1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 4.7.2024.

2. The following Members and the Secretary were present in this session of the meeting:

Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) Ms Doris P.L. Ho	Chairperson
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu	Vice-chairperson
Mr Daniel K.S. Lau	
Mr K.W. Leung	
Professor Roger C.K. Chan	
Dr Venus Y.H. Lun	
Mr Ben S.S. Lui	
Mr Timothy K.W. Ma	
Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui	
Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan	
Dr C.M. Cheng	
Mr Daniel K.W. Chung	
Mr Rocky L.K. Poon	
Professor B.S. Tang	
Professor Simon K.L. Wong	
Mr Simon Y.S. Wong	

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 1 (continued)

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft San Tin Technopole Outline Zoning Plan No. S/STT/1, the Draft Mai Po and Fairview Park Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-MP/7 and the Draft Ngau Tam Mei Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-NTM/13
(TPB Paper No. 10973)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English]

3. The Chairperson said that the meeting was to continue the hearing of representations in respect of the draft San Tin Technopole Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/STT/1 (STT OZP), the draft Mai Po and Fairview Park OZP No. S/YL-MP/7 (MP OZP) and the draft Ngau Tam Mei OZP No. S/YL-NTM/13 (NTM OZP) (collectively the draft OZPs).

4. The Secretary reported that Members' declaration of interests had been made in the morning session of the hearing on 28.6.2024 and was recorded in the relevant minutes of meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The following government representatives (including the consultants), representers and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Development Bureau (DEVB)

Mr Vic C.H. Yau	-	Director, Northern Metropolis Coordination Office (D of NMCO)
Mr Eric T.H. Chung	-	Assistant Secretary (Northern Metropolis)

Environment and Ecology Bureau

Mr Simon S.W. Wang	-	Principal Manager (Conservation in Northern Metropolis)

Innovation, Technology and Industry Bureau (ITIB)

Ms Vicky Cheung	-	Principal Assistant Secretary for Innovation, Technology and Industry (PAS(ITI))
Miss Kristy H.L. Chan	-	Senior Management Services Officer (Innovation, Technology and Industry)

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr K.W. Ng	-	District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East, and Acting Assistant Director of Planning/New Territories (AD/NT)
Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu	-	Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East
Mr Timothy Y.M. Lui	-	Senior Town Planner/Studies and Research
Miss Karen K.Y. Chan	]	Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long
Mr Louis H.W. Cheung	]	East

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Tony K.L. Cheung	-	Project Manager (North) (PM(N))
Mr Gavin C.P. Wong	-	Chief Engineer/North (CE/N)
Ms Teresa O.S. Ma	-	Senior Engineer

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

Mr Simon K.F. Chan	-	Assistant Director (Conservation) (AD(C))

Mr Boris S.P. Kwan	-	Senior Nature Conservation Officer (North)
Dr Evelyne S.L. Kuo	-	Conservation Officer (Wetland)

AECOM Asia Company Limited

Mr Martin M.T. Law	]	
Ms Becky S.M. Wong	]	
Ms H.L. Li	]	
Ms Anna Y.M. Chung	]	Consultants
Ms Avery T.Y. Lam	]	
Ms Hazel W.N. Yun	]	
Mr C.L. Yuen	]	

Representers and Representers' Representatives

R3 of STT OZP – 香港資訊科技聯會

Chan Wai Kwok Kenneth	-	Representer's representative

R6 of STT OZP – 思路研究會

Mr Wang Hao	-	Representer's Representative

R9 of STT OZP – 嘉湖民生事務會

R20 of STT OZP – 湛家雄議員

Mr Cham Ka Hung Daniel	-	Representer and Representer's Representative

R14 of STT OZP – 元朗青年商會

Mr Tang Kwok Pong	]	
Mr Wong Kwok Hei	]	Representer's Representatives
Mr Ng Kun Fung Matthew	]	

Mr Tse Pui To]

R17 of STT OZP and R2 of MP OZP – System Link Development Limited

R81 of STT OZP – 符傳富

Mr Yue Lit Fung Owen - Representer and Representer's Representative

R24 of STT OZP – 冼漢廸

Mr Hendrick Sin - Representer

R31 of STT OZP – Chien Kwok Keung Kenny

Mr Chien Kwok Keung Kenny - Representer

R58 of STT OZP – Lam Ka Fai Francis

Mr Lam Ka Fai Francis - Representer

R64 of STT OZP – 鄭振華

Mr Cheng Chun Wah Gary - Representer

R69 of STT OZP – Chiu Duncan

Hon Duncan Chiu - Representer

Ms Millet So - Representer's Representative

R78 of STT OZP – Luk Wai Lam William

Mr Luk Wai Lam William - Representer

R88 of STT OZP – The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Mr Chan Chak Bun] Representer's Representatives

Mr Lee Chi Chung Wilson]

Ms Chan Chui Yi]

R90 of STT OZP – Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design

Mr Cheung Hoi Fo	-	Representer's Representative

R91 of STT OZP – The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

Ms Pang Chor Kiu Valerie	]	Representer's Representatives
Mr Ian Thomas Brownlee	]	

R93 of STT OZP – Birkenhead Properties & Investments Limited

Ms Wong Pui Sai	-	Representer's Representative

R94 of STT OZP and R1 of MP OZP – Topcycle Development Limited

Ms Kira Loren Whitman	]	Representer's Representatives
Mr Ian Thomas Brownlee	]	

R95 of STT OZP – 立法會議員劉國勳

Hon Lau Kwok Fan	-	Representer

R96 of STT OZP – Ho Chi-Keung Frankie

Ho Chi-Keung Frankie	-	Representer

R101 of STT OZP – Ching Yuk Yu Eugene

Mr Ching Yuk Yu Eugene	-	Representer

R102 of STT OZP – Melody Gain Limited; Clanville Developments Limited

Mr Kenneth To	]	Representer's Representatives
Mr Alvin Lee	]	
Ms Gladys Ng	]	
Mr Poon Wai Lun Alan	]	

R1025 of STT OZP – 韓焯彥

Mr Hong Cheuk In	-	Representer

R3 of MP OZP – Profit Point Enterprises Limited

Mr Poon Fu Kit Benson	]	Representer's Representatives
Mr Ian Thomas Brownlee	]	
Ms Michelle Li	]	

R4 of MP OZP – Venizelle Property Development (HK) Limited

Mr Wong Chung Lai Frank	]	Representer's Representatives
Mr Fan Yan Kin Stephen	]	
Mr Yuen Sing Hank	]	

6. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explain briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. The presentations made by the government representatives on 28.6.2024 and 2.7.2024 had been uploaded to TPB's website for public viewing. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer and/or their representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers and/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 the attending representers and/or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives (including the consultants), the representers and/or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives (including the consultants), the representers and their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After the hearing of all the oral submissions from the representers and/or their representatives, the Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

7. The Chairperson invited the representers and/or their representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R102 of STT OZP – Melody Gain Limited and Clanville Developments Limited

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kenneth To made the following main points:

(a) the representation site, with an area of about 2.2 hectares (ha) in Planning

Area 1A of the proposed San Tin Town Centre, was located about 1 km from the proposed San Tin Station of the proposed Northern Link (NOL) Main Line. Planning Areas 1B and 1C, adjacent to the representation site, were planned for high-density residential developments;

(b) the representation site was originally zoned "Residential (Group C)" ("R(C)") on the then approved NTM OZP and was also the subject site of a section 12A (s.12A) application No. Y/YL-NTM/5 currently in process. Part of the representation site was under an approved planning application for temporary transitional housing development and was intended to operate until 2029. Upon gazettal of the STT OZP in March 2024, the representation site was rezoned to "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") for low-rise developments, including an indoor sports centre and a workshop of the Fire Services Department (FSD);

(c) to optimise the development potential of land within a new development area (NDA), consideration could be given to locating the proposed FSD workshop in other brownfield sites or sites adjacent to existing highways outside the NDA;

(d) the site areas of the existing FSD workshops in Kowloon Bay and Kwai Chung were about 0.69 ha and 0.76 ha respectively. A proposed fire station cum ambulance depot and staff quarters at Tseung Kwan O only occupied a site of about 0.3 ha. On the STT OZP, a "G/IC" site of about 1.5 ha was reserved for the proposed divisional fire station and ambulance depot cum staff quarters and an operational base in Planning Area 12A, and the adjoining "G/IC" site of 0.6 ha was reserved for youth facilities. To achieve better synergy, the youth facilities in Planning Area 12A were proposed to be relocated to Planning Area 1A next to the proposed indoor sports centre. The two sites in Planning Area 12A, with a total area of 2.1 ha, would enable co-location of the proposed divisional fire station and ambulance depot cum staff quarters and an operational base, and the FSD workshop originally planned in Planning Area 1A;

(e) three indoor sports centres were proposed on the STT OZP, which exceeded the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) for provision of two indoor sports centres. While provision exceeding HKPSG requirements would be beneficial to the community, co-location of the proposed indoor sports centre and proposed residential developments could optimise the land utilisation of NDA. With reference to examples of co-locating indoor sports centre and residential developments, including Macpherson Place, Pavilla Bay and Grand Regentville, which had a site area of about 2,428m^2, 7,033m^2 and 14,483m^2 respectively, the representation site with an area of about 2.2 ha would be capable of accommodating youth facilities, an indoor sports centre and residential development of about 2,000 flats; and

(f) given the above, the representation site should be rezoned to "Residential (Group A)" or "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Residential with Government and Community Facilities". With reference to the building height restrictions (BHRs) in adjoining area, a stepped building height (BH) profile could be maintained. According to the technical assessments, an increase of 2,000 flats would have no significant impact on the proposed infrastructure, including transport.

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan and Professor Simon K.L. Wong joined this session of the meeting during the presentation of R102 of STT OZP's representative]

R95 of STT OZP – 立法會議員劉國勳

9. Hon Lau Kwok Fan made the following main points:

(a) development of the San Tin Technopole (the Technopole) was supported as it would adopt a 15-minute neighbourhood concept by which the home-job imbalance could be improved. This had been long awaited by residents in the North District and Yuen Long District who suffered from long commuting

time;

(b) comparing with the land use proposal of the San Tin/Lok Ma Chau Development Node in 2021, the employment opportunities and population as well as land for innovation and technology (I&T) development were significantly increased. This coincided with the 'Outline of 14th Five-Year Plan for National Economic and Social Development of the People's Republic of China and the Long-Range Objectives Through the Year 2035' (the National 14th Five-Year Plan), which supported Hong Kong to enhance, establish and develop into, amongst others, an international I&T centre. By providing a total of 300 ha of land for I&T development, a size comparable to the land area of Shenzhen's I&T Zone, the Technopole could meet the pressing demand for land from the I&T sector, thereby driving the economic development of Hong Kong and grasping the last chance for Hong Kong to return to the international stage;

(c) to cater for evolving planning circumstances and diversified needs of different I&T firms, more development flexibility was allowed for the Technopole on the STT OZP by incorporating more uses under Column 1 of the Notes of the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Innovation and Technology" ("OU(I&T)") zone, including talent accommodation and commercial uses; and

(d) restricting the permissible use could not facilitate successful conservation of the wetland, and rather this would result in abandonment of some 200 ha of wetlands. With active conservation management, including the establishment of San Po Shue Wetland Conservation Park (SPS WCP), the ecological function of wetlands could be enhanced. Active conservation management had been adopted in the Long Valley Nature Park in Kwu Tung North and Park Yoho in Yuen Long, which had successfully increased the area of wetlands and enhanced biodiversity there.

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined this session of the meeting during the presentation of R95 of STT OZP.]

R24 of STT OZP – 冼漢廸

10. Mr Hendrick Sin made the following main points:

(a) in the age of global digitalisation, I&T had been a key driving force for economic development. Hong Kong was transforming into an international I&T centre. Land and human capitals were two crucial factors to expedite the transformation;

(b) the STT OZP was supported as the Technopole could contribute to the development of 'South-North dual engine (Finance-I&T)' (「南金融、北創科」) and maintain Hong Kong's competitive edge in the world. In particular, the Technopole could enable the agglomeration of the I&T sector, capitalising on the locational advantages with the Greater Bay Area (GBA), facilitating collaboration among Hong Kong, Shenzhen and other cities in the GBA and promoting regional economic development. More permissible uses in the "OU(I&T)" zone could meet the diversified needs of I&T firms and talents, which could in turn attract sizable reputable firms in life science, artificial intelligence, advanced manufacturing and renewable energy to establish in the Technopole. Provision of talent accommodation and recreational facilities could improve the liveability, which could help attract and retain talents for the I&T sector; and

(c) the filling of fish pond was supported for providing some 210 ha of land for I&T development, which, together with 87 ha of land in the Hong Kong-Shenzhen Innovation and Technology Park (HSITP) at the Loop, could provide an area comparable to the Shenzhen's I&T Zone.

R3 of MP OZP – Profit Point Enterprises Limited

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

(a) the representation site was zoned "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area" ("OU(CDWRA)") on the MP OZP, and covered by an approved section 16 (s.16) application No. A/YL-MP/344 for a residential development with a plot ratio (PR) of 0.4 and a maximum BH of 6 storeys. To the immediate north of the representation site was Amendment Item B of the MP OZP for the establishment of SPS WCP. While the co-existence of development and conservation was supported, the representer opposed the lack of urban design and planning principles to encourage the optimisation of development potential of private housing sites at the periphery of the Technopole;

(b) the representation site was surrounded by rural landscapes, brownfield sites and wetland areas. However, various committed developments, including the Technopole, SPS WCP and the Ngau Tam Mei (NTM) area, which were under a land use review would significantly alter the surrounding context of the site with upgraded infrastructural capacity. Moreover, the peripheral areas of the Technopole had been transforming into a medium-density neighbourhood. Two s.12A applications and several s.16 applications for private housing/ temporary housing/ comprehensive development with wetland restoration/ enhancement/ protection area had been approved in the adjacent areas, and consideration on various upzoning proposals by the Board was still pending;

(c) the representation site was about 500m away from the "OU(I&T)" zone on the STT OZP, for which a stepped BH from 150 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) descending to 15mPD towards the SPS WCP with a 35m-wide non-building area (NBA) had been adopted. With such a design concept, there would be potential to increase the development intensity for land adjacent to the SPS WCP, including the representation site. It was proposed that the PR of the representation site could be increased from 0.4 to 1.5 and the maximum BH increased from 6 storeys to 22 storeys in order to provide 5,134 private housing units. Similar design interface as those in the "OU(I&T) zone" on the STT OZP could be maintained, with BHs descending

from 80mPD to 20mPD and a wetland restoration area with a width ranging from 70m to 110m; and

(d) the proposed upzoning could increase the supply of private housing units by 2031 and was considered compatible with the proposed high-rise housing developments with BHs ranging from 170mPD to 200mPD opposite to San Tin Highway, and the existing low-rise residential development to the south of the representation site. The private housing developments under Phase 1 development of the Technopole were located further away from the proposed San Tin Station of the NOL Main Line while the representation site was located relatively closer. Hence, it was proposed to revise paragraphs 7.1.7, 7.2.1 and 8.5 of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the MP OZP to take into account the above proposals.

R4 of MP OZP – Venizelle Property Development (HK) Limited

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wong Chung Lai Frank made the following main points:

(a) the representation site, with an area of about 30,000m^2, was originally zoned "Conservation Area" and "Recreation" on the then approved MP OZP No. S/YL-MP/6. Upon gazettal of the amendments to the MP OZP, the representation site was rezoned to "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Wetland Conservation Park" ("OU(WCP)";

(b) the presence of water was the primary factor for an area to be classified as wetland. However, according to the aerial photos taken between 2006 and 2019, the wetland within the representation site had dried out naturally. Besides, unauthorised occupation of the land had also caused disturbance to the natural environment of the representation site. Hence, no wetland feature could be identified at the representation at the moment;

(c) the representation site adjoined various existing residential developments,

including Palm Springs, Fairview Park and existing village settlements, as well as sites covered by approved planning applications for residential developments. While no planning application had been submitted, an enquiry had been submitted to PlanD for rezoning the representation site to "OU(CDWRA)" for wetland restoration area cum low-density residential development with a PR of 0.4. According to PlanD's reply, further technical assessments were required to support the rezoning application. However, the submission progress of the rezoning application was significantly hampered by the outbreak of COVID-19; and

(d) it was proposed to rezone the representation to "R(C)" cum "Wetland Restoration Area", with an area of not less than 60,000 ft^2 dedicated as wetland restoration area. The proposed rezoning could provide low-density residential developments and opportunities for eco-education and eco-recreation and for achieving a net-gain in biodiversity.

R101 of STT OZP – Ching Yuk Yu Eugene

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ching Yuk Yu Eugene made the following main points:

(a) he opposed the site selected for the Technopole, rather than the development of the Technopole itself. In particular, Planning Areas 19B and 19C were considered inappropriate for rezoning to "OU(I&T)" zone, and Planning Area 30 was considered more appropriate for I&T development;

(b) Planning Areas 19B and 19C were private land, which required a lengthy and expensive land resumption process for development. Both Planning Areas were subject to high flooding risk and did not have access to any railway station. They were located within the 'Wetland Buffer Area' (WBA) delineated under the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Applications for Developments within Deep Bay Area Under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 12C), which required no net loss in area and function

of wetlands; and

(c) Planning Area 30 was solely Government land, implying that no land resumption would be required. Located on a highland in the vicinity of Shenzhen, Kwu Tung, San Tin and the Loop, Planning Area 30 would be less prone to flooding risks and would enjoy higher accessibility to railway infrastructure, including the planned Kwu Tung Station to be commissioned in 2027. Although Planning Area 30 was zoned "Green Belt", the ecological impact of developing Planning Area 30 would be much less compared to developing wetlands in Planning Areas 19B and 19C. Moreover, by quoting various local examples including Anderson Road and Queens Hill, development and site formation on a hillside site were technically feasible.

R69 of STT OZP – Chiu Duncan

14. Hon Duncan Chiu made the following main points:

(a) development of the Technopole had long been awaited by the local I&T sector. Due to insufficient land provision in the past 20 years, many I&T firms relinquished setting up business in Hong Kong and resorted to setting up business in Shenzhen as they could not identify suitable I&T sites in Hong Kong. Hence, provision of sufficient land, together with policy support, talent/human resources and funding, was crucial for the development of I&T industry in Hong Kong;

(b) since 2015, various measures had been implemented to garner policy support, attract and retain talent/human resources and attract/provide funding to support the I&T sector. However, shortage of land remained a hurdle for I&T development in Hong Kong. Hence, the Technopole should be developed without further delay to assist in nurturing local I&T firms and attracting overseas I&T enterprises; and

(c) as per the case of Singapore One-north (新加坡緯壹城) , it was important to

provide a site of substantial area for I&T development, where a variety of uses including universities, sizable international firms, entrepreneurship parks, national research institutes and firms for providing investments could be accommodated. A one-stop destination for studying, seeking investments, securing jobs, setting up business, establishing prototypes with the industrial facilities provided, and conducting pilot trial and testing could be realised within the same area, resulting in a high level of connectivity of these activities. Currently, these I&T related elements were dispersed in different areas of Hong Kong. Providing a single site of considerable size for accommodating a comprehensive I&T ecosystem would be highly desirable.

R58 of STT OZP – Lam Ka Fai Francis

15. Mr Lam Ka Fai Francis made the following main points:

(a) the STT OZP was supported as the Technopole could deliver a significant amount of land for I&T uses, facilitating the economic development of Hong Kong. The Technopole was suitable for I&T uses as it adjoined HSITP at the Loop and also comprised the land of the Lok Ma Chau Boundary Control Point (LMC BCP) which could soon be released for development. The Technopole could serve as an extension of HSITP at the Loop;

(b) existing fish ponds might not be under active operation, and the ecological impact could be mitigated via innovative layout and design for the development in the Technopole as well as establishment of SPS WCP;

(c) a green transport system, including bicycles, electric vehicles and electric mobility devices, should be introduced in the Technopole;

(d) as the Technopole adjoined the Shenzhen's I&T Zone, the development of low-altitude economy could be explored as a pilot scheme; and

(e) connectivity between the Technopole and NTM should be enhanced, and the

possibility of allocating land for universities within the Technopole should be explored.

R64 of STT OZP – 鄭振華

16. Mr Cheng Chun Wah Gary made the following main points:

(a) development of the Technopole was supported, as development of I&T industry could contribute to the economic development of Hong Kong and enhance the diversity of the economic sector; and

(b) with the promulgation of the National 14th Five-Year Plan and the 'Hong Kong Innovation and Technology Development Blueprint' and concerted efforts of the Government, the I&T eco-system was being established. Still, there was global competition in attracting sizable I&T enterprises to set up business in Hong Kong. Among various factors, availability of sufficient land was a critical consideration for attracting sizable I&T enterprises, whether in upstream or downstream sector, to set up business in Hong Kong.

R9 of STT OZP – 嘉湖民生事務會

R20 of STT OZP – 湛家雄議員

17. Mr Cham Ka Hung Daniel made the following main points:

(a) the land use proposal and development parameters on the STT OZP and the proposed amendments to the NTM and MP OZPs were generally supported by the Yuen Long District Council;

(b) the National 14th Five-Year Plan supported Hong Kong to develop into an international I&T centre. The Technopole coincided with the National 14th Five-Year Plan by providing about 300 ha of land, with a gross floor area (GFA) of about 7,000,000m^2, for I&T development;

(c) co-existence of development and conservation could be realised on the STT OZP. The concept of "no-net-loss in wetland" had been introduced in the 'Study on the Ecological Value of Fish Ponds in the Deep Bay Area' in 1997, and the findings were subsequently translated into TPB PG-No. 12C. According to TPB PG-No. 12C, "no-net-loss in wetland" referred to both "area" and "function". Some of the existing fish ponds were abandoned without high ecological function. Nonetheless, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report of the Technopole (the EIA Report) had demonstrated that the ecological function would not be undermined due to the development with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. To ensure the effectiveness of the establishment of SPS WCP, the wetlands therein should be managed by AFCD;

(d) the STT OZP was divided into two parts by San Tin Highway, with the northern portion for I&T uses and the southern portion for residential and other supporting uses. Connectivity between the northern and southern portions should be further enhanced at the detailed design stage to facilitate crossing of San Tin Highway by pedestrians and cyclists; and

(e) relocation of government offices and facilities to NDAs, including those in the Northern Metropolis, should be considered.

<u>R78 of STT OZP – Luk Wai Lam William</u>

18. Mr Luk Wai Lam William made the following main points:

(a) as the connectivity of the Technopole with the GBA was crucial, the NOL Spur Line should be planned to connect the Technopole to the new Huanggang Port via the Loop. Such alignment should not be affected during the detailed design stage. Hence, paragraph 13.2.3 of the ES of the STT OZP should be revised to effect the above ; and

(b) workshop facilities should be provided adjacent to I&T uses to support the

establishment of prototypes. Hence, more land should be allocated for workshop uses within the Technopole to enhance productivity.

R6 of STT OZP – 思路研究會

19. Mr Wang Hao made the following main points:

(a) the I&T industry would be a major pillar of local economic development in the foreseeable future, and provision of sufficient land would be the determining factor for the prosperity of I&T industry. The Technopole would significantly alleviate the shortfall of land for I&T uses and drive the development of new quality productive forces;

(b) more flexibility could be allowed for firms to develop tailor-made facilities or equipment that suited their operation needs;

(c) the attractiveness of Hong Kong to overseas talents was diminishing due to high cost of living, difficulty in achieving work-life balance, etc. More facilities could be provided in the Technopole to support the talents, thereby enhancing the attractiveness of Hong Kong as a place for living and working;

(d) collaboration between Hong Kong and other cities in the GBA would be beneficial to the development of local I&T industry; and

(e) ecological impact arising from development was unavoidable. The Government would adopt active conservation management measures, including the establishment of the SPS WCP. Nevertheless, more active conservation management measures should be adopted to unleash the ecological value of the wetlands and mitigate the adverse ecological impact arising from the development.

R14 of STT OZP – 元朗青年商會

20. Mr Tang Kwok Pong made the following main points:

(a) the development of the Technopole was supported as it could provide some 165,000 job opportunities and 6,400 talents accommodations, allowing local residents to work near their homes. With collaboration with the Mainland and the world, the Technopole could support the development of Hong Kong as an international I&T centre. The increase in employment opportunities could not only benefit various local industries including catering and logistics industries, but also minimise the need of long home-work commutation, and hence reduce traffic congestion and high loading of the Tuen Ma Line. The proposed NOL Main Line could also alleviate the traffic congestion of San Tin Highway during peak hours;

(b) there would be improvement to infrastructures for local villages. Nonetheless, more uses should be incorporated in Column 1 of the Notes of "Village Type Development" ("V") zone, including 'Public Vehicle Park', to support their daily needs;

(c) as a large portion of the fish ponds had been abandoned, the active conservation management as proposed by the Government could enhance the ecological function of the wetlands; and

(d) there should be more support to the logistics industry affected by the Technopole development.

R17 of STT OZP and R2 of MP OZP – System Link Development Limited
R81 of STT OZP – 符傳富

21. Mr Yu Lit Fung Owen made the following main points:

(a) the Technopole was supported as the development proposal was backed by

detailed analysis and had been scrutinised by the relevant government departments. A balance among land use, housing supply, employment opportunities and ecological conservation could be achieved;

(b) collaboration with Shenzhen was crucial for the development of 'South-North dual engine (Finance-I&T)'. While local universities performed well in I&T research, Hong Kong could leverage this merit and capitalise on Shenzhen's advantages in establishing prototypes;

(c) overseas talents would pursue quality of life. The proposed blue-green network, together with the wetlands to be preserved, could provide a high-quality living environment for enticing overseas talent; and

(d) public-private partnership (PPP) could be considered for the early implementation of the Technopole.

R3 of STT OZP – 香港資訊科技聯會

22. Mr Chan Wai Kwok Kenneth made the following main points:

(a) the existing floor area in CyberPort, Hong Kong Science Park and Hong Kong Applied Science and Technology Research Institute had been fully occupied. Many start-ups faced difficulty in renting floor space in these I&T parks. The development of the Technopole was supported as it could provide adequate floor space for I&T developments, facilitating the development of 'South-North dual engine (Finance-I&T)';

(b) co-existence of I&T uses and wetlands would be feasible; and

(c) more talent accommodation should be provided.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 15-minute break.]

R31 of STT OZP – Chien Kwok Keung Kenny

24. Mr Chien Kwok Keung Kenny made the following main points:

(a) he was the chairman of Hong Kong Software Industry Association, the vice-president of eHealth Consortium and a member of the Election Committee from the Technology and Innovation Subsector. He supported the Technopole development and advocated expedition of the relevant planning procedures;

(b) during the 2000s, Hong Kong's I&T industry nurtured a pool of talents who pioneered edge-cutting data centre management technologies. However, due to the absence of clear government policies, many of the talents had moved to the Mainland. In recent years, the surge of artificial intelligence had again opened up new opportunities for I&T development in Hong Kong;

(c) I&T development could diversify Hong Kong's economy by fostering an innovation-driven mode of development and could catalyse the growth of other economic sectors. If I&T development was neglected, loss of competitive edges would be resulted. For instance, without full integration of robotic and automation technologies, the logistics industry in Hong Kong had been falling behind our global competitors;

(d) despite the floor spaces provided in Hong Kong Science Park and Cyberport, the I&T industry was still facing acute shortage of floor spaces for laboratory and prototype production. Timely provision of such floor spaces was crucial for transforming basic research findings in Hong Kong into commercial opportunities, thereby retaining outstanding I&T enterprises within the city; and

(e) advance technologies could contribute to the preservation of the natural environment. There were also successful worldwide examples, e.g. Jurong Innovation District in Singapore, which demonstrated harmonious co-existence of I&T developments and natural landscapes.

R88 of STT OZP – The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

25. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chan Chak Bun made the following main points:

(a) he was the president of Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA). HKIA supported the STT OZP as the Technopole development would address the acute shortages in land supply and housing units in Hong Kong and create synergy with Shenzhen in terms of infrastructural and I&T developments, cultural and ecological conservation, tourism, education and nurturing of talents. HKIA's suggestions were set out below;

(b) community farms and agricultural uses should be always permitted within "Open Space" ("O") zone to promote the preservation of agricultural tradition. The alignments of the two drainage channels to be revitalised should be less restrictive to allow flexibility for future urban design, and the areas along these drainage channels and the proposed landscape deck across San Tin Highway and the proposed Road L14 should be designated as public open spaces;

(c) for the "OU(I&T)" zone, private residential developments should be allowed alongside staff quarters in order to attract I&T talents to work and stay in the Technopole, and broad development and urban design parameters could be imposed to safeguard public interests. 'Off-course Betting Centre' and 'Warehouse (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown)' uses should be moved to Column 2 of the Notes of the "OU(I&T)" zone to avoid abuse;

(d) for the proposed mixed use developments, especially those near the proposed San Tin Station of the NOL Main Line, flexibility on BH and PR could be allowed to achieve an interesting urban morphology. The requirement for s.16 application for mixed domestic and non-domestic developments should also be removed to streamline the unnecessary procedures;

(e) BHRs should be imposed on the development sites near the existing historic villages/buildings to foster better urban-rural integration. By referring to an example in Foshan, it was suggested that medium-rise developments be allowed in certain parts of the "V" zone (e.g. Planning Area 22) with less historic and cultural value. This would create a harmonious transition between the village settlements and the medium to high rise urban developments;

(f) the principle of 'no-net-loss' in wetland, both in terms of area and function, should be adopted throughout the course of development of the Technopole. Meandering boundaries for the areas between the SPS WCP and development sites could be explored to enhance integration with the natural environment. Boardwalks and viewing decks could be strategically placed within wetlands and fish ponds, complemented with shop and services and green roofs of nearby developments, to promote eco-tourism and for public enjoyment. Some of the existing fish ponds could also be preserved within the development sites, serving as ecological corridors and water features of the Technopole; and

(g) the proposed San Tin Station of the NOL Main Line was at a distance from the future I&T developments and consideration should be given to revisiting its location. A green internal transport network should be implemented to reduce carbon emissions.

R90 of STT OZP – Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design

26. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Cheung Hoi Fo made the following main points:

(a) he was a council member of Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (HKIUD). HKIUD supported the STT OZP and the development of the Technopole and had the following suggestions;

(b) to reduce the land requirement for roads and carbon emissions and to promote

a more sustainable development, a green transport system should be planned in the Technopole with early implementation;

(c) by referring to a successful example of Nantou Ancient City in Shenzhen, it was considered that initiatives by the Government were crucial for successful urban-rural integration. Considerations could be given to putting 'Exhibition or Convention Hall' and 'Place of Recreation, Sports and Culture' uses under Column 1 of "V" zone and removing the control on 'Hotel' to allow 'Holiday House only' in Column 2, with a view to providing flexibility for future developments within the existing village settlements; and

(d) to encourage innovative urban design for better integration with the surrounding natural environment, it was suggested that a higher degree of flexibility for BH variation at selected development sites should be allowed. Furthermore, a set of urban design guidelines should be formulated to create a holistic strategy to facilitate harmonious integration between urban development and the natural landscape. Such guidelines should be incorporated into the remarks of the Notes of the relevant "OU(I&T)" zones to ensure thorough implementation.

R1025 of STT OZP – 韓焯彥

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Hong Cheuk In made the following main points:

(a) he was a university student representing himself and his friends, including a Black-faced Spoonbill (*Platalea minor*) (黑臉琵鷺) and a Pied Kingfisher (Ceryle rudis) (斑魚狗). While expressing no objection to the development of I&T industry in Hong Kong, he strongly opposed the proposed filling of fish ponds at the Technopole;

(b) he deeply appreciated the mature ecosystem and natural landscape in the northwestern part of Hong Kong, which included wetlands, forests, fish ponds

and stunning natural scenery. When feeling pressured by studies, he found solace by exploring the natural environment on a bike. The preservation of natural environment was important to him personally;

(c) the destruction of natural habitat brought by filling of fish ponds was irreversible and would compromise the integrity of the entire wetland habitat in the Deep Bay Area. By referring to the example of the Three Runway System project at the Hong Kong International Airport, he believed that wildlife species would not necessarily return after the damage was done, even with mitigation measures implemented. For instance, the population of Indo-Pacific Humpback Dolphin (*Sousa chinensis*) (中華白海豚) did not rebound after the establishment of Brothers Marine Park near Lantau;

(d) the EIA was criticised by green groups and environmental experts. Many bird species he witnessed in the wetlands before were not recorded in the EIA Report. The coverage area of the wildlife survey was insufficient and the proposed mitigation measures (e.g. the birds' flight corridor) could not adequately address the wildlife's needs. As such, the relevant parts of the EIA Report should be revisited;

(e) some argued that the abandoned fish ponds no longer served economic functions and should be allocated for urban development. Such perception, however, overlooked the valuable contributions these fish ponds made to the natural environment. He also questioned why preservation efforts must be tied with compensation for urban development. Opportunities for proactive preservation were usually neglected;

(f) there were alternative sites for I&T development, such as brownfield sites used for temporary car parks and dog kennels in the New Territories. It was not convincing that the San Tin area was the only suitable location for the development of the Technopole; and

(g) many uses were placed under Column 1 of the Notes of the "OU(I&T)" zone which would not require planning permission from the Board. Such

flexibility might lead to abuse, resulting in the sites reserved for I&T industries being repurposed for property developments.

[Mr Daniel K.S. Lau left this session of the meeting during the presentation of R1025 of STT OZP.]

R91 of STT OZP – Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

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

(a) the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA) supported the STT OZP as it could modernise the underutilised areas and leverage the locational advantage of the Technopole to create synergy with the I&T industry in Shenzhen. However, he expressed disappointment that the previous suggestions made by REDA in respect of private sector involvement, statutory planning procedures and the role of the Board were ignored;

(b) the design principles as stipulated in the ES of the STT OZP should be fully implemented in the Technopole. This could address the past shortcomings in new town developments, such as poor accessibility and inadequate community facilities and open space provision;

(c) the "OU(I&T)" zone covered about 210 ha of land and would provide GFA of about 5.7 million m^2. Instead of allowing total flexibility, a more focused approach was necessary to define the development content of the various land parcels for such a vast development. Such clarity would facilitate the private sector to actively participate in the development of the Technopole;

(d) the definition of talent accommodation in the STT OZP required further clarifications. The public-to-private housing ratio should be adjusted from 70:30 to 50:50 which should then be reflected in the ES of the STT OZP;

(e) learning from the past experiences of new town development, transport

infrastructure should be prioritised early in the development process. It was suggested the proposed Northern Metropolis Highway and the NOL Spur Line be incorporated in the STT OZP;

(f) there were shortages of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities planned for the area, especially hospital beds;

(g) while the ES of the STT OZP stated that private land would be resumed and disposed to the market by the Government, the latest policy actually allowed in-situ land exchange applications from land owners. In-situ land exchange could reduce upfront government spending on land resumption and public works and would enable earlier premium revenue. The ES should be updated to reflect the latest policy; and

(h) to enhance flexibility, the Board should be involved in reviewing development schemes and Master Layout Plans, if necessary. Centralising all development controls under the leases might result in rigid and lengthy administrative procedures.

R93 of STT OZP – Birkenhead Properties & Investments Limited

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wong Pui Sai made the following main points:

(a) she was from KTA Planning Limited representing Birkenhead Properties & Investments Limited. While generally supporting the development of the Technopole, there were views on the planning requirements of the "OU(I&T)" zone and a site at Lot 769RP in D.D. 99 near Lin Barn Tsuen (練板村), which fell largely within an area zoned "OU(I&T)" in Planning Area 19C of the STT OZP and was partly covered by an ongoing s.12A application No. Y/YL-ST/1;

(b) the success of the Technopole relied on the creation of iconic I&T developments which could synergise with their counterparts in Shenzhen. Flexibility in future use and design as well as respect for ecological resources

were all crucial considerations;

(c) there were four bands of BHRs with each about 100m wide for Planning Area 19C. While this approach aimed to achieve a stepped BH profile, it posed challenges for designing iconic buildings and accommodating wider birds' flight corridors and view corridors. In determining the BH profile, consideration should also be given to the potential adaptation of Modular Integration Construction technology and the high headroom requirements of I&T industry;

(d) the proposed residential developments in San Tin Town Centre were distant from the proposed I&T developments, and would be subject to a public-to-private housing ratio of 70:30. Only 6,400 talent accommodation units were planned in the I&T sites and the permissible type of residential development was limited to 'Flat (Staff Quarters only)', a Column 1 use under the Notes of "OU(I&T)" zone. It was doubted whether such provision was adequate to accommodate the housing demand for 120,000 working population in the Technopole. Taking inspiration from the Singapore-Sichuan Hi-Tech Innovation Park in Chengdu, which offered diverse housing choices near I&T developments and daily facilities within walkable distance, it was suggested that 'Flat' and 'House' uses should be included in Column 1 of the "OU(I&T)" zone to allow more flexibility. With reference to other similar developments in Hong Kong, 'Electric Power Station', 'Chemical Biochemical Plant' and 'Service Industries' uses should also be included in Column 2 of "OU(I&T)" zone to streamline the planning process. Detailed development control could be managed through land grants and layout plan submissions under lease; and

(e) Planning Area 19C possessed potential for early implementation of I&T developments for its strategic location and consolidated land ownership. Being well connected to Castle Peak Road and San Tin Highway, it was merely a 15-minute drive from Yuen Long Town Centre and only 1.5 km away from LMC BCP. The consolidated land ownership could facilitate speedy development, allowing the creation of a critical mass of I&T uses in

the area. The technical feasibility for development had already been demonstrated by the technical assessments under the s.12A application No. Y/YL-ST/1 under processing. As such, more flexible planning control for Planning Area 19C and expedition of the Technopole development were advocated.

R94 of STT OZP and R1 of MP OZP – Topcycle Development Limited

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

(a) he represented Topcycle Development Limited which was one of the land owners in the San Tin area. While generally supporting the STT and MP OZPs, there were some views on various aspects as detailed below;

(b) the Government gazetted the land resumption on the same date as the exhibition of the draft OZPs. The land owned by the representer was already resumed as Government land. While the latest policy allowed land owners to apply for in-situ land exchange to develop their land, there was no indication on how this process could be taken place when the representer's land had already been resumed, and this was unfair for the representer. Besides, the development concepts outlined in the ES of the STT OZP, e.g. to create a liveable town with comprehensive community facilities, could not be achieved without active private sector participation;

(c) only 30% of the units in the Technopole were allocated for private housingand inadequate to meet the future demand. It was suggested the ratio for private housing units be increased. The proposed alignment of the NOL Spur Line and the Northern Metropolis Highway should also be incorporated in the STT OZP; and

(d) the Government planned to resume all conservation-related areas and implement the proposed wetland conservation park on its own. However, it was doubted whether the Government would be financially capable of such

arrangement, given the competing demands for government funding and the relatively low priority of wetland conservation in the agenda. Besides, the uses that could generate income for private operation of wetland conservation park were removed from the Schedule of Uses for the "OU(WCP)" zone. Considering successful examples of PPP for conservation areas, it was suggested that the Notes of the "OU(WCP)" zone on the MP OZP should be amended to encourage private sector involvement, including providing mechanisms for private proposals with long-term operation and management of conservation area and introducing income-generating uses in the Schedule of Uses for this zone.

[Mr Rocky L.K. Poon left this session of the meeting at this point.]

31. As the presentations of the representers and/or their representatives in this session 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 representers, their representatives and/or the government representatives (including the consultants) to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct question to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Land Use Planning

32. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether the mountainous area in Tit Hang (Planning Area 30 on the STT OZP) as proposed by R101 of STT OZP was suitable for development, and whether ecological impact assessment had been conducted for Tit Hang in Planning Area 30 noting that some representers raised why the Government did not pursue development at less ecologically sensitive areas;

(b) noting that there were various competing uses (including land reserved for I&T development, residential uses, etc.) in the Technopole, whether there was scope to adjust the land use mix by allocating land reserved for residential

development to other uses;

(c) whether a data centre was planned at Chau Tau; and

(d) whether consideration had been given to accommodate uses or facilities in caverns, e.g. FSD's workshop, data centre, I&T laboratories and warehouses, and sewage treatment plant.

33. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr K.W. Ng, AD/NT, PlanD, Mr Tony K.L. Cheung, PM(N), CEDD and Mr Gavin C.P. Wong, CE/N, CEDD made the following main points:

(a) in respect of the alternative site zoned "GB" on the STT OZP in Planning Area 30 at Tit Hang suggested for I&T development, it was considered not desirable with the following considerations:

(i) despite the area of the "GB" zone in Planning Area 30 seemingly comparable to that planned for I&T developments in Planning Areas 19B and 19C, the possible developable area there was expected to be much smaller as large-scale site formation works to form platforms suitable for development would be required due to the steep topography. Although such site formation works might be technically feasible, the future I&T developments on such hilly terrain could only be scattered on different platforms, making it difficult to achieve the clustering effect of I&T developments that could be found in Planning Areas 19B and 19C. In addition, an access road would have to be constructed from the foothill (with existing level at about 6mPD) to the uphill areas (with maximum height at around 130mPD). With such a height difference, such access road would need to be meandering, also reducing the potential area of developable land uphill;

(ii) the development of the mountainous area with hilly terrain would require large-scale slope cutting, site formation, rock blasting and other associated infrastructure works. Given the technical constraints, such

works would also take a longer time and involve substantial capital costs. The existing permitted burial grounds in Planning Area 30 and Lok Ma Chau Police Station (listed as a Grade II historic building) in the vicinity would also be affected;

(iii) from ecological and environmental point of view, the Ecological Impact Assessment conducted under the 'First Phase Development of New Territories North – San Tin/Lok Ma Chau Development Node – Investigation' (Investigation Study) covered part of Tit Hang in Planning Area 30. Existing woodland at the foothill area could be found, while the remaining areas were mainly hillside grassland of low to moderate ecological value. Nevertheless, rock blasting associated with site formation works would be required if the suggested alternative site was pursued. Together with the construction of buildings uphill at that site for I&T developments, the existing 300m-wide birds' flight corridor at the old Shenzhen River meander adjoining the site would inevitably be affected, not to mention to the risk of bird collisions with the buildings uphill. Besides, there would be potential environmental impacts on the local neighbourhoods arising from the required slope cutting, rock blasting and other site formation works; and

(iv) the suggested alternative site at Planning Area 30 was quite far away from the planned railway station of the NOL Spur Line near Chau Tau. To facilitate the future I&T workers to daily commute between the planned railway station and the suggested uphill alternative site, additional means of transport might be required. As regards a representer's proposal to relocate the railway station to Planning Area 30, large-scale excavation and tunnel works underneath the mountainous areas would be required and substantial costs would be incurred;

(b) the STT OZP with a design population of about 165,600 persons was not a large-scale new development area (NDA) comparing with the existing new towns in Hong Kong such as Shatin. San Tin Town Centre was planned as a self-

sufficient, integrated neighbourhood with comprehensive commercial, community and recreation facilities that could also provide daily support to the I&T workers and their families. The concept of 'work-live-play' adopted in the planning for the STLMC area was intended to promote such kind of liveable community. Many examples of I&T parks in the Mainland also showed that the provision of a wide variety of uses including different business and living support could bring about a positive effect to the I&T development. On this basis, the current land use mix for the STLMC area with the provision of I&T uses and other non-I&T complementary and supporting uses was considered appropriate. Besides, in a wider context, the planned NDAs and existing new towns in the surrounding areas, including the KTN and FLN NDAs, and the Fanling/Sheung Shui and Yuen Long New Towns, as well as other existing and committed developments initiated by private developers, could also enhance the liveability of the future residents and workers in the Technopole with the provisions of different housing choices and a mixed of supporting uses and facilities;

(c) a site zoned "OU(I&T)" in Planning Area 16B near Chau Tau was reserved for development of a Government Data Centre Complex. To ensure design harmony with and minimise potential impact on the adjacent "V" zone, the ES of the OZP stated that suitable building setback along the periphery of the "OU(I&T)" zone adjoining the "V" zone should be considered by the future project proponent; and

(d) accommodating uses/facilities within caverns would involve high capital costs and a long lead time for the associated engineering and construction works. The development programme for the first population intake in 2031 for the STLMC area could not be met if the cavern option was pursued. The FSD workshop in the "G/IC" zone located in Planning Area 1A with a site area of about 1 ha was intended to serve the whole New Territories. According to FSD, future operation in the workshop would involve various industrial activities with different types of dangerous goods, and might generate nuisances including noise pollution, etc. The current site in Planning Area 1A was located near the San Tin Highway. To the east of the site was the proposed

effluent polishing plant and food waste pre-treatment facilities, whereas to its south within the same "G/IC" zone was a proposed indoor sports centre serving as a buffer between the workshop and the proposed residential developments to its further south. Co-location of the FSD workshop with the planned divisional fire and ambulance depot cum staff quarters in Planning Area 12A was considered not feasible mainly due to the site area requirement proposed by FSD.

34. The Chairperson remarked that taking into account cost-effectiveness, development in caverns was more suitable for relocating existing GIC uses in urban areas to release valuable land resource for alternative uses. Besides, development in caverns would incur much higher capital and recurrent maintenance costs as compared with normal sites. That said, Members' suggestions of accommodating certain I&T facilities such as data centre and laboratory in caverns were noted and the feasibility could be further explored in the long run.

35. Considering that public housing might not be the suitable housing type for the Technopole, and people might not prefer to work and live within the same locality, i.e. home-job balance, a Member asked about the rationale for the public-to-private housing ratio of 70:30. In response, Mr Vic C.H. Yau, D of NMCO, DEVB said that there were several NDAs being taken forward in the New Territories which would be supported by efficient inter-district and cross-boundary transport infrastructures. This would provide more choices for living and working, home-job within the same locality or across different districts in the New Territories. The public-to-private housing ratio of 70:30 was a general planning assumption adopted at a time when Hong Kong needed to increase public housing supply substantially to meet the acute demand for public housing. The development in the Technopole would span over many years, and the actual allocation of land for public or private housing would be finalised at a later stage, taking into account the changing circumstances and development needs, as well as local circumstances such as the concentration of Mainland/overseas I&T talents. Moreover, sensitivity tests (with a higher ratio for private housing) had been conducted under the Investigation Study which revealed that the existing and planned strategic road networks and other supporting infrastructures could cope with possible increase in private housing, if necessary.

36. On home-job balance, Mr K.W. Ng, AD/NT, PlanD said that the concept could be perceived from a wider perspective. Currently, there was no large-scale employment node in

the Northeast and Northwest New Territories, and the Technopole would fill such a gap and offer more choices to residents in the New Territories with a reduction in commuting time and journeys to the urban areas.

37. The Member further asked if the current land use control had allowed flexibility for provision of short-term or long-term accommodations for I&T talents. In response, Mr K.W. Ng, AD/NT, PlanD said that designating 'Flat (Staff Quarters only)' as Column 1 use for "OU(I&T)" zone to allow for talent accommodations was intended to meet such demand. 'Flat (not elsewhere specified)' use was put under Column 2 of the "OU(I&T)" zone, which could allow flexibility for residential uses other than staff quarters upon application to the Board.

38. Noting that some representers had submitted specific land use proposals in their representations, a Member asked whether there was any mechanism for these representers to pursue their proposals in the future. In response, Mr K.W. Ng, AD/NT, PlanD said that the three OZPs, though being draft plans, were with statutory effects and the concerned representers could submit their proposals under the provisions of the Town Planning Ordinance, e.g. s.12A application for rezoning their sites for alternative use.

Urban Design

39. A Member raised the following questions:

(a) whether it was necessary to prepare urban design guidelines as proposed by R90 of STT OZP including that for co-existing wetland and I&T land;

(b) noting R90 of STT OZP proposed that there should be a smooth transition between the wetlands and the I&T development, whether meandering boundaries following the existing configuration of the fish ponds and retention of existing fish ponds within the I&T sites could be explored; and

(c) whether the public or private sector would be engaged in the preparation of the Planning and Design Brief (PDB).

40. In response, Mr K.W. Ng, AD/NT, PlanD made the following main points:

(a) instead of just urban design guidelines, a PDB taking into account various considerations, factors and requirements would be prepared for the "OU(I&T)" sites in the STLMC area;

(b) a 35m-wide NBA was designated as a buffer area along the northwestern and southwestern boundaries of the "OU(I&T)" sites in Planning Areas 19B and 19C with a view to addressing the potential interface issue with the adjoining wetlands in the SPS WCP. R90's suggestion of using the configuration of the existing fish ponds to determine the boundaries between the future I&T sites and the SPS WCP would be explored in the preparation of the PDB; and

(c) the Government would consider engaging stakeholders (including relevant professional institutes) in preparing the PDB.

41. The Chairperson remarked that some suggestions on the urban design aspect from professional institutes such as HKIA, HKIUD and Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects could be further investigated. The Government would consider consulting the professional institutes as appropriate in formulating the PDB before putting the PDB to the Board for consideration.

Urban-Rural Integration

42. Two Members raised the following questions:

(a) noting that many urban villages in the Mainland had been turned into vibrant cultural, recreation and tourist destinations, whether the representatives of R88 and R90 of STT OZP could provide more information on those successful cases, and whether the Government could facilitate urban-rural integration with incorporation of cultural elements; and

(b) whether medium-density development, similar to those urban village cases suggested by R88 and R90 of STT OZP, could be allowed within the "V" zone in the Technopole.

43. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Cheung Hoi Fo, representative of R90 of STT OZP, said that the urban village in Nantou (i.e. the Nantou Ancient Town) co-existing with the surrounding built-up developments was the result of the concerted efforts of the city government's initiatives and the participation of the private sector and the villages. A similar approach could be adopted for the existing recognised villages in the STT OZP to allow private sector participation hence enhance urban-rural integration. The successful examples of urban village concept in the Mainland demonstrated that a vibrant village environment with the co-existence and synergies of the old and new could attract both visitors and I&T talents to work and live in the Technopole, benefitting both revitalisation of the existing recognised villages and preservation of traditions and culture. He added that the stepped height concept adopted on the STT OZP for the elongated "OU(I&T)" zone in Planning Area 19B with BHs gradually climbing up from SPS WCP towards the eastern fringe at more than 100mPD would result in an abrupt change in BH, and hence a 'wall' fronting the "V" zone with BH of 3 storeys in Planning Area 22. Consideration could be given to allowing more flexibility in BHs for the "V" zone and areas nearby so as to create a smoother transition and avoid the wall effect.

44. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Chan Chak Bun, representative of R88 of STT OZP, said that low-rise developments in the "V" zone (Planning Area 22) would result in an abrupt change in BH incompatible with the future high-rise developments nearby. Adoption of the urban village concept allowing medium-intensity developments in "V" zone could facilitate visual harmony and preservation of built heritage. A successful example was the Lingnan World in Foshan. If increasing density within "V" zone was not allowable, there should be a buffer area with medium density and medium-rise development at areas adjoining the "V" zone to ensure a smoother transition in urban morphology. Yet, if the development intensity and permitted uses within "V" zone could be relaxed, the villagers could also enjoy the benefits generated from a vibrant village settlement with various commercial activities. Given the foreseeable merits, the Government might consider reviewing the prevailing policy for development within "V" zone.

45. In relation to the above comments/suggestions, Mr K.W. Ng, AD/NT, PlanD made the following main points:

(a) the concept of urban village was appreciated. The "V" zone at Planning Area

22 was to reflect a number of existing recognised villages in San Tin, within which all current built and cultural heritage therein would not be affected by the proposed developments under the STT OZP. Besides, the land within the "V" zone was primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. Under the OZP, selected commercial and community uses serving the needs of the villagers and in support of the village development were already always permitted on the ground floor of a New Territories Exempted House (NTEH), while other commercial, community and recreational uses (including 'Shop and Services' and 'Eating Place' on upper floors of NTEHs, 'Holiday House' and 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre') might be permitted on application to the Board. In view of the above, the current OZP did not prohibit cultural tourism within the "V" zones like the case of Nantou Ancient City in Shenzhen. The crux of such proposals more hinged on concerned villagers' views and whether a project proponent could be identified to undertake such proposals;

(b) as regards the development intensity, it should be noted that land within the "V" zone was subject to statutory planning control as stipulated in the Notes of the OZP, i.e. a maximum BH of 3 storeys (8.23m) or the height of the existing building. Relaxation of such BH control within "V" zone in particular for the NTEHs would require a review in the Small House policy which fell outside the ambit of the Board or PlanD; and

(c) areas along the northeastern and northwestern boundaries of the "V" zone in Planning Area 22 were zoned "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Amenity" to serve as buffers from the adjacent developments. As regards the development intensity surrounding this "V" zone, to its southwest was an area zoned "O" which would be well-integrated with the future STWMDC. To its northwest and northeast were the "OU(I&T)" zone in Planning Area 19B and the "OU(MU)" zone in Planning Area 23 respectively. For the "OU(I&T)" zone in Planning Area 19B, suitable air paths/view corridors would need to be provided according to the ES of the OZP to provide visual relief and facilitate air flow, minimising the potential impact arising from future buildings on the "V" zone. The BH restrictions designated for the "OU(I&T)" zone only

represented the maximum attainable BH, and the detailed BHs, in particular for the portion having interface with the "V" zone, would be reviewed during the preparation of PDB at the next stage. As for the "OU(MU)" zone in Planning Area 23 close to the planned railway station of the NOL Spur Line near Chau Tau, a master layout plan would be required for approval under lease to ensure an integrated design taking into account various design requirements, such as a stepped building height profile to foster urban-rural integration and design harmony with the nearby villages.

46. The Chairperson remarked that the proposal to increase development intensity of the "V" zone beyond what was currently permissible under the Small House Policy as put forward by R88 and R90 of STT OZP was not merely a land use planning matter but a policy issue that was outside the purview of the Board. That said, within the confines of the prevailing policy, there was still scope to explore the feasibility of incorporating into the PDB various suggestions, such as preserving the cultural heritage, refining the stepped BH and visual harmony between the "V" zone and adjoining new developments, etc.

I&T Development

47. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether ITIB had conducted a study to identify the types of I&T uses to be accommodated in the Technopole and the corresponding land requirements, and the estimated absorption rate of the land parcels;

(b) whether the I&T sites would be developed in phases;

(c) the rationale for allowing 'Warehouse (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown)', talent accommodation and 'Off-course Betting Centre' uses under Column 1 of the "OU(I&T)" zone; and

(d) whether there would be opportunities for local universities to use the facilities, in particular those of laboratories and start-ups, in the Technopole.

48. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Vicky Cheung, PAS(ITI)2, ITIB and Mr K.W. Ng, AD/NT, PlanD made the following main points:

(a) ITIB was conducting a consultancy study to recommend specific I&T uses in the I&T value chain (i.e. upstream (research and development), midstream (prototype or application development) or downstream (manufacturing) processes) for development on different land parcels in the Technopole (area outside the Loop), as well as requisite infrastructure and supporting facilities, etc. The I&T companies approached by ITIB so far had generally indicated interest in setting up their operations in the Technopole. ITIB would further liaise with those interested parties to seek more details on their specific requirements for infrastructure and supporting facilities at a later stage;

(b) the Technopole development would take some 10 to 20 years to implement. Implementation of the I&T land in the Technopole in phases would be a preferred approach catering for the changing needs and evolving development of the I&T industry. In fact, the 87-ha HSITP at the Loop would also be developed in two phases. Among the total area of 87 ha of land, 5 ha was being developed under the Phase 1 Batch 1 development;

(c) the planning intention of the "OU(I&T)" zone was to provide development space for accommodating a variety of I&T uses to cater for operation needs of upstream, midstream and downstream I&T processes. Incorporation of 'Warehouse (excluding Dangerous Godown)' use in the "OU(I&T)" zone was intended to facilitate the storage space in support of the production activities. 'Flat (Staff Quarters only)' was also listed as a Column 1 use of the "OU(I&T)" zone for the provision of talent accommodation units. Besides, the "OU(I&T)" zone allowed other complementary uses under Column 1 so as to provide various commercial features to support the basic needs of the people working there. In formulating the list of commercial uses under Column 1 of the "OU(I&T)" zone, reference had been made to the Master Schedule of Notes for "Commercial" zone; and

(d) the Government had been attaching importance to the collaboration among

industry, academic and research sectors. Though the land planning study by ITIB was still underway and no particular site was designated for purely academic use in the Technopole so far, local universities were encouraged to strengthen collaboration with the I&T industry. In addition, there would be land reserved in the NTM development for a focus on academic and scientific research that would offer space for R&D-related programmes on different I&T fields, which could promote "research, academic and industry" collaboration. Given the geographical proximity, it was believed that the development of academic sector in NTM would provide synergy effect to the development in the Technopole. The planned railway and the road networks would provide convenient connections among the HSITP at the Loop, the STLMC area and NTM. As mentioned before, the Technopole was aimed at nurturing a complete I&T ecosystem which allowed the development of different I&T fields at different stages of I&T value chain (i.e. upstream (R&D), midstream (prototype or application development) and downstream (manufacturing)). There would be ample opportunities for collaborations between the I&T enterprises in the Technopole and the post-secondary institutions, including those in NTM. This could positively respond to some concerns of the I&T sector.

Implementation Aspect

49. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether there was a mechanism for the private sector to participate in I&T development in the Technopole; and

(b) whether the PPP approach could be adopted for the SPS WCP even though it would be established on Government-controlled land.

50. On private participation in the development of the Technopole, Mr Vic C.H. Yau, D of NMCO, DEVB made the following main points:

(a) development of NDAs, including the Technopole, was taken forward under the

Enhanced Conventional New Town Approach (ECNTA). Under ECNTA, the Government would undertake land resumption, site formation and other land preparation works, then allocate the formed sites for different kinds of development. During the process, there were different ways and opportunities for the private sector to participate, such as land sale. Existing landowners in the NDA might also participate through land exchange applications subject to conditions specified by the Government. Previously, such land exchange arrangement was only applicable to sites planned for private residential and commercial developments, but the scope had been recently expanded to cover other types of development, e.g. I&T and logistics uses, etc. Notwithstanding that, the specific sites open to land exchange applications would depend upon the industry-specific policy of the relevant bureaux. ITIB was conducting a consultancy study on how the land parcels would be allocated to different I&T fields. It was possible that the Government might wish to retain control over the disposal of the I&T land, in which case the land would be resumed and not available for land exchange application. The Government would announce the way forward in due course.

51. For the SPS WCP, Mr Simon K.F. Chan, AD(C), AFCD made the following main points:

(a) the approved EIA Report recommended adopting a variety of measures for effective wetland compensation. In order to achieve the compensatory function required under the EIA Report, there was a need for the SPS WCP to be established on Government-controlled land. Where private land was involved, the Government might exercise its statutory power to resume the land. Since a relatively large area of private land within the SPS WCP would have to revert to the Government for conservation purpose, the Government would, before invoking the resumption power, explore possible schemes to incentivise private landowners to voluntarily surrender their land in the SPS WCP area to the Government, such as allowing the land value of the surrendered land to be deducted from land premium in land exchange/lease modifications being/to be pursued by the same land owners elsewhere. Regarding future management of the SPS WCP, different options would be explored under the forthcoming

investigation study for the development of SPS WCP, including management by relevant government department, partnership with non-governmental organisation and/or experienced fisheries specialist(s), etc. Relevant stakeholders would then be consulted.

52. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the Board would be involved in the process of land grant for development sites in the Technopole, the Chairperson clarified that the Board was tasked to consider matters in relation to land use planning, while the land grant process was under the land administration regime which would be handled by the Government.

Development Programme

53. Two Members raised the following questions:

(a) noting that the proposed railway services in the Technopole would not be available until 2033/34, whether there were measures to cater for the first intake of population in 2031; and

(b) information on the development schedule of the Technopole including timing for land availability for development, and the estimated take-up rates for I&T land in the coming 10 years.

54. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Vicky Cheung, PAS(ITI), ITIB and Mr Gavin C.P. Wong, CE/N, CEDD made the following main points:

(a) the proposed San Tin Station of the NOL Main Line would be in place around 2034. The first three buildings in the HSITP at the Loop would be completed progressively from end of 2024 onwards and would have feeder bus services to/from the MTR Lok Ma Chau Station to serve the workforce; and

(b) according to the latest development programme, site formation and infrastructure works in the Technopole would commence in 2024 and 2026 for Phase 1 (Stage 1) and Phase 1 (Stage 2) respectively. The first batch of formed land for I&T use was targeted to be available by around 2026. For Phase 2,

site formation and infrastructure works would commence in 2026.

55. Regarding the estimated take-up rates of I&T land, the Chairperson said that with I&T development topping the Government's agenda, various policy bureaux had made their best possible efforts to speed up development in the Technopole. For example, DEVB together with its family of departments were responsible for the more upstream work including timely completion of the statutory planning process, land resumption and site formation works. With the availability of formed land, ITIB would strive to attract I&T enterprises of strategic importance to set up operations or expand business in the Technopole with a view to optimising the use of valuable land resources. Members could be assured that bureaux would work collaboratively to put the I&T land into optimal uses. According to the current programme and subject to funding approval from the Legislative Council, the first batch of formed site for I&T use was targeted to be available in around 2026, and the Technopole was expected to be fully completed in 2039.

Ecological Aspect

56. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether abandoned fish ponds were of high ecological value;

(b) whether the proposed adoption of fish-stocking method by directly putting fishes to increase food source for birds at the SPS WCP was a temporary measure, and whether there were other measures to enhance the ecological function and capacity of the wetlands;

(c) whether eco-education and eco-recreation facilities would be provided in the SPS WCP; and

(d) whether the sustainable fish farming approach proposed in the SPS WCP was financially sustainable.

57. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Tony K.L. Cheung, PM(N), CEDD and Mr Simon K.F. Chan, AD(C), AFCD made the following main points:

(a) while it was noted that some fauna species including birds would make use of abandoned fish ponds, the ecological value of fish ponds was assessed in the EIA based on various criteria specified in the Technical Memorandum on the Environmental Impact Assessment Process including but not limited to species diversity occurring in the habitat. In general, the ecological value of active fish ponds with regular drain-down was higher as they could provide food source and roosting habitats for birds. Harvesting of commercial fish in active fish ponds by the drained down practice provided an important foraging ground and a resting place for waterbirds. The ecological value of abandoned fish ponds would diminish over time when they were overgrown with weeds or silted up;

(b) regarding the SPS WCP, the fish-stocking method was only a temporary measure to provide food source for birds during the interim period. There would be long-term improvement measures to enhance the feeding grounds and roosting habitats for birds through measures such as reprofiling the bunds of the fish ponds and varying the depths of water;

(c) similar to the Long Valley Nature Park, a wide range of facilities/services would be provided at the SPS WCP, including eco-education, eco-recreation, visitor centre, boardwalks and tourist accommodation, etc. The SPS WCP would be divided into different zones with different functions, including a biodiversity zone, a visitor zone and a eco-friendly aquaculture zone; and

(d) the economic productivity of ecologically enhanced fish ponds was generally lower than traditional fish ponds. The operators could be charged cheaper rents as an incentive. Operation would be assisted by modernised techniques to increase productivity and financial gains.

58. The Chairperson supplemented that land areas of about 253 ha and 40 ha were planned for ecologically enhanced fish ponds and fisheries enhancement area respectively in the SPS WCP. The fisheries enhancement area would be operated on commercial basis, and modernised mariculture techniques would be applied to increase productivity and financial gains for the operators.

Transport Aspect

59. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether the green transport system would be provided prior to the occupation of I&T developments;

(b) how the area would be served with railway services and whether feeder bus services or smart transportation modes would be available to serve developments beyond walking distance of the planned railway stations;

(c) whether it was necessary to provide an internal mass transit system such as a green transportation system to supplement the pedestrian and cycling network; and

(d) whether there were measures to facilitate cross-boundary travel between the Technopole and Mainland, and whether the feeder bus services at the Huanggang Boundary Control Point would be retained at the new Huanggang Port.

60. In response, Mr Vic C.H. Yau, D of NMCO, DEVB, Ms Vicky Cheung, PAS(ITI), ITIB and Mr K.W. Ng, AD/NT, PlanD made the following main points:

(a) the Technopole would be served by three major railway networks, namely the Lok Ma Chau Spur Line, the NOL Main Line and the NOL Spur Line. The area was currently served by the existing Lok Ma Chau Station of the Lok Ma Chau Spur Line, and the proposed Kwu Tung Station would come into operation in 2027. The proposed San Tin Station of the NOL Main Line would serve the future residential neighbourhood at the southern part of the STT OZP, which would come into operation in 2034. Besides, the planned NOL Spur Line, which would connect to the new Huanggang Port with a planned intermediate station near Chau Tau, could serve the I&T land in the northern part of the STT OZP. Adequate public transport services, including feeder bus services

connecting to railway stations, would be provided in the STLMC area when I&T enterprises operated;

(b) the design of the road network in the STLMC area would allow flexibility for the provision of green transportation modes such as new energy vehicles. The need for a green transportation system would be assessed as development proceeded;

(c) to facilitate I&T workers' daily commuting between Shenzhen Park and Hong Kong Park (at the Loop) of the Hetao Shenzhen-Hong Kong Science and Technology Innovation Co-operation Zone, the two Governments were currently exploring the possibility of constructing more than one cross-river footbridge in the Loop to connect the Hong Kong Park and the Shenzhen Park. The feasibility of providing convenient clearance services/facilities to facilitate cross-boundary travel would be explored by the relevant bureaux/departments; and

(d) the existing cross-boundary facility at the LMC Spur Line Boundary Control Point provided convenient connection with Shenzhen for the Technopole, and co-location arrangement would be implemented at the new Huanggang Port to further facilitate cross-boundary travel.

61. Regarding future transport arrangement, Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, Transport Department supplemented that the construction of new Huanggang Port with co-location arrangement was anticipated to complete by end 2025. Upon the commissioning of the new Huanggang Port, the existing LMC BCP would no longer be required, and hence, the need for existing feeder bus services thereat would be reviewed. Hong Kong and Shenzhen Governments had been liaising closely in that regard. As regards whether Mainland car plate would be required for private cars accessing the new Huanggang Port, the current "Northbound Travel for Hong Kong Vehicles" arrangement applied to the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge only for the time-being. For local connections in the Technopole, transport interchange hubs were planned near the proposed San Tin Station of NOL Main Line and the proposed railway station near Chau Tau with provision of franchised bus services/green feeder system, the details of which would be determined at a later stage.

While the intra-district Smart Green Feeder System would be examined taking into account the future patronage demand and cost-effectiveness of different types of green feeder systems, the Government had been promoting the use of new energy bus which was eco-friendly in reducing carbon emission.

Drainage and Geotechnical Aspects

62. A Member raised the following questions:

(a) whether there were measures to address flooding problem and whether extreme weather conditions had been taken into account in formulating the drainage plan for the Technopole; and

(b) noting that Tit Hang in Planning Area 30 was a sloping area, whether there was risk of landslide, in particular for its adjacent development sites, according to the assessments conducted.

63. In response, Mr Tony K.L. Cheung, PM(N), CEDD made the following main points:

(a) the Technopole development would provide a great opportunity to enhance the drainage system in the rural area. A 'sponge city' concept had been adopted in the planning and development of the Technopole. The existing drainage channel system would be revitalised to include floodable landscapes and flood attenuation facilities so that flood protection and climate resilience could be enhanced. Sustainable drainage system would also be implemented through the provision of flood retention tanks to further enhance climate resilience in the planning area. The design of the drainage system would be in accordance with the latest design procedures and guidelines issued by the Drainage Services Department in March 2024, which would cater for extreme weather and climate change. For example, the proposed flood retention facilities would need to have larger capacity to withstand extreme heavy rainstorms;

(b) with the implementation of new/improved drainage facilities in the village area, surface runoff towards the villages would be intercepted and diverted to the

widened San Tin Eastern Main Drainage Channel and San Tin Western Main Drainage Channel, minimising the risk of flooding. The site formation level of the Technopole would be around 6.5mPD, which was nearly 2m higher than the existing ground to cater for extreme weather and climate change including storm surges; and

(c) natural terrain hazard assessment for the Technopole including Planning Area 30 had been conducted, and more comprehensive study would be carried out in the detailed design to ensure slope stability and minimise the risk of landslides.

[Mr Timothy K.W. Ma left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

64. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that this session of the meeting was completed. She thanked the representers, their representatives and the government representatives (including the consultants) for attending the meeting. As all the hearing sessions were completed, the Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting later and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The representers, their representatives and the government representatives (including the consultants) left the meeting at this point.

65. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.