

**Minutes of 1274th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 22.6.2022**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr C.H. Hau

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

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

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West
Transport Department
Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung

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

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

Director of Lands
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo

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

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

The Draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/FSSE/C – Further Consideration of a New Plan

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The Secretary reported that the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/FSSE/C (draft OZP) was to take forward the recommendations of the Task Force of Land Supply on partial development of the Fanling Golf Course (FGC) for housing development and the findings of the ‘Technical Study on Partial Development of FGC Site – Feasibility Study’ (the Technical Study) which was commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The draft OZP covered the 32 hectares (ha) of the FGC to the east of Fam Kam Road (the Area), and part of the Area was proposed for public housing to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) with the Housing Department (HD) as the executive arm. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai - being a Member of HKHA;
(as Director of Lands)

Mr Paul Y.K. Au - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs
(as Chief Engineer who was a member of the Strategic Planning
(Works), Home Affairs Committee and Subsidized Housing Committee of
Department) HKHA;

Dr C.H. Hau - conducting contract research projects with CEDD;

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHA;

Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and
Tender Committee of HKHA;

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau] being a member of Hong Kong Housing Society
Ms Lilian S.K. Law] (HKHS) which had discussion with HD on housing
development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS which had
discussion with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS
which had discussion with HD on housing
development issues; and
- Mr L.T. Kwok - his serving organization currently renting premises in
various estates of HKHA at concessionary rent for
welfare services, and formerly operating a social
service team which was supported by HKHA and
openly bid funding from HKHA.

2. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered an apology for being not able to attend the meeting and Mr Franklin Yu had not yet joined the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed public housing development on the draft OZP was proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of the above Members on the item only needed to be recorded and the above Members could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The following representatives of PlanD were invited to the meeting at this point:

- Mr Anthony K.O. Luk - District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui &
Yuen Long East (DPO/FS&YLE)
- Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung - Senior Town Planner/Fanling & Sheung Shui

4. The Chairperson said that on 17.6.2022, the draft OZP for the Area was submitted for Members' consideration and agreement. At that meeting, Members had no objection to adopting the proposed "Residential (Group A)" zone for public housing development in Sub-Area 1 as the basis for plan exhibition but expressed some concerns on the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Recreation cum Conservation" ("OU (Recreation cum Conservation)") zone for Sub-Areas 2 to 4. Some Members considered that more weight should be given to conservation than recreation in the planning intention of the proposed "OU (Recreation cum Conservation)" zone. As for the schedule of uses under the zone, given that the golf course, which was an existing use, was not incompatible with the conservation intention, it was reasonable to maintain it under Column 1, whereas other Column 1 and 2 uses should be refined to limit the passive recreational uses to those which would not compromise the conservation intention. In the light of the above, the Board agreed that the respective Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft OZP should be revised and submitted to the Board for further consideration. Taking into account the comments expressed, PlanD had revised the Notes and ES of the draft OZP which had been provided to Members prior to the meeting and the same with two more plans were tabled as well. Members were invited to further consider whether the draft OZP and its revised Notes and ES were suitable for exhibition for public inspection pursuant to the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The statutory public consultation procedure in the plan-making process would be carried out accordingly upon exhibition of the OZP. A hearing would be arranged for the Board's consideration of the representations and comments on the representations in respect of the draft OZP. The Board's decision would then be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council for approval. She then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the revisions made to the draft OZP.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi joined the meeting at this point.]

5. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, made the following main points:

- (a) in response to Members' comments on the "OU (Recreation cum Conservation)" zone, revisions to the Notes and ES of the zone were proposed;
- (b) the revised Notes:

- (i) the name of the zone was revised to “OU (Conservation cum Recreation)” to better reflect the main planning intention to conserve Sub-Areas 2 to 4;
 - (ii) Column 1 uses of the “OU” zone were reviewed according to three principles: (i) with reference to the Master Schedule of Uses for “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zone, suitable uses namely ‘Nature Reserve’, ‘Nature Trail’ and ‘Wild Animals Protection Area’ uses were adopted; (ii) existing use and its associated operations and uses including ‘Golf Course’, ‘Park and Garden’ and ‘Picnic Area’ uses would be allowed; and (iii) Government uses and facilities which were compatible with the conservation intention and supported the conservation and recreation functions, namely ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ and ‘Public Convenience’ would be allowed;
 - (iii) relatively active recreational uses and larger Government facilities such as ‘Government Use’ and ‘Public Utility Installation’ were put under Column 2 where planning permission from the Board would be required, so that the Board could control and monitor any such uses in this ecologically sensitive area;
 - (iv) the planning intention of the “OU” zone was revised to allow only passive recreational uses which were compatible with the conservation intention and which would serve the general public;
- (c) the revised ES:
- (i) in response to Members’ comments that elaborations of the ecological resources and natural habitats to be preserved should be incorporated, the Habitat Map was appended to the revised draft ES as Figure 2. The map could serve as a reference to the future operator for preservation of the important habitats including the woodland, watercourse and swampy woodland;

- (ii) in response to Members' concern on the traffic condition in the Area and the suggestion of setting out the relevant measures, relevant details including the proposed Po Shek Wu Road Flyover (the Flyover) as a traffic improvement measure were set out in the revised ES. Upon completion of the Flyover, some traffic to Fanling Highway would be diverted without entering Po Shek Wu Road Interchange and hence there would be spare road capacity to support additional housing developments in the North District including the proposed public housing development in Sub-Area 1;
- (iii) the relevant parts of the ES in respect of the "OU" zone were amended in accordance with the above-mentioned revisions; and
- (d) subject to the Board's agreement to the above-mentioned revisions to the Notes and ES, the OZP would be exhibited for public inspection pursuant to the Ordinance.

[Mr Franklin Yu and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

6. As PlanD's presentation had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

Planning Intention and Schedule of Uses for the "OU" Zone

7. While recognising the proposed revisions were to strike a balance between conservation and passive recreational use, a Member expressed concern on whether such revisions might be perceived by the public as arbitrary without solid grounds. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, explained that for some standard zonings, such as "Residential (Group A)", general reference was made to the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN) in determining the Column 1 and Column 2 uses. For "OU" zoning, the Board had the authority to decide on the suitable uses based on relevant considerations. As for the subject "OU" zone, the determination of Column 1 and Column 2 uses was based on the ecological values of the Sub-Areas ascertained by technical assessments and was not an arbitrary decision. The Chairperson supplemented that it had been an established procedure

for PlanD to consult the Board and take on board Members' comments where appropriate prior to the exhibition of OZPs. The conservation intention for the Area had already been incorporated into the draft OZP, and the Board considered in the last meeting that such intention could be made more explicit for the better understanding of the public. Hence, making revisions to the draft OZP in response to Members' comments, and with justifications as presented by PlanD, was perfectly legitimate.

8. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the definition of 'Government Use';
- (b) the definition of 'Government Refuse Collection Point', and whether it would be of a large size;
- (c) the definition of 'Wild Animals Protection Area', and whether the tortoises being reared by the Hong Kong Golf Club (HKGCC) would be affected by such provision; and
- (d) the definition of 'Golf Course', and as part of the Area would be developed for public housing, whether the remaining portion would still be regarded as a golf course in view of the reduced scale and number of holes.

9. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Definition of Terms (DoT) used in statutory plans, 'Government Use' meant 'any place, structure or premises used directly in connection with or in support of Government administration, or the provision of Government services and facilities for use by and for the benefit of the public'. It included, for example, 'Fire Station' and 'Police Station'. While the Area would generally be served by the committed and planned Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in the vicinity, taking into account the ecological consideration, 'Government Use' was put under Column 2 to provide flexibility for serving future needs. Any such

development should be supported by technical assessments and planning permission from the Board would be required;

- (b) ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ meant a place for storage of waste for disposal. It could be relatively large in scale and cause environmental nuisance so that planning permission from the Board would be required. The Area would be served by the existing refuse collection points in the vicinity and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department had no plan for providing a new refuse collection point within the Area at this juncture. The provision in the “OU” zone was to provide flexibility for serving future needs;
- (c) according to the DoT, ‘Wild Animals Protection Area’ meant ‘any place specified under the Wild Animals Protection Ordinance (Cap. 170) for the protection of wild animals and where entry by or presence of any person was restricted’. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department had the authority to delineate a particular area as a wild animals protection area pursuant to the said ordinance and to restrict the entry and operation hours of such area, and Mai Po Marshes Restricted Area was an example. Given that it was a Column 1 use under “CA” zone, it was considered appropriate to put it as a Column 1 use for the “OU” zone as well. The concerned tortoises currently reared by the HKGC were located outside the Area and would not be covered or affected by this provision; and
- (d) with reference to the DoT, ‘Golf Course’ meant ‘a large area of land where golf was played’ irrespective of the number of holes within the golf course. The existing golf course in the remaining part of the Area would still be regarded as ‘Golf Course’ use.

10. In response to the question concerning the tortoises, a Member supplemented that the Wild Animals Protection Ordinance was intended to control human activities but not animals within the protection areas.

11. In response to a Member’s question on whether ‘Golf Course’ use was compatible with the conservation intention, a Member said that many golf courses overseas were located

within conservation areas and there were literatures proving that golf courses could contribute to nature conservation.

12. Having noted that the Area with the existing golf course would be returned to the Government upon expiry of the land lease, a Member expressed concern on whether it was appropriate to put 'Golf Course' use under Column 1 of the "OU" zone. In response, the Chairperson said that as pointed out in the last meeting, the discussion should focus on the land uses of the OZP rather than the future management of the Area. Being an existing use that was not incompatible with the conservation intention, the golf course use should be respected. It had been a practice generally adopted in the plan-making process. On the contrary, it appeared unreasonable to exclude an existing use which was compatible with the planning intention.

13. A Member was of view that it was possible for the general public to mix up the FGC and 'Golf Course' use with the HKGC. The use of terminology should be mindful. In response, the Chairperson said that the subject matter of the discussion was golf course as a land use as defined under the DoT but not the HKGC or any golf club operator.

14. Noting that 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' allowing educational programmes on the environment was incorporated as a Column 1 use under the "OU" zone, a Member enquired whether the planning intention should be further refined to reflect such education purpose. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, said that the revised planning intention was primarily to set out the conservation intention and that passive recreational uses compatible with such intention would be allowed. Educational programmes for schools were currently arranged by the HKGC, and similar programmes could be allowed in future with such provision under the "OU" zone. Specifying the education purpose in the planning intention was considered not essential. The Chairperson remarked that in general, the planning intention was to set out the primary objective of the respective land use zone but not to reflect all its Column 1 uses exhaustively.

'Picnic Area' Use

15. A Member, who considered the revisions to the Notes and ES appropriate, asked whether 'Picnic Area' use would attract too many visitors to the Area which might in turn

contravene the conservation intention. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, said that 'Picnic Area' use referred to a place for outing at which food was usually taken in open air and for the enjoyment of the general public. As shown in a photo of Hong Kong Open (a golf tournament) in the FGC, an area was used for picnic during the event. Given that it was an existing operation of the golf course and compatible with the conservation intention, 'Picnic Area' was put under Column 1 for the "OU" zone. The Chairperson supplemented that according to the MSN of "CA" zone, 'Picnic Area' use was a Column 1 use with a remark that it could be added to the OZPs where appropriate. Given that such use was generally adopted as Column 1 use under "CA" zone on other OZPs and the Area would be put under the Government's management, it was considered appropriate to put 'Picnic Area' use under Column 1 of the "OU" zone.

16. A Member, who appreciated PlanD's effort of revising the Notes and ES of the OZP in response to Members' comments, also expressed concern that 'Picnic Area' and 'Park and Garden' uses might lead to an influx of visitors to the Area designated for conservation purpose, causing adverse impacts on the habitats with ecological importance. With such area situated at a location more accessible than Inspiration Lake Recreation Centre of the Hong Kong Disneyland which was a popular picnic area, the number of visitors to the area should be controlled. In response, the Chairperson pointed out that as written in paragraph 12.2.2 of the draft ES regarding the "OU" zone, mitigation measures including control over the number of visitors and activities, and access control to features of conservation importance would be considered with a view to achieving the conservation objective of the zone.

Tree Preservation and Compensation

17. A Member raised questions on preservation of trees of conservation importance within Sub-Area 1 and whether those trees would be specified on the OZP. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that according to the Tree Survey of the Technical Study, among the 1,255 trees in Sub-Area 1, there were 70 trees of particular interest including 46 rare/protected species, and 14 of which were recommended to be retained in-situ while the remaining 32 were to be transplanted. None of the 46 rare/protected species would need to be removed. While normally the details of tree preservation proposal would not be specified on the OZP and in its Notes, the Habitat Map would be incorporated into the revised ES of the draft OZP for reference. HD would take into

account the Habitat Map and the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to preserve those trees as far as practicable during the detailed design stage and implementation of the public housing project. Also, a planning brief of the public housing development would be prepared, in which the tree preservation requirements would be specified. The Chairperson added that following the practice of other OZPs, the principle of preserving species of conservation importance was incorporated into the ES of the draft OZP, but not the details of the tree preservation proposal which were available in the relevant report of the Technical Study and would be specified in the planning brief.

18. A Member enquired on the locations of woodland compensation planting. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the potential reception sites for compensated trees would be located at the turfgrass nursery areas and the fairways of the golf course within Sub-Areas 2 and 3. The specific locations of woodland compensation planting would be determined subject to future site planning and detailed design. Relevant guidelines, including, among others, tree compensation at a ratio of 1:1, would be duly followed. In response to the Chairperson's follow-up question, Mr Luk said that the proposed preliminary locations of woodland compensation planting, which were recommended in the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA), would not be indicated on the draft OZP.

19. A Member had the following observations and comments on the OZP from the tree preservation and compensation perspective:

- (a) the Area was characterised by precious large trees but the protection of which was not featured in the planning intention or the Remarks of the "OU" zone. While there was prevailing mechanism for tree preservation, it was considered desirable to further elaborate on this aspect in the relevant part of the OZP for future reference;
- (b) according to the Tree Survey, about 1,000 trees within Sub-Area 1 would be affected by proposed development thereat, particularly in the area where the playgrounds of the proposed special school would be sited. Whilst mitigation measures were proposed to retain the trees of conservation importance as far as possible, the layout of the proposed developments

should be further improved to minimise the extent of tree felling and to avoid the felling of large trees;

- (c) trees with Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) of 1m or above were identified as large and mature trees in the EIA. However, it was uncommon to find trees with DBH of 1m or above in Hong Kong and the criterion of DBH for mature trees should thus be adjusted from 1m to 500mm. If the criterion was adjusted, more large and mature trees of the Area could be preserved;
- (d) with regard to the tree compensation proposal, while the ratio of 1:1 was a planting criterion in accordance with the relevant technical circular, it was just the basic compensation requirement in terms of number set out therein. If the basic requirement could be met and sufficient growing space for tree planting could be identified, it was also specified in the circular that ‘further planning and design consideration with an objective to achieve the compensatory planting ratio of 1:1 in terms of aggregated DBH, i.e. the total DBH of planted trees to have the same total DBH of removed trees should be undertaken as far as practicable’. Since there should be sufficient growing space for tree planting within the Area, the compensation ratio of 1:1 in terms of aggregated DBH should be considered or justifications should be given otherwise; and
- (e) for the species of compensatory tree planting, in addition to the native ones, species with large ultimate DBH, such as Banyan Tree and Camphor Tree (DBH up to 1m) should also be considered in order to effectively maintain the site character.

20. In relation to the Member’s first comment regarding tree preservation and compensation, the Chairperson enquired whether the principle of preserving or transplanting those precious large trees in a cautious manner could be incorporated into the revised Notes or ES of the OZP. Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, supplemented that for some special zonings like “CA” and “Site of Special Scientific Interest”, trees of conservation importance would be specified in the ES of the respective zone if needed. Given that the “OU” site was Government land which would be handed over to the Government, the established

practice of tree preservation and compensation would be duly followed. Should the Board consider it appropriate to elaborate on this aspect as discussed, the relevant part of the revised ES could be suitably amended to reflect such an aspect. Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, added that the Habitat Map would be appended to the revised ES and the need for preserving the important habitats including the woodland, watercourse and swampy woodland had been specified in the ES. If Members considered that the preservation of large trees should also be highlighted, the revised ES could be further refined as appropriate.

21. A Member shared the Member's views concerning the impact of the layout of the proposed development on the existing trees within Sub-Area 1. Taking into account the history and ecological importance of the Area, the building design and disposition of the proposed development should be more sensitive in order to minimise the impact on the ecological features. With reference to Plan 10 of TPB Paper No. 18044, the layout of the proposed housing development should be modified with varied built forms in response to the micro ecology of the Area. For instance, the future design of the proposed social welfare facilities could incorporate a courtyard to preserve the affected large tree.

Ecological Considerations

22. A Member, whilst considering the revised Column 1 and Column 2 uses of the "OU" zone compatible with the conservation intention, said that the revised ES might not clearly explain why only Sub-Area 1 was proposed for development with the remaining sub-areas reserved for conservation purpose, having noted that the Area was one of the land supply options recommended by the Task Force on Land Supply for public housing development and there was public aspiration for providing housing at the Area. Although the EIA had recommended that Sub-Areas 2 to 4 were an integral part in the ecology of the Area which should be conserved together as a whole, especially for the protection of the Chinese Swamp Cypress which was a Class I protected species in China and an endangered species, the information of the ecological value of "Moderate" for Sub-Areas 2 and 3 and "Moderate to High" for Sub-Area 4 as mentioned in the revised ES could not reflect the said critical ecological considerations and the need to conserve the integrity of Sub-Areas 2 to 4. To highlight this ecological consideration for the formulation of the OZP, the relevant paragraphs of the revised ES should be refined.

23. The Chairperson said that reference should be made to the findings of the EcoIA of the EIA for the interpretation of the ecological values of the Sub-Areas. As pointed out by the Member, it appeared that presenting the ecological values alone (e.g. “Moderate”) without details of the assessment in the revised ES might not be effective to reflect the ecological importance of the concerned areas. In this regard, the Chairperson enquired and Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, explained that according to the EcoIA, the assessment and classification of the ecological values of the Sub-Areas were based on the Technical Memorandum on Environmental Impact Assessment Process (the TM). The ecological findings of Sub-Areas 2 to 3 and that of Sub-Area 4 were detailed in Paragraphs 8.2.4 and 8.2.5 respectively in the revised ES. The Member’s concern on conserving Sub-Areas 2 to 4 as a whole had been featured in the last sentence of paragraph 8.2.5. The swampy woodland in Sub-Area 4 was located at a low-lying area with a site level difference of about 8m from Fan Kam Road. The unique environment was conducive to catching and storing water for nurturing the swampy woodland. In this connection, the EcoIA emphasised that the proposed development should not cause any disturbance to the hydrology in the Area and no adverse impacts on the hydrology of the swampy woodland should be caused. Sub-Areas 2 to 4 should be regarded as an integral entity of ecological importance. The above key information concerning Sub-Areas 2 to 4 was highlighted in paragraphs 8.2.5 and 8.2.6 accordingly, despite that the ecological value of Sub-Areas 2 and 3 was “Moderate” as mentioned in paragraph 8.2.4.

24. Another Member said that while the categorisations of ecological values of “Low to Moderate”, “Moderate” and “Moderate to High” came from the EIA mechanism, there was no definition of these values in the TM. The values were concluded based on the consultant’s expertise with reference to the evaluation criteria set out in the TM which could be subjective. For instance, with the endangered Chinese Swamp Cypress found in Sub-Area 4, it might be arguable that the ecological value of the Sub-Area identified as “Moderate to High” should be “High” instead. Therefore, it was not necessary to include these categorisations on ecological values of the Sub-Areas in the revised ES. Rather, consideration could be given to highlighting the species of ecological importance in the revised ES to justify the planning considerations for the Area.

25. The Chairperson remarked that to facilitate the general public, and not only the ecological experts, to comprehend the ecological considerations of the “OU” zone, the drafting of the ES should not be too technical. While details of assessment on the ecological aspect

were available in the EIA report, it was more appropriate to give an account of the species of ecological importance identified in the Sub-Areas, based on which the planning intention of conservation was derived. The Chairperson suggested and Members agreed to revise the respective paragraphs in the revised ES as discussed. The Vice-chairperson, while supporting the suggestion to delete the descriptive categorisations on ecological values of Sub-Areas, reminded that such approach should be consistently applied in the future plan-making process. If there was any OZP already having similar information in its ES, such information should be deleted when opportunity arose. Another Member advised that the deletion of the categorisations on ecological values from the draft ES would not compromise the understanding of the ecological considerations of the Area since there was a conclusion provided in paragraph 8.2.6.

26. Noting that the “OU” zone covered not only Sub-Areas 2 to 4 but also a minor portion of Sub-Area 1, a Member suggested that the coverage of the “OU” zone be clearly described in the revised ES to avoid confusion.

27. A Member expressed concern that the compensatory tree planting at a ratio of 1:1 within Sub-Areas 2 and 3 might result in a change to the existing ecological character (i.e. from mainly turfgrass with tree clusters at the fringes to a dense woodland), and subsequently affect the hydrology of the Area and the well-being of Chinese Swamp Cypress. Hence, the tree compensation proposal should be enhanced in the detailed design stage. Also, to avoid disturbance to the swampy woodland, the site level difference between Fan Kam Road and Sub-Area 4 and the natural terrain of the Area should not be affected by the proposed development and road works. The Member further enquired whether the area of the potential ecological corridor adjacent to Sub-Area 4 would impose adverse impact on the swampy woodland. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the proposed locations of compensatory tree planting as mentioned above were preliminary for the conduction of the EIA and could be adjusted in the detailed design stage. Given the sensitivity of the swampy woodland, the tree compensation proposal would be further developed in the detailed design stage taking into account the hydrology in the Area. Suitable locations within and/or outside the Area would be identified for tree compensation planting. As shown on the plan of the tree compensation proposal, there would be no tree planting within Sub-Area 4. With regard to the potential ecological corridor adjacent to Sub-Area 4, it fell within Ping Kong area where currently was covered by woodland and no development was

expected. It would not affect the conservation intention of the “OU” zone. Another Member supplemented that, theoretically, if there was no earth movement involved in the tree compensatory planting, the hydrology would not be affected. With more trees planted, the water storage capacity in the area would be higher and was favourable to the habitat of swampy woodland. It was also noted that there was a drainage outlet to control the water flow between Chinese Swamp Cypress and the adjacent retention lake. In view of the above, it was not anticipated that the compensatory tree planting in Sub-Areas 2 and 3 would affect the hydrology of the Area and in turn the swampy woodland.

Proposed Development in “R(A)” Zone

28. Noting from Figure 1 of the revised draft ES that there was a narrow gap between the southeastern boundary of the “R(A)” zone and the hatched line delineating Sub-Area 1, a Member enquired whether it was essential to maintain the gap or technical adjustment of the line could be made for better presentation. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, with the aid of a visualiser, said that Sub-Area 1 would not be entirely used for public housing development and a minor eastern portion was earmarked for the protection of the existing green knoll. The delineation of Sub-Areas was to facilitate the conduct of the EIA and EcoIA. The key plan of Sub-Areas in Figure 1 was intended to facilitate the comprehension of the descriptions of Sub-Areas in the revised ES, whereas for the delineation of the zoning boundary, the OZP should be referred to. Regarding the concerned narrow gap, the hatched line could be adjusted to align with the zoning boundary for better presentation.

29. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the whole area of Sub-Area 1 was included in the calculation of the gross floor area (GFA) of the public housing development; and
- (b) whether the proposed public vehicle park in the “R(A)” zone could cater for the demand from organising international golf events such as Hong Kong Open.

30. Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, made the following main points:

- (a) the portion of Sub-Area 1 zoned “OU” was excluded from the calculation of GFA of the proposed public housing development; and
- (b) according to paragraph 11.1.5 of the revised ES for the “R(A)” zone, the planning of public vehicle park should as far as practicable take into account the demand for public parking spaces generated by the holding of local and international sports events in the FGC nearby. Reference would also be made to the existing parking spaces (about 280) available at the open-air car park of the FGC.

Traffic

31. Regarding the elaboration of the proposed Flyover in paragraph 8.2.7 in the revised ES in response to Members’ comments, Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West clarified that the proposed Flyover allowed south-bound traffic, instead of north-south bound of Po Shek Wu Road to connect with Fanling Highway west-bound directly, without entering the roundabout, and should be revised accordingly. The Chairperson said that PlanD would liaise with TD for amendments.

32. The Chairperson concluded that Members supported the commencement of plan exhibition on the basis of the draft OZP, the revised Notes and ES proposed by PlanD, subject to the incorporation of the following refinements to the revised ES prior to exhibition:

- (a) to specify that the “OU” zone covered part of Sub-Area 1 and Sub-Areas 2 to 4;
- (b) to emphasise that the plant species of ecological importance should be conserved as far as possible. This principle of ecological consideration should be incorporated before the section on land use zonings as it was applicable to the Area as a whole rather than a particular land use zone; and
- (c) the descriptive wordings on categorisations of ecological values in paragraphs 8.2.3 to 8.2.5 could be deleted, given that the descriptions were too general and could be interpreted out of context. After all, details of the

ecological findings and conclusion were available in the EIA report. Relevant parts of the revised ES should be elaborated to highlight the species of ecological importance identified in the Area and the planning intention for conservation. If there was concern on the consistency amongst OZPs, the wordings of categorisations of ecological values could be maintained, but the meaning of which should be specified in the revised ES. To avoid misinterpretation of these technical terms, the suggested deletion was preferred.

[Post Meeting Note: a Member, who was unable to attend the meeting, had put forward comments in writing before the meeting. With the revised Notes and ES of the OZP, the Member agreed that the draft OZP and its Notes and the ES were suitable for public inspection.]

[Professor Roger C.K. Chan joined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

33. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to:

- “(a) agree that the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (to be renumbered as S/FSSE/1 upon gazetting) and its revised Notes are suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area OZP (to be renumbered as S/FSSE/1 upon gazetting) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and agree that the revised ES is suitable for exhibition for public inspection together with the draft OZP and issued under the name of the Board.”

34. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 2

Any Other Business

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

35. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:05 p.m.