment in the absence of a specific study into this hypothetical scenario;
- (c) an integrated planning approach had been adopted in the LUR by enhancing the connectivity among the development sites and the future town centre. For instance, cycle tracks might be enhanced to facilitate interaction between the existing and planned neighbourhoods. The amendments to the OZP were mainly to provide a broad land use zoning with stipulation of an appropriate development intensity to make sure that the proposed developments would not have insurmountable technical problems. The detailed layout, design and facilities to be provided were subject to further studies by the relevant project proponents at the implementation stage;

- (d) under the current planning, land around KSRS was proposed primarily for residential development to address the acute housing needs. Although some active agricultural land which mainly fell within Item A1 site would be affected by the proposed developments, there were considerable fallow agricultural land to the south of Pat Heung Road/ Kam Sheung Road currently zoned “Agriculture” (“AGR”) on the draft OZP, which had potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The planning intention was to maintain those land for agricultural purposes so as to give a clear and positive message to the landowners and the relevant stakeholders. Under the Agricultural Land Rehabilitation Scheme, AFCD would facilitate the landowners and prospective tenants to entering into tenancy agreements, and provide technical support and low-interest loans to farmers. Besides, the Agri-Park, which aimed to facilitate knowledge transfer with a view to enhancing productivity, might also serve to accommodate farmers displaced by government development projects that would take place within the same time-frame. The Government would continue its efforts in identifying land suitable for agricultural rehabilitation and providing assistance to the affected farmers;

- (e) according to HK2030+, a diversity of new employment opportunities would be created on a regional basis with a view to connecting the population to employment centres. Under the latest planning, the future employment opportunities in the New Territories North would mainly be concentrated in Ping Che/Ta Kwu Ling, San Tin/Lok Ma Chau and Hung Shui Kiu. As KTS was mainly planned for rural township development, the proposed PR of 3 might not be able to facilitate large scale commercial developments for employment generation;

- (f) the technical feasibility of the remaining nine potential housing sites hinged mainly on the infrastructure capacity particularly the capacity of the existing sewage treatment plant. However, there was no proposal to expand the sewage treatment facilities at the moment;

- (g) if all identified housing sites were implemented, the estimated population for the 14 potential housing sites identified under the LUR would be about 90,000; and
- (h) no feasibility study for comprehensive development had been conducted for the whole Kam Tin area.

Public Housing Development

36. Some Members raised the following questions to representative of HD:
- (a) whether HD would consider integrating community farms and riverine parks in the proposed public housing developments;
 - (b) whether HD would consider the suggestion to name the future public housing estate as “吳家村/邨” ; and
 - (c) whether subsidized sales flats (SSF) would be provided in the proposed public housing developments.
37. In response, Ms Cindy S.Y. Lee, SPO1, HD, made the following main points:
- (a) the proposed public housing developments were still at a preliminary planning/design stage. The community farms suggested by the representers would be explored as appropriate at the detailed design stage;
 - (b) the suggestion on the name of the proposed public housing developments would be relayed to the relevant section within HD for consideration; and
 - (c) flexibility was allowed in the feasibility study conducted by CEDD and HD for the development of public rental housing and/or SSF. The mix could be determined at a later stage.

Transport Infrastructure

38. Some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) whether the carrying capacities of the major transport facilities were able to cater for the transport demand generated by the proposed developments in KTS;
- (b) the reason for not recommending improvement works for Kam Sheung Road; and
- (c) whether park-and-ride facilities at KSRS would be enhanced to meet the needs of additional population.

39. In response, Mr Desmond C.K. Lam, CE/W1, CEDD, made the following main points with the aid of a PowerPoint slide:

- (a) with the change from 7-car trains to 8-car trains and an hourly frequency of 28 at each direction, the carrying capacity of WR would be increased by 60% comparing with the capacity in 2015, which would be able to cope with the transport demand generated by the proposed developments in KTS. For the longer term, the Government would carry out studies to examine the need for a new heavy rail directly connecting NWNT with the urban areas to meet the future rail service demand. Regarding road capacity, the traffic impact assessment had confirmed that with implementation of the road improvement measures, there would be no unacceptable traffic impact due to the proposed developments. Besides, the Government was undertaking feasibility studies for Route 11 to cope with the increase in traffic demand brought by the future population growth in the NWNT; and
- (b) Kam Sheung Road was constructed some time ago and did not comply with the current standard. Given there were many constraints for the widening of Kam Sheung Road including existing building structures

along the road, more time would be required to liaise with the local residents and resolve the technical issues. In response to the local concerns, a feasibility study had been conducted to review the feasibility of the traffic improvements scheme for Kam Sheung Road. While no widening works was proposed for Kam Sheung Road at the moment, the proposed development would not cause adverse traffic impacts after the implementation of a number of road improvement works, including widening a section of Kam Ho Road to a dual two-lane carriageway, and a section of Kam Tin Road Eastbound from two-lane to three-lane, as well as improving the interchange at Kam Tin Road/Kam Ho Road/ Kam Tin Bypass.

40. Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, supplemented that a public car park with 610 car parking spaces for park-and-ride purpose and 708 bicycle parking spaces would be provided at KSRS . To meet the local demand for public car parking spaces, relevant government departments would review the provision of parking spaces at the proposed public housing and GIC developments at the detailed design stage.

Noise impact

41. A Member asked how the traffic noise impact created by the road and railway network on Item A2 site could be addressed. In response, Ms Cindy S.Y. Lee, SPO1, HD, said that while Item A2 site was prone to noise impact, CEDD and HD had undertaken a preliminary Noise Impact Assessment and the result was agreed by the Environmental Protection Department. The potential noise impact could be addressed by design considerations such as building layout and setback, as well as the use of acoustic window/balcony. Mr Desmond C.K. Lam, CE/W1, CEDD, supplemented that noise barrier could be installed if necessary.

Compensation and Rehousing Arrangement

42. Some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) details of the enhanced compensation and rehousing arrangements for the

villagers affected by the Government's clearance exercises;

- (b) whether in-situ rehousing for the affected villagers was feasible; and
- (c) whether the affectees who were eligible for HKHA's subsidized housing could only choose the rehousing option in HKHS's dedicated rehousing estates under the enhanced measures.

43. As the compensation and rehousing arrangements were under the purview of Development Bureau, the Chairperson provided the following information:

- (a) the enhanced measures announced by the Government in May 2018 included the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for eligible domestic occupants in squatters and business undertakings affected by the Government's clearance exercises. Under the enhanced measures, the affected eligible households residing in surveyed/licenced structures continuously for at least seven years immediately preceding the pre-clearance survey and without ownership of other properties would be offered rehousing in the dedicated rehousing estates to be developed by HKHS without the comprehensive means test. For those affectees who were also owners of agricultural land, their land would be compensated separately in accordance with existing policies. Each case would be considered with reference to the relevant facts and circumstances;
- (b) given the land to be cleared was needed to facilitate new development, in-situ rehousing for the affectees would not be possible. However, a site had already been reserved in Hung Shui Kiu for the dedicated rehousing estate to be built and operated by HKHS. The affectees in KTS could be rehoused in the same district and estate, which could help to maintain the social network. The dedicated estate would offer both rental and subsidized sale flat units to the affectees; and
- (c) while one of the enhanced measures was to provide more rehousing option for those who were not eligible for HKHA's subsidized housing by offering dedicated estates to be operated by HKHS without means test

requirement, the current means-tested rehousing option of HKHA's flats would still be retained as an option for the eligible households. Specifically, if the eligible households had resided in the surveyed/licenced domestic structures continuously for at least two years immediately preceding the pre-clearance survey, they would continue to be eligible for rehousing to HKHA's flats subject to means test and other prevailing criteria.

44. In response to a Member's question on the number of people being affected by the proposed developments, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, said that according to a preliminary estimation, the proposed public housing and GIC developments would affect about 166 existing structures and 80 households. However, the exact number of structures and people that would be affected would be subject to detailed survey at a later stage.

Re-grant of Resumed Land

45. In response to a Member's question regarding the government's policy on the re-grant of resumed land, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, said that the land previously owned by R2 was resumed by the Government for road construction. According to LandsD, although some of the resumed land had not been used for road, the Government had the right to dispose of the land for appropriate uses and there was no obligation to offer the land back to the person from whom it was resumed. As for the re-grant application, it was noted that LandsD had not acceded to the application. Mr Chan Man Hon Dennis (representative of R2), supplemented that the letter of LandsD in 2014 did not indicate that the re-grant application was rejected, it only mentioned legal advice would need to be sought. He was of the view that the final decision had yet to be made by the Government.

Others

46. In response to a Member's question, Mr Desmond C.K. Lam, CE/W1, CEDD said that Ho Pui Stream was outside the boundary of the amendment items and the Government had no plan to revitalize the stream.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

47. As Members did not have any further questions, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. She thanked the government representatives as well as the representers/commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate the representations/comments in closed meeting and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives as well as the representers/commenters and their representatives left the meeting at this point.

48. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:40 p.m.

49. The meeting was resumed at 2:40 p.m.

50. 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 Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West)

Transport Department

Mr Patrick K.H. Ho

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Raymond W.M. Wong

Assistant Director/Regional 3, Lands Department

Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)

[Closed Meeting (Deliberation)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Kam Tin South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-KTS/14
(TPB Papers No. 10443)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Deliberation Session

51. The Chairperson said that the zoning amendments of the draft Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) mainly involved three sites proposed for public housing development. The issues on compensation and rehousing arrangements for affected parties were outside the scope of the OZP and the purview of the Board, and should be dealt separately by the Government. Besides, enhancements to the existing Agricultural Land Rehabilitation Scheme to assist those affected farmers were recently introduced by the Government in relation to the New Development Area (NDA) projects. The Chairperson then invited Members to express their views on the representations and comments.

Development Intensity

52. Some Members considered that the proposed maximum plot ratio (PR) of 3 for the three public housing sites were on the low side. They had the following views:

- (a) it was noted that after taking into account mainly the Shek Kong Airfield Height Restriction (SKAHR) and other development constraints, the PR of the proposed public housing developments was restricted to a maximum of 3. However, if the SKAHR was relaxed/removed and infrastructure capacity was enhanced in the long run, there would be scope to increase the PR of the public housing sites at the detailed design stage;

- (b) as the Government had been striving to make available new land to address the acute demand for housing units, consideration should be given to increasing the domestic PR at this stage so as to create capacity to cater for any future demands. Increasing the domestic PR at the representative sites would provide a much needed relief to the current acute housing land shortage;
- (c) instead of going through the statutory procedures again to amend the statutory plan in stages, it might be more time-efficient if the PR of the public housing sites was increased first, followed by a technical feasibility study to be conducted by the Government later;
- (d) if the PR of 3 stipulated in the OZP could be adopted as the minimum PR instead of the maximum PR, the Government could then choose to go for a higher PR when supporting technical assessments became available;
- (e) to enhance housing supply while preventing over expansion of developments into the rural area, the Government should maximise the development potential in the town centre area; and
- (f) the possibility of transferring the development intensity of Item A1 site to Item A3 site could be explored and there would be no reduction in the number of housing units if the aggregate development intensity remained the same. Residential development and agricultural use could co-exist, and Item A1 site, or at least part of the site, could be retained for agricultural use.

53. However, the Vice-chairperson and some Members considered that the proposed maximum PR of 3 was appropriate. They had the following views :

- (a) by making reference to the residential density for the traditional new towns, such as Sha Tin and Tseung Kwan O, which had a much higher PR, the current PR of 3 was on the low side. However, the town centre of Kam Tin South was akin to the rural township in non-urban areas, a

maximum PR of 3 was thus considered appropriate;

- (b) in view of the development constraints, including SKAHR, there might not be any potential for further increasing the development intensity in the near future;
- (c) the maximum PR of 3 was compatible with the adjacent station property developments as well as the surrounding rural landscape. Though it was important to increase housing supply, various infrastructures including drainage, sewerage and transport would need to commensurate with the associated population increase. Based on previous experiences, conducting detailed technical feasibility study for a large scale development often involved a lengthy process. It was inappropriate for the Board to increase the PR arbitrarily without duly considering its technical feasibility or else the Board's decision would be subject to challenge. Thus, it might be prudent not to increase the PR at this stage. Notwithstanding that, the project proponent could apply for minor relaxation of the stipulated PR with supporting technical assessments to facilitate the proposed public housing developments with a higher PR and the Board could then consider based on individual merits; and
- (d) the West Rail was rather congested at the moment. According to the TPB Papers No. 10443 (the Paper), the carrying capacity of the West Rail would be increased by 60% by 2019 when comparing with the capacity in 2015. Taking into account all the major planned developments in the North West New Territories, the estimated patronage during the morning peak hour would be higher than the increased carrying capacity based on the assumption of 4 persons per m². It might be hasty to increase the PR without a comprehensive feasibility study on traffic impact and transport demand or a plan to further increase the capacity of the public transport network in the region.

54. A Member pointed out that the maximum PR of 3 would allow a better living

environment and was appropriate for a rural town, while another Member considered that the physical form and design of the developments were more important than the density per se as they would contribute to the quality of life and living environment. With good planning and responsive urban design measures, the positive attributes of high-density development would be realised.

55. Some Members had the following views:

- (a) in view of an acute housing shortage in the ten-year period from 2018-19 to 2027-28, the use of the sites for public housing and the proposed development intensity as shown on the draft OZP were supported. Nonetheless, the Board should indicate clearly its support for making best use of land resources. The relevant departments should explore the feasibility to increase the PR and conduct the necessary technical assessments whenever there was room to so pursue. Specifically, the development intensity in the remaining nine sites identified under the Land Use Review for Kam Tin South and Pat Heung (LUR) could still be reviewed with a view to optimizing the use of scarce land resources, subject to assessments on the technical feasibility; and
- (b) should there be an increase in the PR of the proposed public housing sites, the infrastructure and public transport systems would also need to be improved to cater for the additional population. Jobs should be created in the area to encourage local employment.

56. The Chairperson, in concluding Members' discussion on development intensity said that since the three proposed public housing sites were located close to railway station, the development potential of these sites should be optimized. However, in view of the development constraints, including SKAHR, Members in general agreed that it would be inappropriate to increase the development intensity for the sites at this late stage without sufficient information on technical feasibility. Notwithstanding that, the development intensity of the remaining nine sites under the LUR could be further reviewed, subject to assessments on the technical feasibility.

[Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang, Daniel K.S. Lau, David Y.T. Lui and Stephen H.B. Yau left the meeting during the above discussion.]

Comprehensive Planning

57. Some Members had the following views on the planning of the area:

- (a) the rationale behind not amending the OZP in one-go was not clear. The previous rezoning of the two West Rail sites for private housing in 2015 and the current rezoning of three public housing sites appeared piecemeal and incomplete. The 14 potential housing sites identified in the LUR should be planned comprehensively;
- (b) the Board should consider the planning and development for the whole Kam Tin area in a holistic and comprehensive manner. In so doing, there would be greater scope to adopt better planning and design concepts for the effective use of land resources;
- (c) the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) was undertaking studies on the feasibility of using land at the periphery of the nearby Tai Lam Country Park for housing development. The proposals should not result in any conflict with the current and remaining land use proposals in the area, in particular in terms of infrastructural capacity;
- (d) the land use planning of Singapore had demonstrated successful balance between city landscape and development. Though the untouched land was much less than Hong Kong, the greenery provision in Singapore was more successful in shaping the city;
- (e) connectivity among the public housing sites and to the West Rail Station should be given priority in the detailed design of the sites. It was noted that more detailed information on connectivity among the planned public housing sites was provided during consideration of the Pok Fu Lam OZP;

- (f) traditional rural towns such as Shek Wu Hui and Luen Wo Hui consisted mainly of low-rise tenement blocks of about 7 storeys only, the proposed developments in Kam Tin South were not of such character; and
- (g) the surroundings of the Ho Pui Stream, which passed along Item A1 and A3 sites, were very nice and the water quality and landscape of the stream should be restored and be enhanced to facilitate the comprehensive planning for a riverside rural town. Concerned departments could consider rehabilitating the river channel and enhancing the river banks. Beautification work of the river course should be included in the public housing development. A successful example of rehabilitation of river in new town development was the Shing Mun River near Mei Lam Estate in Sha Tin.

58. The Chairperson and the Secretary provided the following information on the overall planning of the area:

- (a) the LUR was completed in 2014, under which a total of 14 potential housing sites had been identified. Broad technical assessments confirmed that development of the sites should have no insurmountable problem subject to infrastructure provision. In view of the infrastructure constraints, the sites would be implemented by phases. The two West Rail sites were rezoned first in 2015 as they were technically feasible and no land resumption/clearance of private land would be involved. For the remaining potential development sites, the LUR recommended that further studies for provision of supporting infrastructures in the area, in particular the need for an additional sewage treatment plant, should be conducted;
- (b) for the current three public housing sites, taking into account the advantage of their close proximity to the West Rail station and the future commercial/residential development thereat, as well as the infrastructural capacity in the area supported with the technical assessments, early

implementation could be allowed to meet the acute public housing demand;

- (c) planning brief(s) for the public housing developments would be prepared to set out the planning parameters and the design requirements of individual sites as well as the detailed technical studies to be undertaken by the Housing Department at the detailed design stage. Concerns on detailed planning and design concept including connectivity, greenery provision and Ho Pui Stream rehabilitation could be incorporated in the planning brief(s) and addressed at the detailed design stage;
- (d) for the public housing sites proposed in Pok Fu Lam, more detailed information on the vehicular accesses and pedestrian linkages were provided as the five sites were to serve as a package of major reception resources for Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment. Due to the site level differences, the five sites at Pok Fu Lam would need access improvement and had to be connected through a pedestrian network comprising footpaths, pedestrian crossing facilities and footbridges. The Kam Tin South area was predominantly low-lying flat land. Vehicular accesses and pedestrian linkages would be considered at the detailed design stage; and
- (e) the major purpose of the studies being undertaken by HKHS was to look into the feasibility of developing the fringe areas of Country Parks for public housing and non-profit-making elderly homes. The findings of the study would be submitted to the Government for consideration, which would facilitate discussion by the community in the future.

Rural/Urban Integration

59. Some Members had the following views as regards rural/urban integration:

- (a) Kam Tin, meaning 'beautiful fields', had a nice rural environment. The

Kam Tin South development should thus be different from a traditional new town. The area was one of the earliest residential settlements and an important agricultural area in Hong Kong. Almost half of organic farms in Hong Kong were currently located in the area. The existing rural character and local village community should be respected, and the existing agricultural activities and the organic farms in the area should be retained as far as possible;

- (b) consideration should be given to integrating the agricultural landscape into the township development and promotion of agricultural activities in the public housing sites. The provision of land for agricultural activities, such as community-based agriculture and hobby farming in the area, should be encouraged; and
- (c) conservation and agriculture were becoming more important considerations nowadays. With comprehensive planning, development was not always destructive if a balance could be achieved.

60. The Chairperson made the following points:

- (a) the Food and Health Bureau (FHB) and the Development Bureau would jointly commission a consultancy study on Agricultural Priority Areas to identify quality agricultural land and formulate suitable policies and measures to provide incentives to encourage using fallow agricultural land for agricultural use; and
- (b) the proposed Agri-Park would contribute to agricultural rehabilitation and serve to accommodate farmers displaced by government projects that took place within the same timeframe.

GIC Facilities

61. Some Members had the following views on the provision of GIC facilities:

- (a) besides housing need, there was also a strong demand of land for GIC facilities, in particular, there was concern on whether there was sufficient provision of elderly facilities in the area. The Government should adopt a more proactive approach to tackle the shortage of land for various GIC uses;
- (b) rezoning of two sites to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) was supported and more GIC facilities should be included into the three public housing developments; and
- (c) better design of the GIC sites would help enhance the image of the area, and the Government should design and plan the proposed GIC developments more innovatively.

62. The Chairperson said that elderly facilities were always permitted in “G/IC” zones. Besides, social welfare facilities were always permitted in the “Residential (Group A)” zones and the Director of Social Welfare would be invited to consider inclusion of specific social welfare facilities in the public housing projects during the detailed design stage. The Chairperson drew Members’ attention that social welfare facilities and other GIC facilities as required by the Government would be exempted from PR calculation as stipulated in the Notes of the “Residential (Group A)” zone on the OZP.

Compensation and Rehousing Arrangement

63. Some Members had the following views on the compensation and rehousing arrangement:

- (a) while the issue of compensation and reprovisioning was outside the scope of the Board, the Government should endeavour to ensure that the affected clearerees were properly taken care of; and
- (b) many residents in the area were elderly and had been living in the area for a long time. They could easily lose their social network and find it

difficult to get used to the new living environment after relocation. The public consultation process should ensure every affected clearnees would receive the relevant information and were well aware of the development/relocation programme. In-situ rehousing which only involved temporary relocation should be considered as most of the affected clearnees could not afford the high property price and rent, even for those subsidized flats provided by HKHS.

64. The Chairperson said that the Government had announced earlier in May 2018 the enhanced ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for eligible domestic occupants in squatters and business undertakings affected by Government's clearance exercises. The enhancements included the following major elements:

- (a) to offer non-means tested rehousing for affected eligible households residing in licenced structures for seven years preceding the pre-clearance survey to the dedicated rehousing estates to be developed by the HKHS and a site in Hung Shui Kiu had already been reserved for the affected clearnees in the Yuen Long district; retaining the current option of means-tested rehousing to subsidised flats by Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) for eligible households residing in licenced domestic structures for two years preceding the survey; and relaxing the eligibility criteria and increase the amount of ex-gratia cash allowances;
- (b) the farmers operating on the affected agricultural land could receive relevant ex-gratia allowances, including crop compensation as well as allowances for disturbance, farm structures, etc. The Government had introduced a special Agricultural Land Rehabilitation Scheme in relation to NDA projects under which the Government would proactively identify land suitable for agricultural rehabilitation, and carry out matching with the affected farmers;
- (c) FHB and Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) were reviewing the relaxation of the current restrictions on relocation of

poultry farms and would consult relevant stakeholders on the proposals in due course; and

- (d) apart from the present avenue of making statutory claims, the option of receiving ex-gratia allowances had been introduced for eligible business operators and the criteria were further relaxed. Some business operations on government land under short-term tenancies would also be eligible.

Other Issues

65. In response to a Member's question, the Chairperson said that public housing development included public rental housing, home ownership scheme, as well as other forms of subsidised housing.

66. In view of the increasing number of pet owners in Hong Kong, a Member asked if there was any special scheme to allow keeping of pets in the re-housing arrangement. In response, the Chairperson said that the residents in public housing estate were not allowed to keep dogs and cats. However, the flexibility to allow such within HKHS's dedicated rehousing estates could be further explored. In addition to the continuous handling of stray animals by AFCD, the Government would actively liaise with the animal welfare organisations to extend the network for re-homing services.

67. Members noted that the representers and commenters' other views and their proposals, including impact on transport and infrastructure, public consultation, technical assessment and implementation of mitigation measures, public-private joint partnership, re-granting of resumed land, as well as alternative housing supply and planning framework, etc. had been dealt with in sections 6.3 and 6.4 of the Paper. After discussion, Members generally agreed that there was no strong justification to amend the draft OZP to meet the adverse representations, and the major grounds of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting in the morning session.

68. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) noted that R315 to R317 had not provided any view on the proposed amendments; and
- (b) decided not to uphold R1 to R314 and R318 to R320, and considered that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet these representations for the following reasons :

“For all Representations

- (i) the sites of Items A1, A2, A3, B1 and B2 are considered suitable for public housing development and supporting Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities to meet the pressing housing need of the Long Term Housing Strategy’s target. Relevant technical assessments reveal that with mitigation measures in place, the proposed developments would not be subject to unacceptable environmental impacts nor generate unacceptable impacts in terms of traffic, ecological, environmental, landscape, infrastructure, air ventilation and visual aspects on the surrounding areas;

On Specific Grounds and Proposals

Impact on Transport Infrastructure

- (ii) the Traffic Impact Assessment has confirmed that the public housing and GIC developments at sites of Items A1, A2, A3, B1 and B2 will not cause unacceptable adverse traffic impact after the implementation of the proposed road improvement works. The West Rail Line service will be able to meet the demands during the peak hours at the busiest section (i.e. from Kam Sheung Road Station to Tsuen Wan West Station) of the West Rail (R5 to R9, R12, R14 to R16, R20, R21, R23 to R26, R31, R42, R45, R49, R52, R55 to R102, R104, R105, R107 to

R132, R134 to R165, R167 to R207, R210 to R282, R284 to R285, R287 to R289, R291 to R310, R312 to R314);

Affected Local Villagers/Residents, Farmers and Agricultural Land

- (iii) the Government will follow the established procedures in consulting those affected stakeholders and offer compensation, Ex-gratia Allowances and/or rehousing arrangements to the eligible affected parties (R8 to R51, R55 to R62, R64 to R190, R192 to R207, R209 to R289, R291 to R293, R295 to R314);

Provision of Supporting GIC and Parking Facilities

- (iv) adequate GIC facilities will be provided to serve the planned population and local community. Relevant government departments will review the provision of public vehicle park at the public housing and GIC developments at the detailed design stage (R5, R52, R304 and R320);

Public Consultation of the Proposed Public Housing Development

- (v) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the zoning amendments have been duly followed. The views received are duly considered and responded by the concerned Government bureaux/departments in the process. The exhibition of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance (R10, R15, R26, R39 to R41, R53, R62 and R226);

Technical Assessments & Implementation of Mitigation Measures

- (vi) technical assessments confirmed that the proposed development would not cause insurmountable problems on traffic, environmental and other infrastructural capacities. The Housing Department (HD) will refine the development scheme of the public housing developments at the detailed design stage and carry out necessary detailed technical

assessments and incorporate mitigation measures as required (R1 and R318);

Amendment Item A3

- (vii) Item A3 is to take forward the public housing development thereat to meet the pressing public housing demand and is in the public interest. The planning of the site is already at an advanced stage with its rezoning process initiated. Using whole or part of the site for private housing development/or other development will affect the public housing production (R2, R3 and R38);

Public Engagement of Land Use Review for Kam Tin South and Pat Heung (LUR)

- (viii) the LUR was a district-based land use review and public consultation including briefings for Kam Tin Rural Committee, Pat Heung Rural Committee, Yuen Long District Council, local farmers, villagers, green groups and concerned groups had been conducted. For the current rezoning amendments, the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public have been duly followed (R1 and R8);

Other Potential Housing Sites - Development Intensity & Rezoning in One-go

- (ix) the proposed development intensity of the remaining nine potential sites housing identified in the LUR have taken into account the development constraints and the findings of technical assessments. Further increase in development intensity of the area will be subject to further technical assessments. Besides, technical assessments have not yet been conducted to support the rezoning of the remaining sites (R1, R3, R4 and R8);

Local Employment Opportunity

- (x) the supporting commercial and community facilities at the two West Rail sites and sites of Items A1, A2, A3, B1 and B2, as well as the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area near Kam Tin and Pat Heung would

generate new job opportunities. This will bring more jobs closer to the residents in the North West New Territories region (R8, R14, R21, R23 to R26, R55 to R105, R107 to R132, R134 to R146, R148 to R190, R192 to R205, R207, R210 to R225, R227 to R246, R248 to R250, R252 to R259, R261 to R282, R284 to R285, R287 to R289, R291 to R293, R295 to R300, R302 to R314);

Other Sources of Housing Supply

- (xi) the Government has adopted a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply, and has been pressing ahead with various initiatives to meet the land requirements. The Government would continue to identify other potential housing sites (R10, R17 to R19, R22, R26, R50, R51, R290); and

Public-private Joint Development

- (xii) since the Government has yet to make a decision on the introduction of a Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Scheme and work out the details, it would be premature to evaluate the representers' proposal from the perspective of a PPP Scheme (R2, R3 and R4)."

69. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:30 p.m..