



圖例 NOTATION

ZONES	地帶
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA (CDA)	綜合發展區
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A) (RA)	住宅(甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B) (RB)	住宅(乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C) (RC)	住宅(丙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP D) (RD)	住宅(丁類)
VILLAGE TYPE DEVELOPMENT (V)	鄉村式發展
INDUSTRIAL (I)	工業
OPEN STORAGE (OS)	露天貯物
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY (GIC)	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE (O)	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES (OU)	其他指定用途
UNDETERMINED (U)	未決定用途
GREEN BELT (GB)	綠化地帶
CONSERVATION AREA (CA)	自然保育區
COMMUNICATIONS	交通
MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION	主要道路及路口
MISCELLANEOUS	其他
BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME	規劃範圍界線
PETROL FILLING STATION (P F S)	加油站

土地用途及面積一覽表 SCHEDULE OF USES AND AREAS

USES	大約面積及百分比 APPROXIMATE AREA & %		用途
	公頃 HECTARES	% 百分比	
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	3.32	0.51	綜合發展區
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	30.02	5.57	住宅(甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	58.68	9.07	住宅(乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	12.78	1.97	住宅(丙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP D)	48.98	7.57	住宅(丁類)
VILLAGE TYPE DEVELOPMENT	60.62	9.37	鄉村式發展
INDUSTRIAL	14.80	2.29	工業
OPEN STORAGE	5.58	0.86	露天貯物
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	17.81	2.75	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	16.24	2.51	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	16.63	2.57	其他指定用途
UNDETERMINED	59.70	9.23	未決定用途
GREEN BELT	120.81	18.67	綠化地帶
CONSERVATION AREA	129.11	19.85	自然保育區
DRAINAGE CHANNEL	2.43	0.38	排水道
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	43.62	6.73	主要道路等
TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	647.11	100.00	規劃範圍總面積

夾附的《註釋》屬這份圖則的一部分，現經修訂並按照城市規劃條例第5條展示。 THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN AND HAVE BEEN AMENDED FOR EXHIBITION UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

核准圖編號 S/YL-TYST/12 的修訂 AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/YL-TYST/12

AMENDMENTS EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE	按照城市規劃條例第5條展示的修訂
AMENDMENT ITEM A1	修訂項目 A 1 項
AMENDMENT ITEM A2	修訂項目 A 2 項
AMENDMENT ITEM A3	修訂項目 A 3 項
AMENDMENT ITEM A4	修訂項目 A 4 項
AMENDMENT ITEM A5	修訂項目 A 5 項
AMENDMENT ITEM B	修訂項目 B 項
AMENDMENT ITEM C	修訂項目 C 項
AMENDMENT ITEM D1	修訂項目 D 1 項
AMENDMENT ITEM D2	修訂項目 D 2 項
AMENDMENT ITEM D3	修訂項目 D 3 項
AMENDMENT ITEM D4	修訂項目 D 4 項
AMENDMENT ITEM E	修訂項目 E 項

(參看附表) (SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

2020年7月10日 按照城市規劃條例第5條展示的核准圖編號 S/YL-TYST/12 的修訂 AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/YL-TYST/12 EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON 10 JULY 2020

Fiona LUNG 龍小玉 SECRETARY 城市規劃委員會秘書

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的唐人新村分區計劃大綱圖
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD
TONG YAN SAN TSUEN - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN



規劃署遵照城市規劃委員會指示擬備 PREPARED BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD

圖則編號 PLAN No. S/YL-TYST/13

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO THE
APPROVED TONG YAN SAN TSUEN
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/YL-TYST/12
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

- Item A1 – Rezoning of two sites to the west of Kung Um Road and to the east of Lam Tai East Road from “Undetermined” (“U”) to “Government, Institution or Community(1)” (“G/IC(1)”).
- Item A2 – Rezoning of two sites to the west of Kung Um Road and to the east of Lam Tai East Road from “U” to “G/IC(2)”; and a site to the east of Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange from “Open Storage” (“OS”) to “G/IC(2)”.
- Item A3 – Rezoning of five sites to the south, southwest and west of Tin Liu Tsuen and east of Shan Ha from “U” to “Residential (Group A)3” (“R(A)3”).
- Item A4 – Rezoning of four sites to the north, west and south of Tin Liu Tsuen and east and south of Shan Ha from “U” to “Open Space” (“O”).
- Item A5 – Rezoning of strips of land along Lam Tai East Road and Lam Tai West Road and to the west of Kung Um Road from “U” to areas shown as ‘Road’.
- Item B – Rezoning of a site to the east of Lam Tai East Road and to the northwest of Tin Liu Tsuen; and a site to the southwest of Tin Liu Tsuen from “U” to “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”).
- Item C – Rezoning of a site to the west of Lam Tai West Road and to the east of Shan Ha from “U” to “Village Type Development (1)” (“V(1)"); and a site to the east of Long Hon Road and to the west of Shan Ha from “R(D)” to “V(1)”.
- Item D1 – Rezoning of a site to the south of Yuen Long Highway and to the north of Tong Yan San Tsuen Road from “Industrial (Group D)” (“I(D)”) and “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Storage and Workshop Use” (“OU(SW)"); a site to south and east of Tong Yan San Tsuen Road from “I(D)”, “G/IC” and “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) to “OU(SW)”; and a site to the south of Tin Shui Wai West Interchange (TSWWI) and to the east of Yuen Long Highway from “GB” to “OU(SW)”.

- Item D2 – Rezoning of a site to the south of TSWWI and to the east of Yuen Long Highway from “GB” to “OS”.
- Item D3 – Rezoning of strips of land to the south, west and north of Tong Yan San Tsuen Road, to the north and west of Park Villa and to the south of TSWWI from “R(B)1”, “GB”, “I(D)” and “G/IC” to “O”.
- Item D4 – Rezoning of a strip of land to the south and east of TSWWI from “GB”, “I(D)” and “R(B)1” to an area shown as ‘Road’.
- Item E – Rezoning of a site to the southern end of Kung Um Road from “U” to “OU” annotated “Sewage Treatment Works” (“OU(STW)”).

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone to incorporate the “R(A)3” sub-zone and a corresponding exemption clause for plot ratio calculation.
- (b) Incorporation of ‘Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle) (on land designated “R(A)3” only)’ as a Column 1 use under the Notes for the “R(A)” zone and corresponding amendment to replace ‘Public Vehicle Park’ (excluding container vehicle)’ under Column 2 by ‘Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle) (not elsewhere specified)’.
- (c) Deletion of restriction on site coverage in the Remarks of the Notes for the “Residential (Group C)” zone.
- (d) Revision to the planning intention in the Notes of the “V” zone to incorporate the planning intention of the “V(1)” sub-zone.
- (e) Incorporation of ‘Art Studio (excluding those involving direct provision of services or goods)’ as a Column 1 use under the Notes of the “Industrial” (“I”) zone and corresponding amendment to replace ‘Place of Recreation, Sports and Culture’ under Column 2 by ‘Place of Recreation, Sports and Culture (not elsewhere specified)’.
- (f) Incorporation of ‘Eating Place (not elsewhere specified) (in wholesale conversion of an existing building only)’ as a Column 2 use under the Notes of the “I” zone.
- (g) Incorporation of ‘Institutional Use (not elsewhere specified) (in wholesale conversion of an existing building only)’ as a Column 2 use under the Notes of the “I” zone.
- (h) Incorporation of ‘Public Clinic (in wholesale conversion of an existing

building only)' as a Column 2 use under the Notes of the "I" zone.

- (i) Replacement of 'Educational Institution (ground floor only except in wholesale conversion of an existing building)' under Column 2 of the Notes of the "I" zone by 'Educational Institution (in wholesale conversion of an existing building only)'.
- (j) Replacement of 'Place of Entertainment (ground floor only except in wholesale conversion of an existing building)' under Column 2 of the Notes of the "I" zone by 'Place of Entertainment (in wholesale conversion of an existing building only)'.
- (k) Replacement of 'Religious Institution (ground floor only except in wholesale conversion of an existing building)' under Column 2 of the Notes of the "I" zone by 'Religious Institution (in wholesale conversion of an existing building only)'.
- (l) Replacement of 'Training Centre' under Column 2 of the Notes of the "I" zone by 'Training Centre (in wholesale conversion of an existing building only)'.
- (m) Revision to the planning intention in the Notes of the "I" zone to include 'selected uses akin to industrial production and would not compromise building and fire safety' as being always permitted in the "I" zone.
- (n) Deletion of the Notes of the "I(D)" zone.
- (o) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the "G/IC" zone to incorporate the "G/IC(1) and "G/IC(2)" sub-zones.
- (p) Incorporation of a new set of Notes for the "OU(SW)" zone.
- (q) Incorporation of a new set of Notes for the "OU(STW) zone.
- (r) Incorporation of 'Picnic Area' as a Column 1 use under the Notes for the "Conservation Area" ("CA") zone and corresponding deletion of 'Picnic Area' under Column 2 of the "CA" zone.
- (s) Deletion of 'Market' from Column 2 of the Notes for the "Comprehensive Development Area", "R(B)", "R(D)" and "V" zones.
- (t) Revision of 'Shop and Services' to 'Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)' under Column 2 of the Notes for the "R(A)" and "G/IC" zones.

Town Planning Board

10 July 2020

RNTPC Paper No. 3/20
For Consideration by the
Rural and New Town
Planning Committee
on 26.6.2020

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE
APPROVED TONG YAN SAN TSUEN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/YL-TYST/12
AND APPROVED TAI TONG OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/YL-TT/16**

1. Introduction

This paper is to seek Members' agreement that:

- (a) the proposed amendments to the approved Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-TYST/12 (**Attachment I**) and approved Tai Tong OZP No. S/YL-TT/16 (**Attachment II**) as shown on the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen OZP No. S/YL-TYST/12A (**Attachment III**) and draft Tai Tong OZP No. S/YL-TT/16A (**Attachment IV**) respectively, together with their Notes (**Attachments V and VII** respectively) are suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) the revised Explanatory Statements (ESs) of the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen and Tai Tong OZPs (**Attachments VI and VIII** respectively) are expressions of the Town Planning Board's (the Board's) planning intentions and objectives for the various land use zonings of the draft OZPs, and are suitable for exhibition together with the draft OZPs and their Notes.

2. Statuses of the Current OZPs

- 2.1 On 4.9.2018 and 13.3.2012, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C), under section 9(1)(a) of the Ordinance, approved the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen OZP and draft Tai Tong OZP, which were subsequently re-numbered as S/YL-TYST/12 and S/YL-TT/16 respectively. The approved OZPs were subsequently exhibited for public inspection under section 9(5) of the Ordinance.
- 2.2 On 9.7.2019, the CE in C referred the approved Tong Yan San Tsuen OZP No. S/YL-TYST/12 and Tai Tong OZP No. S/YL-TT/16 to the Board for amendments under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Ordinance. The reference back of the OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 19.7.2019 under section 12(2) of the Ordinance.

3. Background

Yuen Long South (YLS) Study

- 3.1 According to the 2011-12 Policy Address, the Government would explore the possibility of converting some 150 ha of agricultural land in North District and

Yuen Long that were used mainly for industrial purposes or temporary storage, or which was deserted, into housing land. In this connection, the Planning Department (PlanD) and Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) jointly commissioned the “Planning and Engineering Study for Housing Sites in YLS – Investigation” (the YLS Study) in November 2012 to examine the development potential of the degraded brownfield sites¹ in YLS for housing purpose and other uses with supporting infrastructure and community facilities, and to improve the existing environment.

- 3.2 On 1.9.2017, the Board was briefed on the Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) of the YLS Study, taking into account the public views collected in the Stage 3 Community Engagement (TPB Paper No. 10310). Under the RODP, about 185 ha of land (including about 100 ha of brownfield land) to the southwest of Yuen Long New Town would be transformed into a new community with about 28,500 new flats (new population of about 85,400) and the creation of about 10,500 employment opportunities. The development would comprise of 4 stages, i.e. Stages 1 to 4, which will be implemented by phases.

Revised RODP of YLS

- 3.3 In December 2018, in view of the increasingly acute demand for public housing, the Executive Council (ExCo) gave approval for the Government to increase the domestic plot ratio (PR) for public housing sites by up to 30% where technical feasibility permits. Echoing the 2018 Policy Address, the Long Term Housing Strategy (LTHS) also announced the target to revise the public/private housing supply split to 70:30 for the ten-year period from 2019-20 to 2028-29. In the light of the latest policy initiatives and to meet the acute demand, a review on the RODP of the YLS Study was subsequently commissioned primarily with a view to optimising the development intensities of the early stages of the YLS Development where technical feasibility permits, while largely maintaining the same design concepts and layout of the RODP. The review was substantially completed in 2019 and the Revised RODP was promulgated in May 2020.
- 3.4 The review confirmed the technical feasibility to optimise the development intensities for Stages 1 and 2 of the YLS Development, including:
- (a) Intensification of the maximum domestic PR for public housing sites from about 5 in the RODP to 6.5 in the Revised RODP, i.e. an increase of about 30% in line with the latest ExCo decision, to meet the acute housing demand;
 - (b) Intensification of the maximum non-domestic PR for multi-storey building² (MSB) sites from 3 to 4 in the RODP to 5 in the Revised RODP, to meet the demands from brownfield operators and the general public;

¹ According to the “Study on Existing Profile and Operation of Brownfield Sites in the New Territories – Feasibility Study”, brownfield sites are defined as “primarily agricultural land in the New Territories which has been formed and occupied by industrial, storage, logistics and parking uses.”

² Brownfield operations are generally land-intensive and operated in open-air environments where there may be environmental implications on the surrounding areas. To tackle the issues of brownfield sites, the Government is exploring the technical feasibility and financial viability of accommodating and consolidating some of the brownfield operations that are still needed in Hong Kong in a more land efficient manner, such as in multi-storey buildings (MSBs). MSBs are large-floorplate, high-headroom, purpose-designed buildings with wide and specially-designed vehicular passageways and ramps intended to accommodate brownfield operations that could

- (c) Earmark all housing sites under Stages 1 and 2 for public housing purpose to ensure early delivery of public housing to meet the acute demand; and
- (d) Increase in the overall public/private housing supply split from about 61:39 to about 68:32, generally in line with the latest LTHS target.

3.5 The Executive Summary of the YLS Study, documenting the study findings, the Revised RODP, proposed development phasing (which has since been updated following the promulgation of the Revised RODP, see **Plan 7**) and other implementation matters, is at **Appendix 1**. A comparison of the key parameters of the RODP and Revised RODP of the YLS Development are as follows:

	RODP (August 2017)	Revised RODP (May 2020)
YLS Area	224 ha	
YLS Development Area⁽¹⁾	185 ha	
Total Population	About 88,000	About 101,200
Number of New Flats	About 28,500	About 32,850
Public-Private Housing Mix	Public 61% Private 39%	Public 68% Private 32%
Employment Opportunities	About 10,500	About 13,630
Non-domestic Floor Space (m²)		
- Commercial	About 180,000	About 229,930
- Storage and Workshop ⁽²⁾	About 375,200	About 484,110
Maximum PR		
- Domestic	About 5	6.5
- Non-domestic	4	5

Note:

- (1) Development Area means the land area proposed for new development and infrastructure. It excludes areas retained for existing residential and institutional developments/roads/watercourses and land zoned for non-development purposes, such as “Green Belt” (“GB”) and “Agriculture” (“AGR”).
- (2) Excluding the proposed site for open storage, which generally carries no gross floor area (GFA) implications.

3.6 The YLS Study and some of the infrastructure works proposed therein are Designated Projects under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Ordinance (EIAO)³, with the latter requiring environmental permits for construction and operation. On 30.11.2017, the EIA report for the YLS Development (based on the RODP) was approved with conditions by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) under the EIAO. Subsequently, an environmental review and relevant assessments on traffic and transport, visual, landscaping, air ventilation, geotechnical, sustainability and other aspects were conducted to ascertain the feasibility and acceptability of the Revised RODP, the relevant assessment results of which are summarised in paragraph 4 below. Overall, the infrastructure required for the Revised RODP remains largely the same and the findings of the approved EIA report, as re-evaluated under the environmental review, are applicable to the Revised RODP.

not be accommodated in conventional flatted factory buildings. Apart from YLS, MSB developments are also proposed and being piloted by the Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area (to which about 24 ha of land are reserved for MSB developments).

³ According to Schedule 3 of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Ordinance, engineering feasibility study of urban development projects with a study area covering more than 20 ha or involving a total population of more than 100,000 is a major Designated Project requiring EIA report(s).

Phased Approach in Zoning Amendment

- 3.7 The YLS Study has concluded that the intensification of development intensities under the Revised RODP is technically feasible and environmentally acceptable as a whole. Notwithstanding this, a number of strategic transport infrastructure studies are currently being undertaken to support the developments in Northwest New Territories, such as the “Feasibility Study on Route 11 (between North Lantau and Yuen Long)” (Route 11 Study). The substantive findings of these studies may shed light on whether the development potential within the YLS area, including the remaining stages of the YLS Development, could be further optimised to meet the acute demand for housing and other societal needs.
- 3.8 To allow flexibility to adjust the scale of the remaining stages of the YLS Development, where appropriate, it is considered prudent to amend the zonings for Stages 1 and 2 of the YLS Development first (**Plan 7**), so as to meet the acute demand for housing and the expected demand for MSB floorspace once clearance of brownfield land in YLS ensues. Subject to the substantive findings of the aforesaid strategic transport infrastructure studies, a further review would be carried out, as early as 2021, to explore the feasibility to further optimise the development intensities for the remaining stages of the YLS Development. Having regard to the outcome of the further review, further amendments to the OZPs would be carried out to effect the remaining stages of the YLS Development in due course. Nevertheless, it is expected that the entire YLS Development would be completed by 2038 as originally scheduled.

4. The Proposed Amendments

- 4.1 The current proposed amendments involve rezoning of about 71 ha of land to the southwest of Yuen Long New Town to facilitate Stages 1 and 2 of the YLS Development. The broad amendment items are listed below with further details of each amendment item provided in paragraph 6. Opportunity has also been taken to revise and update the Notes of the OZPs to incorporate the latest revisions of the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN), as well as to update the ESs to the OZPs to reflect the latest statuses and planning circumstances of the OZPs. The major revisions are summarised in paragraphs 7 and 8 below.

Amendment Items A, A1 to A5 – Proposed Public Housing Development, Government, Institution or Community (GIC) Facilities, Open Space and Associated Works to the west of Kung Um Road and south of Muk Kiu Tau Tsuen (Plans 1a, 2a, 3a and 4a to 4c, 4f and 4g)

- 4.2 The subject amendment items, covering about 41.7 ha of land (including about 6.2 ha of government land (GL)), form a large part of the “Urban Living” planning area intended for a vibrant and lively neighbourhood proposed under the YLS Study (**Appendix 1**). Five sites to the west of Kung Um Road and in the vicinity of Tin Liu Tsuen and Shan Ha are proposed for high-density, high-rise public housing developments (Amendment Item A3). In support of the YLS Development, six sites in the vicinity are proposed for various GIC facilities (Amendment Items A, A1 and A2), while a further four sites in the vicinity are proposed for district open
-

RESTRICTED

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 650th Meeting of the
Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 26.6.2020**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairman

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr K.W. Leung

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Y.S. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East,
Transport Department
Mr Ken K.K. Yip

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

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

Assistant Director/Regional 3,
Lands Department
Mr Alan K.L. Lo

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms April K.Y. Kun

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Anita M.Y. Wong

~~decisions on three similar applications (No. A/NE-KLH/578, A/YL-KTS/832 and A/TM-SKW/105) for proposed public utility installation (solar energy system/panels) pending the formulation of assessment criteria on applications for installations of solar energy system. As the set of assessment criteria was still being formulated, the Planning Department recommended deferment of the current application until such assessment criteria was endorsed for use.~~

76. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the application. The application would be submitted to the Committee for consideration after the assessment criteria on applications for installation of solar energy system had been formulated.

~~[The Chairman thanked Miss Winnie B.Y. Lau, DPO/FSYLE, Ms S.H. Lam, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong and Ms Emily P.W. Tong, STPs/FSYLE, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]~~

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 23

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-TYST/12 and the Approved Tai Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-TT/16

(RNTPC Paper No. 3/20)

77. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendment items to the approved Tong Yan San Tsuen (TYST) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and Tai Tong (TT) OZP were to take forward Stages 1 and 2 of the Revised Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) of the Yuen Long South (YLS) Development under the "Planning and Engineering Study for Housing Sites in YLS – Investigation" (the YLS Study) commissioned by the Planning Department (PlanD) and the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), where Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was the consultant of the YLS Study.

The Revised RODP had recommended substantial number of flats for public housing. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---|--|
| Mr Gavin C.T. Tse
(as <i>Chief Engineer</i>
(Works), <i>Home Affairs</i>
<i>Department</i>) | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs as a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA); |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - his firm having current business dealings with HKHA and ARUP; |
| Mr Conrad T.C. Wong | - his firm having current business dealings with HKHA; |
| Mr L.T. Kwok | - his serving organisation openly bid a funding from HKHA; and |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - currently conducting contract research projects with CEDD. |

78. The Committee noted that Mr L.T. Kwok had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

79. The Committee noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, as the proposed amendments, including those for public housing development, were the subject of amendments to the OZP proposed by PlanD, the interests of Members in relation to HKHA would only need to be recorded. As Mr K.K. Cheung and Dr C.H. Hau had no involvement in relation to the amendment items, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Session

80. The following representatives from PlanD, CEDD and the consultants were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

- Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW)
- Mr Steven Y.H. Siu - Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW)
- Ms Sandy S.K. Ng - Senior Town Planner/Cross-Boundary Infrastructure and Development (STP/CID)

CEDD

- Mr Desmond Lam - Chief Engineer/West 1 (CE/W1)
- Mr W.L. Chui - Senior Engineer/District Monitoring Group on Housing Sites (West) (SE/DMGHS(West))

The Consultants

- Mr Peter Chan
 - Mr Ray Tang
 - Mr Elvis Lau
- } ARUP

81. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited the government representatives to brief Members on the Paper. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Background

- (a) according to the 2011-12 Policy Address, the Government would explore the possibility of converting some 150ha of land in North District and Yuen Long that were used mainly for industrial purposes or temporary storage, or which was deserted, into housing land. In that connection, PlanD and CEDD jointly commissioned the YLS Study in November 2012 to examine

the development potential of the degraded brownfield sites in YLS for housing purposes with supporting infrastructure and community facilities, and to improve the existing environment. The RODP was promulgated in August 2017;

- (b) in December 2018, in view of the latest policy initiatives and to meet the acute demand for public housing, a review on the RODP of the YLS Study was commissioned primarily with a view to optimising the development intensities of the early stages of the YLS Development where technical feasibility permitted. The review was substantially completed in 2019 and concluded that the intensification of development intensities under the Revised RODP was technically feasible and environmentally acceptable as a whole, and the Revised RODP was promulgated in May 2020;

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the OZPs

- (c) the current proposed amendments on the TYST and TT OZPs involved rezoning of about 71 ha of land to the southwest of Yuen Long New Town to facilitate Stages 1 and 2 of the YLS Development, which aimed to meet the acute demand for housing and the expected demand for Multi-storey Building (MSB) floor-space once clearance of brownfield land in YLS ensued;
- (d) Amendment Items A (on TT OZP) and A1 to A5 (on TYST OZP) involved rezoning of about 41.7ha of land for public housing development, government, institution or community (GIC) facilities, open space and associated works:
 - (i) Amendment Item A: rezoning of a site to the east of Kiu Hing Road from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” (“OU(RU)”) and “Agriculture” to “Government, Institution or Community(1)” (“G/IC(1)”) with a maximum building height (BH) restriction of 8 storeys;

- (ii) Amendment Item A1: rezoning of two sites to the west of Kung Um Road from “Undetermined” (“U”) to “G/IC(1)”;
 - (iii) Amendment Item A2: rezoning of three sites in the vicinity of Shan Ha Road and Kung Um Road from “Open Storage” (“OS”) and “U” to “G/IC(2)” with a maximum BH restriction of 4 storeys;
 - (iv) Amendment Item A3: rezoning of five sites to the west of Kung Um Road from “U” to “Residential (Group A) 3” with a maximum plot ratio (PR) restriction of 7 and a maximum BH restriction of 160mPD;
 - (v) Amendment Item A4: rezoning of four sites and strips of land in the vicinity of Lam Tai West Road, Lam Tai East Road and Kung Um Road from “U” to “Open Space” (“O”); and
 - (vi) Amendment Item A5: rezoning of an area to the west of Kung Um Road from “U” to an area shown as ‘Road’;
- (e) Amendment Item B (about 1.2ha) was for retention of existing residential clusters, which involved rezoning of two sites in the vicinity of Tin Liu Tsuen on the TYST OZP from “U” to “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) with maximum PR and BH restrictions of 0.2 and 2 storeys (6m) respectively and rezoning of a site in the vicinity of Muk Kiu Tau Tsuen on the TT OZP from “OU(RU)” to “R(D)”) with maximum PR and BH restrictions of 0.4 and 3 storeys (9m) respectively;
- (f) Amendment Item C (about 1.3ha) was mainly for reprovisioning of village houses affected by government projects, which involved rezoning of two sites in the vicinity of Shan Ha on the TYST OZP from “R(D)”) and ‘U’ to “Village Type Development (1)” (“V(1)”) and rezoning of a site in the vicinity of Wong Nai Tun Tsuen on the TT OZP from “OU(RU)” to “V(1)”), both with a maximum BH restriction of 8.23m (3 storeys);
- (g) Amendment Items D1 to D4, covering about 22.6ha of land on the TYST

OZP, was mainly for proposed MSB development, open storage, open space and associated works to the south of Yuen Long Highway and near Tin Shui Wai West Interchange (TSWWI):

- (i) Amendment Item D1: rezoning of three sites south of Yuen Long Highway from “Industrial (Group D)” (“I(D)”), “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”), “G/IC” and “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Storage and Workshop Use”, with maximum non-domestic PR and BH restrictions of 5 and 110mPD respectively;
 - (ii) Amendment Item D2: rezoning of an area to the south of TSWWI from “GB” to “OS”;
 - (iii) Amendment Item D3: rezoning of two sites and strips of land in the vicinity of TSWWI and Tong Yan San Tsuen Road from “I(D)”, “R(B)1”, “G/IC” and “GB” to “O”; and
 - (iv) Amendment Item D4: rezoning of an area to the south of Yuen Long Highway from “I(D)”, “R(B)1” and “GB” to an area shown as ‘Road’.
- (h) Amendment Item E (about 4.2ha) involved rezoning of a site to the southern end of Kung Um Road from “U” to “OU” annotated “Sewage Treatment Works” mainly for a sewage treatment/screening plant with maximum BH of 35mPD;

Proposed Amendment to the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZPs

- (i) corresponding revisions to the Notes and ES had been proposed to take into account the proposed amendments and to follow the revised Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plan promulgated by the Board;

Technical Assessments

- (j) relevant technical assessments had been carried out in the YLS Study and all assessment results indicated that the YLS Development was technically feasible and would not cause unacceptable environmental impacts;

Consultation

- (k) the Shap Pat Heung Rural Committee (SPHRC), the Yuen Long District Council's Housing, Town Planning and Development Committee (YLDC HTP&DC) and Ping Shan Rural Committee (PSRC) were consulted on 8.5.2020, 20.5.2020 and 12.6.2020 respectively. The SPHRC supported the YLS Development and the proposed OZP amendments, but raised concerns on the compensation/relocation arrangement for affected stakeholders and the traffic and transport impact of the proposal during both the construction and implementation stages. SPHRC members suggested road improvement works as well as a new connection to Yuen Long Town Centre and a tunnel connection to the TT area via the proposed Route 11;
- (l) the YLDC HTP&DC did not raise objection to the proposed amendments, but passed a motion objecting to the alleged bundling of the YLS Development with the proposed road improvement works in the area. YLDC HTP&DC members also raised concern on traffic, lack of employment opportunities and commercial/retail uses in the YLS area, the need for an integrated pedestrian and cycling network and associated infrastructures, the displacement of some existing social welfare facilities, and the operational feasibility of the proposed MSBs. Suggestions were made to include more GIC facilities in the YLS Development and provide more public housing in the TYST area;
- (m) the PSRC did not raise objection to the YLS Development. Apart from traffic concerns similar to those raised by SPHRC and YLDC HTP&DC, PSRC members also raised concern on the brownfield operations to be affected by the YLS Development. Specific suggestions were made

including retaining some of the area in the YLS Development for open storage use and construction of an additional access road to Shan Ha; and

- (n) the proposed amendments had been circulated to relevant government bureaux/departments for comments. Comments from concerned government bureaux/departments had been incorporated where appropriate. Other departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed amendments.

82. As the presentation by PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

83. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

Traffic and Transportation Aspects

- (a) details of the proposed environmentally friendly transport services (EFTS);
- (b) details on the proposed Route 11 and whether it would help ease the traffic condition in the area;
- (c) details of the traffic and transport impacts of the YLS Development;

GIC Provision

- (d) noting that there would be increases in the development intensity and changes to the overall public/private housing supply as shown on the Revised RODP, whether there would be sufficient GIC facilities to cater for the future population and whether the affected residential care home for the disabled would be reprovisioned;

Development intensity and open space provision

- (e) the development intensity of the residential developments in the Yuen Long

area;

- (f) noting that open space would be provided in residential developments and Amendment Item A4 also involved the rezoning of a number of sites to “O”, under what circumstances would open space be provided in residential developments or be provided separately;
- (g) whether the areas rezoned to “O” could be used for residential development to increase flat supply; and

MSB development

- (h) details of the operation of the MSBs and noting that there was an on-going study regarding MSBs, whether the industry would be consulted on the findings.

[Mr Y.S. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

84. In response, Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, and Mr Desmond Lam, CE/W1, CEDD, made the following points:

Traffic and Transportation Aspects

- (a) the EFTS, which was the same as that being studied under the Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area (HSK/HT NDA), was to connect YLS with HSK/HT NDA and the Tin Shui Wai area. For the on-going study of the proposed EFTS, the Stage 1 public consultation to seek the public’s views on the alignment and operation mode of the EFTS was completed;
- (b) with regard to the planned Route 11, it was proposed to connect Sham Tseng and Lam Tei with northeast Lantau Island and was currently under study by the Highways Department. Relevant parties would be consulted on the findings at a later stage. Subject to the findings of the study, the

tentative completion year of Route 11 would be 2036;

- (c) a traffic and transport impact assessment was conducted as part of the YLS Study. With reference to Plan 6 of the Paper, a series of major transport infrastructures and improvement measures were proposed, including improvements to the TYST Interchange and TSWWI, a new slip road to divert traffic away from the section of Kung Um Road and Kiu Hing Road close to Shap Pat Heung Road for direct access to Yuen Long Highway, new district distributor roads running through the development area, and widening of Kung Um Road and Kiu Hing Road, etc.;

GIC Provision

- (d) the YLS Study had taken into account the need to provide GIC facilities to meet the planned population in the area. Some GIC facilities, such as neighbourhood elderly centre and residential care home for the elderly, would be provided within public housing developments. There were also sites rezoned to “G/IC” for provision of such facilities. The provision for open space and GIC facilities was in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the planned provision was generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population;

Development intensity and open space provision

- (e) regarding the development intensities of residential developments in the Yuen Long area, the maximum domestic PR of residential developments in the Yuen Long New Town was 5. The public housing developments under Amendment Item A3 had a maximum domestic PR of 6.5, which was increased from the original PR of 5 in the RODP taking into account the latest policy initiatives to increase the domestic PR of public housing sites by up to 30% where technical feasibility permitted;
- (f) as for sites to be rezoned to “O” under Amendment Item A4, they were mainly district open space to meet the requirements under the HKPSG.

While local open space would be provided in the proposed public housing developments, district open space usually would be provided separately. It should be noted that as the existing residential developments in the YLS area were mainly low-density and low-rise in nature, the strips of land proposed to be rezoned to “O” also served as a buffer and breezeway to improve the overall environment; and

MSB development

- (g) the operation of the MSBs was currently under study and a market sounding-out exercise was being carried out. No details on the operation of the MSBs were currently available. For brownfield operations that would be affected by the YLS Development, compensation to the affected operators would be provided according to the prevailing policies.

Affected operations in the YLS area

85. A Member enquired about the impacts of the YLS Development on the livestock farms in the area. In response, Mr Desmond Lam, CE/W1, CEDD said that there were three chicken farms and three pig farms within the YLS area. One chicken farm and one pig farm would be affected under Stage 2 of the YLS Development and it was anticipated that land resumption works would commence tentatively in 2025. The remaining livestock farms were located at the further south of the YLS area and fell within the remaining stages of the YLS Development, of which one chicken farm would be retained. Compensation to the affected farm operators would be provided according to the established mechanisms.

86. Noting that two existing concrete batching plants (CBPs) in Tong Yan San Tsuen would be affected under Amendment Item D1, a Member was concerned that it might affect the supply of concrete for construction projects in Hong Kong, and enquired whether there would be sites for relocation of the CBPs. Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, said that Amendment Item D1, which fell within Stage 2 of the YLS Development, was mainly for the provision of MSBs to accommodate brownfield operations that could not be accommodated in conventional flatted factory buildings. Land resumption for that part of the YLS area was anticipated to commence tentatively in 2022. Compensation to the

affected business operators would be provided according to the established mechanisms while assistance would be provided for their relocation as appropriate. As there were also existing CBPs that would be affected by the HSK/HT NDA, there might be opportunities to explore compensation/relocation as a whole to ensure the concrete supply to the construction industry would not be adversely affected. While there were no sites earmarked in the YLS area for CBP, such use was a Column 2 use in the “OS” zone.

87. The Chairman supplemented that the Works Branch of Development Bureau was overseeing the supply of concrete for the construction industry and would closely monitor the situation.

88. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments and that the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-TYST/12A at Attachment III (to be renumbered as S/YL-TYST/13) and draft Tai Tong OZP No. S/YL-TT/16A at Attachment IV (to be renumbered as S/YL-TT/17) and their Notes at Attachments V and VII respectively are suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statements (ESs) at Attachments VI and VIII for the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen OZP No. S/YL-TYST/12A (to be renumbered as S/YL-TYST/13) and draft Tai Tong OZP No. S/YL-TT/16A (to be renumbered as S/YL-TT/17) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZPs and the revised ESs will be published together with the draft OZPs.”

89. 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 Chairman thanked Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen, DPO/TMYLW, Ms Sandy S.K. Ng, STP/CID, Mr Desmond Lam, CE/W1, CEDD, Mr W.L. Chui, SE/DMGHS(West), CEDD, Messrs Peter

Chan, Ray Tang and Elvis Lau for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, Mr Simon P.H. Chan, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak and Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STPs/TMYLW), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 24

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/1009 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Food and Electronic Goods for a Period of 3 Years in "Undetermined" Zone, Lots 490 RP (Part), 709, 710, 711, 723, 724, 725, 729, 730, 731 and 732 in D.D. 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1009A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

90. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary warehouse for storage of food and electronic goods for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and

十八鄉鄉事委員會第二十五屆執委會第 12 次及 13 次聯合例會

日期：2020 年 5 月 8 日 (星期五)

時間：下午 2 時 30 分

地點：本會會所二樓會議廳

出席者：程振明、梁智峯、林照權、張志安、易喜亮、葉振發、張華年、
黃劍雄、黃漢榮、曾玉生、鄧肇康、李柏偉、林衛光、楊全發、
胡兆雄、周錦祥、黃律中、蔣石耀

請假：陳作堯

列席者：發展局 - 林智文、陳冠恒

：土木工程拓展署 - 林志強、徐偉樂

：規劃署 - 袁承業、吳淑君、蕭亦豪、葉嘉泳

：奧雅納工程顧問 - 陳禮仁、楊詠珊、鄧思威、盧曼芝、林澤康

：元朗民政處 - 吳燕冰、王佩兒

：十八鄉北區議員 - 沈豪傑

：新界鄉議局特別議員 - 林添福

：梁福元、易漢猷、胡景光、胡偉傑、胡偉忠、何桂華、俞國忠

記錄：本會秘書 - 鄒維芳、羅梅芳

會議紀錄

主席宣佈開會時間：下午 2 時 30 分

(甲) 通過事項：

06 NOV 2020



~~1. 通過第二十五屆第 12 次及 13 次聯合會議議程：由易喜亮提議，葉振發~~

~~和議，與會者一致通過。~~

- ~~2. 通過第二十五屆第 10 次及 11 次聯合會議紀錄：由易喜亮提議，葉振發和議，與會者一致通過。~~

(乙) 報告及跟進事項：

1. 發展局、土木工程拓展署、規劃署及奧雅納工程顧問講解及諮詢元朗南第一及第二階段發展及改劃建議。

發展局林志文表示，關於元朗南發展，理解地區人士最關注交通問題，會盡量爭取道路工程與土地平整工程同時開展，期望在樓宇落成前完成道路工程，解決交通需求，同時改善鄉村交通。至於棕地方面，長遠計劃除了多層大廈外，短期亦會扶助業界，從中協調為業界尋找不多於 10 公頃合適用地。元朗南發展計劃程序，首先要改劃法定圖則；為道路刊憲；完成法定程序後向立法會申請撥款。期望在改劃階段能得到大家的支持，再進行後續工程。

規劃署吳淑君表示，規劃署及土木工程拓展署就元朗南發展委託奧雅納工程顧問進行研究。

奧雅納陳禮仁表示，元朗南發展於 2012 年開始，經過 3 個社區參與及規劃研究後，於 2017 年落實元朗南建議發展大綱圖，當時規劃人口為 88,000 人，提供 28,500 個住宅單位。及後因應新房屋政策及公眾廣泛意見，政府決定於 2018 年進行檢討，考慮適量增加發展密度以回應社會大眾對房屋的需求，其間於 2013、2014 及 2016 年曾到鄉事會聽取大家的意見，並於 2017 年向大家匯報發展大綱圖。2017 年與 2020 年修訂發展大綱圖主要改動為：公庵路主要公屋地帶的地則比率由原本 5 倍增加至 7



倍，提升人口比例，增加房屋供應。唐人新村棕地作業者使用的多層大廈地則比率由原本 4 倍增至 5 倍。將一幅細露天倉用地調整，增建新道路至丹桂村公營房屋。回應市民訴求，將田寮村電力支站搬離民居；配合未來發展，將交通交匯處靠近公營房屋，方便市民。新建議發展大綱圖，人口增加百份之 15 至 1,001,200 人；公營房屋單位增加百份之 15 至 32,850 個；就業機會增加百份之 30 至 13,630 個；工、商業樓面面積增加了百份之 28。交通配套方面，興建新主幹道貫通發展區，連接唐人新村至公庵路沿線地區；興建新連接路讓車輛繞過元朗公路以北的公庵路直接駛至元朗公路及元政路的公共交通交匯處；覆蓋部份明渠擴闊公庵路至雙線行車；改善唐人新村及天水圍西交匯處；元朗南新增 3 個公共交通交匯處；研究連接元朗南和洪水橋/厦村新發展區的環保運輸服務；新增更多道路接駁口以改善周邊鄉村與元朗市發展連接。

規劃署蕭亦豪表示，元朗南發展項目佔地甚廣，必須分階段推行，整個發展項目涉及約 100 公頃棕地作業及數百戶受影響居民。政府考慮基建帶動發展的重要性，元朗南發展以基建先行，所以擴闊公庵路、僑興路、電力支站及污水處理廠、污水泵房等會在第一、二階段進行。及後再發展較北面的公營房屋用地及多層大廈，盡力爭取在 2028 年讓首批市民入住元朗南公營房屋，至於餘下第三及四階段發展，受制於其他因素影響，現時地則比率相對較低，待可行性研究報告完成後，將進一步探討釋放發展潛力，再進行法定程序，整體目標在 2038 年全面落成元朗南發展項目。今次改劃大綱圖，主要涉及大棠及唐人新村，5 組修訂項目各佔 10 多公頃，包括：公營房屋用地、工場及露天貯物用地、休憩用地、政府機構或社區設施與及道路，分佈十分均衡。

修訂項目 A: 主要涉及欖堤路東、西路附近高密度公營房屋發展，將有約 52,000 名居民遷入，最早入伙年份為 2028 年，當中主要包括 5 塊公營房



屋用地，附設幼稚園、零售及福利設施等，總地積比率為 7 倍。此外，還有社區設施，包括鄰近木橋頭 4 間小學、2 座政府大樓、元朗公路以南 2 個污水抽水站、垃圾收集站、電力支站及休憩用地。

修訂項目 B: 在天水圍西交匯處附近，主要將 3 幅土地興建多層樓宇，提供樓面面積 484,000 平方米以容納棕地作業者、1 幅露天貯物用地及休憩用地。

修訂項目 C: 在山下村東、西面及黃泥墩村附近提供土地為原區安置符合搬村資格的居民。

修訂項目 D: 保留一些與「經修訂的建議發展大綱圖」沒有衝突的住宅社區，分別為天龍村、田寮村 1 間屋宇及木橋頭村 4 間現有屋宇。

修訂項目 E: 在公庵路南端興建一所污水處理廠，服務整個元朗南地區。今次改劃建議主要涉及第一及第二階段發展，預計主要工程在 2022 年逐步展開，目標在 2028 年讓首批居民入住。

實施安排撮要:

- 1.) 元朗南發展項目主要採用「加強版的傳統新市鎮發展模式」，但今次改劃不涉及私人發展的用地，因此政府會根據《收回土地條例》收回發展所需的土地。
- 2.) 政府為土地業權人作出法定補償，符合搬村資格的居民，政府將按現行新界搬村政策予以補償及安置。
- 3.) 政府為所有合資格受影響的棕地作業者、寮屋居民、農民及禽畜養殖場負責人提供補償、特惠補償、津貼或其他安排。

至於未來路向，規劃署正準備開展元朗南發展第一及第二階段的法定規劃程序，地政總署稍後會進行凍結登記；土木工程拓展署為道路及污水收集系統刊憲，繼而向立法會申請撥款，最快於 2022 年開始收地。至於元朗南餘下的發展，政府將於 2021 年審視 11 號幹線及環保運輸系統的可行性研究，再探討能否進一步釋放發展潛力，務求在 2038 年完成整個元



朗南發展。歡迎各委員提出意見，有關意見將一併提交予城規會考慮。如小組委員會同意有關修訂項目，城規會便會展示修訂分區計劃大綱圖作為期兩個月的公眾諮詢，屆時所有公眾人士可對修訂項目提出申述。

土木工程拓展署林志強表示，稍後會為道路工程刊憲，包括：全面改善唐人新村交匯處，車輛可在朗漢路附近直接駛至元朗公路往屯門或上水方向，由上水往元朗的車輛經唐人新村交匯處便能貫通至發展區新道路；擴闊公庵路及僑興路至雙線單程行車，交通將大為改善；現時十八鄉路及公庵路口十分擠塞，將劃為雙線行車及興建 L1 路分流車輛，舒緩交通擠塞。

梁福元先生表示，對於受發展影響的棕地作業者關注政府如何安置或賠償？建議先興建新道路將車輛分流至唐人新村交匯處，解決大棠路一帶交通擠塞問題，才擴闊公庵路，避免影響當地交通。另外，公庵路附近的村民經常投訴雞場發出臭味擾人及污染環境，為何仍然要保留雞場？能否考慮將污水渠接駁至 K66 黃泥墩巴士總站？建議興建 11 號幹線時在公庵山預留隧道出入口，以配合未來交通發展。

林添福特別議員表示，受元朗南發展影響的村落最關注僑興路交通改善工程，現時僑興路並非標準道路，十八鄉交匯處繁忙時間非常擠塞，若增加一條不經迴旋處便能直往博愛的行車線，便可疏導交通，促請部門詳細講解僑興路及十八鄉交匯處交通設計方案。

周錦祥主任認為元朗人習慣以元朗市為社交活動中心，關注元朗南將有 10 萬人居住，應積極考慮將僑興路全面由 2 線增至 3 線行車。若未能做到，則強烈建議在僑興路北段往原築這段亦必須劃為 3 線行車，最



好能一併覆蓋明渠，否則該處交通將非常擠塞。

易漢猷村代表認為元朗南今次改劃建議偏重改善唐人新村的交通，前任梁福元主席多年前已建議要求改善大棠路及公庵路，但是今次改劃只着重改善原築、溱柏往十八鄉路的交通。現時大棠路及公庵路正面對交通擠塞問題，若其中一條道路發生交通意外，也會導致附近一帶的交通嚴重擠塞，促請部門盡快落實解決交通問題？

沈豪傑議員表示，元朗南發展主要向現有棕地作業者收地發展，雖然唐人新村北面將會規劃土地，但是規模根本不足以安置現有棕地作業者，關注部門是否有方案實行原區安置？此外，現時元朗市交通已經很擠塞，往來市區主要用三號幹線，關注未來有 10 萬人在元朗南居住，促請部門應認真考慮在公庵山加建隧道接駁 11 號幹線，解決元朗南交通問題，同時亦有助增加發展密度。

胡兆雄主任表示，即使平日公庵路交通也十分繁忙，今早在原築燈位有 40 至 50 部車輛等候，車龍擠塞至木橋頭村，關注元朗南將會有 10 萬人居住，是否單靠一條雙程路便能解決交通擠塞問題？

發展局林志文表示，感謝大家提出意見，認同要先處理大家最關注的交通問題，稍後再詳細解釋元朗市中心交通接駁問題，例如 L1 路，而路政署及運房局正研究 11 號幹線。至於棕地安排，發展局會協助棕地作業者尋找合適土地，或在規劃方面作出協調，多管齊下協助業界。

土木工程拓展署林志強表示，就策略性道路，路政署正研究 11 號幹線，關注大欖隧道開始有擠塞情況，將來 11 號幹線落成後，有助將車



輛分流至大欖隧道，新界西北的交通將大為改善。另外，十八鄉迴旋處將新增一條專用左線，車輛直接從大旗嶺路或十八鄉路，無須經迴旋處便能前往上水方向，改善交通擠塞。

奧雅納鄧思威表示，關於僑興路及公庵路，南行及北行將擴闊為雙線行車，每隔約 200 米便有一個連接路往北行或南行，提升僑興路及公庵路的交通系統。為免影響交通，擴闊工程將會分階段實施，首先在唐人新村興建新道路，再擴闊欖堤東、西路，分流部份現時使用僑興路及公庵路的車輛。現時元朗市交通擠塞，政府鼓勵市民使用穿疏巴士或小巴等公共交通工具，將擴闊大旗嶺路連接元朗站公共交通交匯處，再加上接駁天橋，定能舒緩馬田路及十八鄉路的交通。而日後車輛使用擴闊了僑興路及公庵路，亦有助疏導大棠路一帶的交通。

程主席表示，原築路口是交通「死結」，強烈建議全面覆蓋明渠，促請土木工程署儘快落實有關擴闊工程。另外，部門曾承諾在去年尾向程主席及梁福元先生提交有關報告，但至今仍未收到。

發展局林志文表示，理解大家關注元朗南交通及配套是否足夠？稍後再促請部門仔細研究覆蓋原築附近明渠的可行性。

土木工程拓展署林志強表示，將先興建唐人新村交匯處及 B1 及 B2 新道路去分流車輛，刊憲時再為大家詳細介紹交通設計。

梁福元先生表示，十八鄉路原築附近的居民日日都面對塞車之苦，促請有關部門盡快研究如何解決原築交通擠塞問題，建議可以興建臨時天橋。此外，環保單車徑及行人徑是否接駁至 K66 黃泥墩巴士總站？



奧雅納鄧思威表示，會有單車徑及行人徑覆蓋整個元朗南，會仔細考慮梁先生提出接駁至 K66 黃泥墩巴士總站的建議。

胡兆雄主任建議將近田寮村連接路位置向前移(元朗方向)。

程主席表示，大家非常關注交通問題，建議應重點研究貫通公庵山連接 11 號幹線問題，以配合未來發展，同時亦要盡快處理原築交通擠塞問題。此外，一個體育中心並不足以應付元朗南 10 萬人口，建議最少要增建一個足球場。若大家仍有意見，可透過鄉事會向部門反映，感謝各政府部門代表講解元朗南第一及第二階段發展及改劃建議。



2. 元朗民政處報告

06 NOV 2020

吳燕冰主任表示，感謝鄉事會協助為各村落集體採購防疫用品。鄉郊代表選舉選民登記，今年新登記及已登記原居民需要更改通訊地址截止日期同為 7 月 16 日；已登記選民更改資料則請於 6 月 16 日前提交資料。雨季即將來臨，預防水浸宣傳單張已送到鄉事會，村代表如發覺村落水浸亦可致電渠務署熱線 2300 1110。

林添福特別議員表示，關於村代表選舉居民代表的選民資格，部門已開始抽樣調查，如接獲有關表格必須回覆，否則登記資格將被取消。

3. 追認本會 4 月 3 日第十二次執行委員會會議因應新型冠狀病毒影響而押後至 5 月 8 日與第十三次執行委員會會議聯合舉行。

由易喜亮提議，葉振發和議，與會者一致通過上述事項。

4. 地政總署就新界鄉議局提出十大訴求回覆。

屏山鄉鄉事委員會

第二十一屆執行委員會

第八次會議紀錄(摘錄)

日期：二零二零年六月十二日(星期五)

時間：下午二時三十分

地點：本會會議廳

會議主持：鄧志強

記錄：陳美斯

出席者

執行委員：鄧志強主席 林權首副主席 鄧同發副主席
張錦福 吳燦輝 鄧偉陽 鄧炳輝 鄧達善
鄧子光 林如棟 鄧自強 陳愛金 陳月倫
鄧焜強 鄧志學 張錦超 周錦明 張國才
鄧積善 郭樹基 陳錫儔 陶炳南 鄧超雄

新界鄉議局特別議員：張致堦

顧問：楊家安 鄧慶業 李軍樑

列席：鄧森福 張家慶 陳文輝

鳳池村村民袁寶華

政府部門代表/嘉賓

<u>姓名</u>	<u>所屬部門</u>	<u>職位</u>
郭漢明先生	天水圍分區警署	鄉村巡邏隊警署警長
鄭文德先生	元朗分區警署	警民關係組警長
吳偉健先生	元朗分區警署	元朗特遣隊警長
禰若翰先生	元朗民政事務處	高級聯絡主任(1)
王淑嫻女士	元朗民政事務處	聯絡主任主管(鄉郊二)
王開傑先生	元朗民政事務處	聯絡主任(鄉郊二)
林智文先生	發展局	首席助理秘書長(規劃及地政)5
陳冠恒先生	發展局	助理秘書長(規劃)10
林志強先生	土木工程拓展署	總工程師/西1
徐偉樂先生	土木工程拓展署	高級工程師/房屋用地分區監察組/西
張兆倫先生	土木工程拓展署	工程師3/房屋工程2

袁承業先生	規劃署	屯門及元朗西規劃專員
吳淑君女士	規劃署	高級城市規劃師／跨界基建發展3
曾翊婷女士	規劃署	城市規劃師／元朗西1
陳禮仁先生	奧雅納工程顧問	董事
楊詠珊女士	奧雅納工程顧問	董事
鄧思威先生	奧雅納工程顧問	助理董事

會議內容：

八. 討論事項(2)

政府部門講解元朗南第一及第二階段發展的改劃建議。

鄧志強主席介紹與會嘉賓:

發展局首席助理秘書長（規劃及地政）5林智文先生

發展局助理秘書長（規劃）10陳冠恒先生

土木工程拓展署總工程師／西1林志強先生

土木工程拓展署高級工程師/房屋用地分區監察組/西徐偉樂先生

土木工程拓展署工程師3／房屋工程2張兆倫先生

規劃署屯門及元朗西規劃專員袁承業先生

規劃署高級城市規劃師／跨界基建發展3吳淑君女士

規劃署城市規劃師／元朗西1曾翊婷女士

奧雅納工程顧問董事陳禮仁先生

奧雅納工程顧問董事楊詠珊女士

奧雅納工程顧問助理董事鄧思威先生

發展局首席助理秘書長（規劃及地政）5林智文先生表示，很高興能出席今次會議為各委員介紹元朗南第一及第二階段發展的改劃建議。元朗南發展計劃是政府在新界推行的第三個大型發展項目，為要解決房屋及經濟活動用地的需求，同時締造契機以改善鄉村環境，讓城鄉有所裨益。元朗南發展牽涉不少棕地作業，例如倉存物流業等，該些行業對現行經濟活動擔當重要角色，為了盡量減低對該些行業的影響，在推展計劃時，在清拆時間表上將會有序地逐步進行。長遠而言，政府正研究將棕地作業遷移至多層樓宇用地，現階段正進行市場意向調查。短期而言，受影響的棕地作業可根據2018年經加強的特惠補償及安置安排獲得賠償，

此外發展局會協調相關部門向有意在其他地區重置業務的經營者在覓地重置時提供規劃及地政程序方面的協助。

林智文先生表示，今次改劃只佔元朗南發展計劃約一半範圍，至於鄰近大欖郊野公園及位於唐人新村一帶的餘下階段（即原來的第三及第四階段合併）的土地，政府計劃最早在2021年考慮擬議策略性基礎設施(特別是道路)的容量後，再探討能否進一步釋放餘下階段的發展潛力。政府將檢視交通配套，再推行整個項目，並為餘下範圍進行土地改劃。但就一些地區道路改善工程，當局會盡早進行以改善區內交通情況。今次會議主要是向各委員介紹元朗南第一及第二階段發展的改劃建議，希望得到各位支持及聽取意見，然後把意見呈交城市規劃委員會(城規會)考慮。除此之外，土木工程拓展署(土拓署)預計在今年下旬就部分擬議的道路及污水收集系統工程諮詢鄉事委員會，亦藉此機會就道路改善工程的初步建議向委員作介紹。

奧雅納工程顧問董事陳禮仁先生表示，政府於2012年開展了元朗南房屋用地規劃及工程研究，經過三個階段的社區參與，於2017年確定了元朗南發展的「建議發展大綱圖」，當時規劃人口約為88,000人，新增住宅單位約28,500個。因應新房屋政策及公眾廣泛意見，政府於2018年決定為元朗南發展進行檢討，適量地優化發展密度，以回應社會大眾對公營房屋、商業及社區設施的需求。

陳禮仁先生表示，「經修訂的建議發展大綱圖」的土地用途及道路佈局大致不變。修訂項目主要包括：(一) 近公庵路的六幅公營房屋土地，包括改劃一幅私人住宅土地為公營房屋土地，地積比率由五改為七；(二) 近唐人新村規劃五幅棕地作業多層樓宇用地，亦提升了發展密度，由地積比率四增至五；(三) 調整一幅露天貯物用地的邊界以容納一條接駁至丹桂村公營房屋的連接路；(四) 優化政府、機構或社區設施，例如電力站搬離民居、擴大一幅政府用地以容納公共運輸交匯處。

陳禮仁先生表示，「經修訂的建議發展大綱圖」總人口由約88,000人增加至約101,200人，新建住宅單位數目增加至約32,850個，公私房屋比例約為七比三，就業機會增加至約13,630個，工、商業樓面面積增加約28%。「經修訂的建議發展大綱圖」的規劃概念不變，區內劃分五個規劃區，包括三個不同發展密度的住宅區、一個就業帶及一個田園地帶。因應元朗南的地理環境，北面靠近新市鎮的樓宇規劃樓層較高，南面較低密度發展以配合大欖郊野公園的周邊環境，三個不同發展

密度的住宅區各自設有活動中心及休憩空間，元朗明渠亦將改善為更美觀的活動走廊。

陳禮仁先生表示，「經修訂的建議發展大綱圖」包含混合發展，例如公共運輸交匯處、政府綜合大樓提供商業、零售及社會福利設施，大部份樓宇的低層發展為商業用途，政府土地及大樓低層為社會福利及文娛康樂設施例如診所、體育中心、社區會堂、街市及學校等以方便居民使用，該些設施除了提供居民日常需要之外，亦為原區居民提供不少就業機會，減低區內居民對區外出行需要。為營造多元化社區，元朗南發展以不同形式營造綠色空間，例如農地、山邊河道等，以提供動態和靜態的休憩空間，結合活化河道、行人路和單車徑以形成優美的藍綠網絡。

陳禮仁先生表示，因應「經修訂的建議發展大綱圖」，顧問進行了一系列的技術評估，包括交通及運輸、環境檢討、排水、排污、供水及公用設施、空氣流通、社會經濟影響、綠色倡議研究及碳排放和可持續發展方面，經評估後確定元朗南發展計劃在技術上是可行的。技術評估期間，顧問提出一系列交通改善措施及工程的建議，區內將會興建一條主幹道，以連接元朗南主要範圍，亦覆蓋部份元朗明渠以擴闊公庵路及僑興路為標準雙線單程行車道。同時在三個住宅區新增公共交通設施，各區設有巴士總站以方便居民。對外交通方面，將改善唐人新村交匯處及天水圍西交匯處，新建一條連接路至 YOHO midtown 旁邊的公共運輸交匯處，開闢接駁巴士至西鐵元朗站，亦提供完善的區內單車徑接駁至區外的單車徑。

土木工程拓展署總工程師／西1林志強先生表示，元朗南發展計劃最先推展工程包括：(一) 欖提東路一幅土地興建公營房屋，(二) 唐人新村範圍內的多層樓宇用地；(三) 兩幅鄉村遷置用地；(四) 唐人新村交匯處改善工程；(五) 連接公庵路及僑興路至大旗嶺路的新道路；(六) 連接公庵路至唐人新村交匯處的部分新道路；(七) 以及擴闊部分公庵路、僑興路及黃泥墩村路。現階段的刊憲並不包括欖口村村口的籃球場。

林志強先生表示，改善後的唐人新村交匯處，將可由元朗公路西行直接駛往元朗南。有關覆蓋元朗明渠以擴闊公庵路及僑興路的建議，土拓署正研究可否全面覆蓋近原築的一段元朗明渠，前提是首先獲批更改環境許可證。若取得相關批准時，土拓署就道路刊憲時一拼向各委員詳細交代工程詳情。

規劃署屯門及元朗西規劃專員袁承業先生表示，元朗南發展計劃分為兩次改劃，第一次改劃涉及第一及第二階段發展的土地，預期於2028年落成第一批公營房屋，餘下階段將探討可否善用基建容量例如研究中的11號幹線。今次改劃涉及71公頃土地，包括住宅、商業、休憩用地等，主要包括五個修訂項目：(一) 公營房屋發展及附近設施，涉及40多公頃土地；(二) 唐人新村範圍興建多層式工業樓宇，涉及22.6公頃土地；(三) 唐人新村休憩用地；(四) 三幅土地用作原區安置；及(五) 興建污水處理廠。

袁承業先生表示，元朗南發展的時間表，第一階段預計於2022年展開，第二階段預計於2025年展開，餘下階段預計於2029年展開。政府即將展開法定規劃程序修改相關分區計劃大綱圖，然後就部分擬議的道路及污水收集系統工程等進行刊憲，土拓署在有關工程建議刊憲前會向鄉事委員會諮詢意見；待完成相關法定程序及詳細設計後，會向立法會申請撥款。若一切順利，預計2022年開始逐步展開工程，而整個元朗南發展於2038年完成。於今次簡介會聽取各委員意見後，規劃署將把修訂圖則提交城規會考慮，待通過修訂後便會根據城規條例刊憲，進行兩個月公眾諮詢。

鄧志學委員表示，唐人新村興建多層式工業樓宇對區內居民帶來不便，建議改為興建公營房屋。另外，建議朗漢路以南的綠化土地改為工業用地（“I”用地），為受影響的現有棕地作業者作出補償。

張致楷委員表示，建議第一期工程為山廈村興建連接路，以盡早舒緩交通擠塞情況。同時，該村有三幅土地作興建丁屋用途，希望道路設計上不會影響該些土地。

張錦福委員表示，有關欖口村村口的道路問題，建議將公庵路經欖喜路及欖裕路出山下路的兩段道路改為雙程行車，避免出現交通擠塞。另建議取消公庵路通往欖口村的一段道路。

林如棟委員詢問，新發展區的擬議道路並不直通市中心，車輛只能駛入公庵路及僑興路，沒有直接道路通往元朗市中心，究竟新發展區內有否街市等足夠設施。

鄧子光委員詢問，公庵路迴旋處是盡頭，政府會否考慮興建隧道伸延至荃灣或其他地方。

鄧志強主席建議覆蓋明渠伸延至朗邊，因為房屋發展計劃包括朗邊，未來該區將會增加不少人口，有需要擴闊道路以舒緩交通問題。另外，他認同鄧志學委員的意見，多層式工業樓宇並不能解決棕地作業問題，建議綠化土地改為工業用地。鄉委會最擔心和憂慮的問題主要是交通規劃和棕地作業者的安置安排。

張錦福委員表示，希望政府部門接納各委員的意見，經修改後再向鄉委會諮詢。

林智文先生回應指，今天會議就改劃建議所提出的意見，政府會在提交改劃建議時一併向城規會反映，就道路設計方面，現階段尚未定稿，土拓署於今年稍後時間會再向鄉事委員會作正式諮詢，然後才刊憲。

袁承業先生表示，就工業用地規劃問題，修訂後的建議發展大綱圖上位於唐人新村範圍的擬議工業用途的用地維持不變，因為經技術、交通和噪音等評估後，認為該範圍並不適合用作高密度住宅發展。政府希望就新發展計劃整體改善元朗南，改善過程中會影響現有的棕地作業者，大綱圖已預留土地供棕地作業者使用，政府會積極尋找措施以協助解決多層式工業樓宇的用途。另一方面，城規會於今年3月修訂了相關的規劃指引編號13，以從寬考慮屏山鄉範圍的二十五公頃土地用作露天貯物及港口後勤用途，若某些棕地作業不適合使用多層式工業樓宇，可選擇使用該些土地。若有其他合適土地建議，可交由發展局作出協調，向城規會提出政策上支持，以幫助業界人士。

袁承業先生表示，就社區設施問題，第一階段發展的公營房屋將設有街市。此外，預計未來的政府用地或會按需要闢設街市。元朗南會盡量為區內居民提供基本生活所需，以減低跨區活動的需要。就綠化及農業土地問題，經過多年研究及根據現時的用地情況，顯示該區的農業地帶仍然活躍，能為其鄰近的綠化土地及住宅用地作緩衝用途。由於該範圍還未改劃，規劃署會聽取各委員意見後在下次改劃時再作研究。

林智文先生補充指，由於建議的綠化及農業地帶未納入今天的改劃範圍，若日後作改劃時，將會再向鄉事委員會諮詢。

林志強先生回應指，就山廈村的道路規劃問題，土拓署稍後會聯同村代表作實地視察，惟原則要顧及道路安全及減少收地範圍。未來唐人新村通往元朗市的交通

將會有一條接駁路到沙井路，再接駁到山下路往公園南路出元朗市。元朗南新發展區將會有各樣的社區設施，可以滿足基本生活需要。另外，就鄧志強主席提到覆蓋朗天路明渠問題，由於該處不屬於元朗南發展範圍，但該署會備悉有關意見，並適時向當局反映。至於11號幹線，路政署現正就11號幹線的走線進行研究，稍後會向鄉事委員會匯報有關研究結果。另外，有委員提出擴闊欖裕路，由於該處存在墳地，這涉及繁複的收地程序，因此有待餘下階段發展時一併考慮是否有交通需要。

張錦福委員表示，希望政府積極考慮全面覆蓋朗天路明渠，以及擴闊欖裕路，避免欖堤西路與欖口村籃球場交界發生交通意外，建議在公庵路往元朗公路通往欖裕路的支路進行擴闊道路工程。

林 權副主席建議署方出席下一次諮詢會議時提供交通評估。

林如棟委員詢問，擬建唐人新村交匯處的道路設計是否配合朗邊房屋發展項目擬議的新道路。

林志強先生回應指，元朗南發展的道路設計將配合朗邊房屋發展項目擬議連接至孖峰嶺路的新道路。

鄧志學委員表示，唐人新村土地不宜劃作工業用地，應該改為公營房屋用地，若不適合高密度樓宇發展，可改為低層低密度的房屋，這會減少反對聲音。

林志強先生回應指，由於唐人新村範圍的工業用地非常接近元朗公路，經環境評估後，該範圍不適宜房屋發展。

陳禮仁先生解釋，由於該處受空氣和噪音影響，所以不適宜居住。

林如棟委員詢問，何時開始凍結登記。另外，受影響的工廠商戶搬遷需要一段時間準備，署方如何處理。

林智文先生回應指，政府將配合法定圖則及刊憲時間表進行凍結登記，然後就收地時間表通知相關的居民。若一切順利，預計於2022年開始收地程序。就工廠搬遷問題，根據古洞北/粉嶺北新發展區的經驗，在收到通知後，一般可有一至兩

年的搬遷時間。他總結指，我們希望得到各委員支持及聽取意見，然後把意見呈交城規會一併考慮。而改劃建議亦將進行法定諮詢。

鄧志強主席表示，本會對於署方提出的修訂建議仍有相當意見，希望署方聽取本會的意見，並積極考慮修改。鄧志強主席多謝政府部門出席會議。

與會者無任何討論事項，會議於4時10分結束。

主 席：

記 錄：

日 期：

會議記錄於 3.9.2020 獲得通過，無須修訂。

**房屋及城鄉規劃和發展委員會
2020 年度第三次會議記錄**

日期：2020 年 5 月 20 日（星期三）

時間：上午 10 時正至下午 1 時 20 分

地點：元朗橋樂坊二號元朗政府合署十三樓元朗區議會會議廳

<u>出席者</u>	<u>出席時間</u>	<u>離席時間</u>
主席： 區國權議員	會議開始	會議結束
副主席： 司徒博文議員	會議開始	會議結束
委員： 陳敬倫議員	會議開始	會議結束
陳美蓮議員	會議開始	上午 11:55
陳樹暉議員	會議開始	會議結束
張智陽議員	會議開始	下午 1:00
張秀賢議員	會議開始	下午 1:00
程振明議員	會議開始	下午 11:50
方浩軒議員	會議開始	會議結束
侯文健議員	會議開始	會議結束
何惠彬議員	會議開始	下午 12:30
郭文浩議員	下午 12:05	會議結束
黎國泳議員	會議開始	會議結束
黎永添議員	會議開始	下午 12:30
林廷衛議員	會議開始	下午 12:30
李俊威議員	會議開始	下午 1:00
梁德明議員	會議開始	會議結束
李頌慈議員	會議開始	會議結束
麥業成議員	會議開始	會議結束
文美桂議員	會議開始	上午 11:55
巫啟航議員	會議開始	會議結束
伍軒宏議員	會議開始	會議結束
石景澄議員	會議開始	下午 12:30
沈豪傑議員, JP	會議開始	上午 11:50
鄧志強議員	會議開始	上午 11:50
鄧賀年議員	上午 10:20	上午 11:20

鄧家良議員	會議開始	下午 11:50
鄧勵東議員	會議開始	上午 11:05
鄧瑞民議員	會議開始	上午 11:00
鄧鎔耀議員	會議開始	上午 11:55
杜嘉倫議員	會議開始	會議結束
王百羽議員	會議開始	會議結束
黃偉賢議員	上午 10:10	下午 1:00
王穎思議員	會議開始	會議結束
楊家安議員	會議開始	下午 1:00

秘書： 郭浩庭先生 元朗民政事務處行政主任（區議會）1

列席者

禰若翰先生	元朗民政事務處高級聯絡主任（1）
蕭亦豪先生	規劃署高級城市規劃師／元朗西 1
高穎儀女士	元朗地政處高級產業測量師／東
林家強先生	康樂及文化事務署元朗區副康樂事務經理 1
張穎堃女士	食物環境衛生署元朗區衛生督察（潔淨）
胡疊明先生	漁農自然護理署高級農林督察（農業推廣）
黎慕儀女士	房屋署房屋事務經理（元朗六）
杜繼祖先生	土木工程拓展署工程師／16（西）

議程第一項

林智文先生	發展局首席助理秘書長（規劃及地政）5
陳冠恒先生	發展局助理秘書長（規劃）10
林志強先生	土木工程拓展署總工程師／西 1
徐偉樂先生	土木工程拓展署高級工程師／房屋用地分區監察組／西
袁承業先生	規劃署屯門及元朗西規劃專員
吳淑君女士	規劃署高級城市規劃師／跨界基建發展 3
蕭亦豪先生	規劃署高級城市規劃師／元朗西 1
賴有財先生	運輸署高級工程師／西北
陳禮仁先生	奧雅納工程顧問董事
楊詠珊女士	奧雅納工程顧問董事
鄧思威先生	奧雅納工程顧問助理董事

議程第三項(1)

~~黃劍偉先生 地政總署署理首席地政主任／元朗工程項目~~

	(土地徵用組)
袁敬強先生	地政總署高級地政主任／元朗工程項目 3
	(土地徵用組)
彭德源先生	地政總署高級經理／清拆 (總部)
黃振華先生	地政總署經理／清拆 (一)
<u>議程第二項(2)</u>	
黃劍偉先生	地政總署署理首席地政主任／元朗工程項目 (土地徵用組)
袁敬強先生	地政總署高級地政主任／元朗工程項目 3 (土地徵用組)
彭德源先生	地政總署高級經理／清拆 (總部)
張偉佳先生	地政總署經理／清拆 (二)

缺席者

文富穩議員, BBS (因事請假)
伍健偉議員

* * * * *

歡迎詞

主席歡迎各委員及政府部門代表出席房屋及城鄉規劃和發展委員會 2020 年度第三次會議。主席建議合併討論議程第一項及議程第二項續議事項(3)。

議程第一項：元朗南第一及第二階段發展的改劃建議
(房委會文件 2020／第 14 號)

議程第二項續議事項：

(3) 司徒博文議員、方浩軒議員、李俊威議員、梁德明議員建議討論「跟進元朗南規劃發展進度」

(房委會文件 2020／第 9 號)

2. 主席歡迎下列部門代表出席會議並與委員討論：

林智文先生 發展局首席助理秘書長 (規劃及地政) 5

陳冠恒先生	發展局助理秘書長（規劃） 10
林志強先生	土木工程拓展署總工程師／西 1
徐偉樂先生	土木工程拓展署高級工程師／房屋用地分區監察組／西
袁承業先生	規劃署屯門及元朗西規劃專員
吳淑君女士	規劃署高級城市規劃師／跨界基建發展 3
蕭亦豪先生	規劃署高級城市規劃師／元朗西 1
賴有財先生	運輸署高級工程師／西北
陳禮仁先生	奧雅納工程顧問董事
楊詠珊女士	奧雅納工程顧問董事
鄧思威先生	奧雅納工程顧問助理董事

3. 主席邀請部門代表簡介文件。

4. 委員發表的意見摘錄如下：

- (1) 關注區內就業機會是否足夠，查詢有否就區內就業走勢作預測，有委員質疑預期就業數字的準確性；又查詢預期需要跨區上班的人口數目和流向及相關的交通配套；
- (2) 認為發展前應先處理交通議題，並定期審視及改善交通問題，而非留待與新發展一併處理，認為新發展區不能再依賴現有已飽和的道路網絡，建議統合改善整個元朗區的交通；有委員建議部門就交通議題諮詢元朗區議會轄下的交通及運輸委員會（交委會）；
- (3) 認為元朗南發展計劃需等待十一號幹線（北大嶼山至元朗）的可行性研究（十一號幹線研究）完成方可分階段進行，顯示交通問題嚴重，無法承載新增人口及疏導人口流動；要求提供交通及運輸影響評估數據；
- (4) 認為擬議公共運輸交匯處可能會加劇元政路、元龍街一帶的交通擠塞情況；又查詢有關工程會否影響已規劃的康樂及文娛設施用地；
- (5) 建議全面覆蓋近十八鄉路的一段元朗明渠以改善公庵路／僑興路及十八鄉路的交通問題；有委員建議擴大覆蓋範圍，及查詢部門就綠化明渠的取向；
- (6) 關注往元政路的連接路與大棠路十字路口的設計及十一號幹線走線如何連接元朗南以疏導交通；有委員建議於元朗南興建隧道連接十一號

幹線，又關注道路工程可能對現有道路使用者的影響；

- (7) 查詢部門對建議於公庵山興建隧道的取態；
- (8) 認為西鐵線已經飽和，無法再提升現有服務以支撐更多人口；
- (9) 認為擬議的洪水橋環保運輸系統走線迂迴；有委員建議環保運輸系統採用無軌設計，以環狀線方式運行；
- (10) 建議提供更多康樂及文娛設施，例如球場、游泳池及緩跑徑，又建議考慮靈活運用校園的球場設施供大眾使用；有委員關注部分工程可能影響現有的球場；
- (11) 建議將單車徑納入道路交通網絡，以方便單車使用者；查詢是次改劃是否已包含「單車友善環境」可行性研究的建議及會否考慮批准使用電動單車，認為部門應落實研究的建議；有委員認為現時使用的雙層式單車泊位設施落後於世界其他地方，建議引入有樁式共享單車系統；
- (12) 查詢部門會否以地契條款要求發展商提供單車泊位；
- (13) 希望部門承諾興建由食物環境衛生署管理的公營街市；
- (14) 建議興建有主題色彩的商場和公園，吸引當區居民於本區消費；
- (15) 關注如何安置受影響的居民和現有的農禽業及棕地作業，查詢部門會否就棕地作業作凍結登記；
- (16) 有委員認為政府需清楚了解現時露天倉的營運需求，認為露天作業未必可搬遷至多層樓宇，又關注未來租金對營運者的影響；有委員參考外國例子，建議於多層樓宇周邊提供空間作露天貯物之用；
- (17) 表示有安老院舍／殘疾人士院舍會受元朗南發展所影響，查詢它們會否獲優先安置；
- (18) 認為現時規劃作安置棕地作業的土地佔地不足，建議於公庵山興建隧道，並於元朗南南部另覓土地安置棕地作業，同時避免大型車輛駛經民居；亦有委員關注於多層樓宇可供使用前的中期棕地作業安置安排；

- (19) 查詢「經修訂的建議發展大綱圖」內有關「政府用地（儲備）」的用途；查詢可否使用這些土地安置受影響的居民並設置安置屋邨，認為計及元朗區的數個新發展項目，洪水橋的安置屋邨不足夠安置受影響居民；
- (20) 建議應縮短項目預期工程時間及審慎決定工程範圍以減少對居民的影響；
- (21) 指出部門應與當區鄉事委員會加強溝通；及
- (22) 有委員憂慮元朗南發展計劃和其他發展計劃，例如「明日大嶼願景」，可能帶來的負面影響。

5. 林智文先生的綜合回應摘錄如下：

- (1) 表示元朗南發展會分階段推行；現時改劃涵蓋第一及第二階段發展，涉及約 17 000 個公營房屋單位及約 52 000 名新增人口，而餘下階段的改劃會於審視擬議策略性基礎設施（特別是道路）的容量，及再探討能否進一步釋放餘下階段的發展潛力後，方會推行。希望可在十一號幹線的配合下，審慎增加房屋供應；
- (2) 元朗南發展可提供約 13 600 多個就業機會。另外，鄰近的洪水橋／厦村新發展區將提供約 150 000 個新增就業機會亦可為元朗南的居民提供就業機會。為此，元朗南發展已規劃了道路和公共交通服務，方便居民往來元朗新市鎮及洪水橋／厦村新發展區；
- (3) 路政署正進行十一號幹線研究，會將委員的意見轉達，相信路政署會適時諮詢區議會。除區域性的道路外，亦期望藉是次發展推行地區性道路工程以紓緩交通問題，現階段希望收集委員對改劃建議的意見，局方預期於今年內就首批道路及污水收集系統工程諮詢區議會，以進行刊憲及法定諮詢程序；
- (4) 土木工程拓展署正研究全面覆蓋近原築的一段元朗明渠的可行性，會適時就建議向區議會諮詢；
- (5) 擬議元政路公共運輸交匯處工程將不會於第一階段工程中進行，亦不會影響已規劃的康樂及文娛設施用地；
- (6) 已進行的交通及運輸影響評估顯示現有鐵路可承載建議的發展人口。

同時，現有西鐵線亦透過增加車卡及提升信號系統進一步提升服務；長遠而言，為應付客運需求，政府會適時推展跨越 2030 年的鐵路及主要幹道基建的策略性研究；

- (7) 政府正研究以環保運輸系統連接元朗南發展區至洪水橋／厦村新發展區；而洪水橋／厦村新發展區亦會設一個西鐵線車站；
- (8) 研究報告的行政摘要（包括交通及運輸影響評估）已上載上網；
- (9) 預計有空間於「休憩用地」提供球場；表示規劃署須因應發展情況與康樂及文化事務署（康文署）商討提供游泳池的需要；就共用學校設施而言，若相關政策局支持有關建議，規劃署可在規劃上作配合；
- (10) 於規劃上已預留空間作單車設施，設計時亦會考慮盡量避免單車使用者經常上落車，會在詳細設計時考慮相關細節；
- (11) 會預留零售樓面面積滿足當區居民生活所需，當中包括已預留選址興建街市。政府備悉委員就街市營運模式意見，會轉達與相關部門作考慮；
- (12) 指出政府清拆項目都會進行凍結登記，目的是收集發展範圍內現有構築物及業務經營者的資料及登記現時的情況，以便日後審核他們接受住戶安置及／或領取特惠津貼的資格。相關凍結登記將根據發展時間表適時進行；
- (13) 第一階段發展將影響約十數戶住戶。政府於 2018 年 5 月公布劃一且經加強的特惠補償及安置安排，對於居住於已登記寮屋／持牌構築物的住戶，政府除了繼續維持由香港房屋委員會（房委會）提供「須通過經濟狀況審查」安置選項，讓受影響的合資格住戶入住房委會轄下的公屋單位外，亦引入「免經濟狀況審查」安置選項，讓受影響的合資格住戶獲安置到由香港房屋協會（房協）發展和管理的專用安置屋邨；
- (14) 經初步評估，認為於洪水橋及北區的三個專用安置屋邨足夠作安置受影響居民之用，當局會檢視情況並按需要考慮提供更多的專用安置屋邨；
- (15) 政府在制定工程時間表時已考慮有效管理工程及減低對地區的滋擾等因素；

- (16) 表示會與受影響的禽畜飼養場營運者商討提供協助；
- (17) 備悉委員對以多層樓宇容納現有棕地作業的意見，但以多層樓宇安置棕地作業，可以善用土地資源。明白業界關注多層樓宇的租金，局方正進行市場意向調查，以進一步考慮多層樓宇的運作模式。在多層樓宇可供使用前，局方會採取多管齊下的方式協助受影響的棕地作業，包括在規劃及土地事宜上向正在尋找適合地點搬遷的經營者，提供諮詢服務及便利措施。政府正物色合適的臨時政府用地，讓部分受新發展區或其他政府項目清拆行動影響的業務經營者以短期租約形式使用；
- (18) 表示第一階段發展不會影響現有安老院舍／殘疾人士院舍；會與勞工及福利局及社會福利署探討如何協助受影響私營院舍；
- (19) 表示發展項目需時較長，政府需預留政府用地儲備以滿足現時未能預見的地區需求；及
- (20) 備悉委員建議加快推展項目，會於推展項目時與地區人士保持密切聯絡。

6. 林志強先生的綜合回應摘錄如下：

- (1) 表示將興建新的連接路以配合第一及第二階段房屋發展，讓車輛繞過元朗公路以北的公庵路直接駛至元政路的擬議公共運輸交匯處。根據交通及運輸影響評估顯示，元朗南發展產生的交通流量並不會對元政路造成不可接受的影響，其行車量／容車量比率為低於一；
- (2) 表示交通及運輸影響評估已計及就業和人口數據，以及研究中的十一號幹線；研究報告的行政摘要已上載上網；
- (3) 表示現階段計劃改善部分欖裕路、進行唐人新村交匯處改善工程及興建相關的連接路，現階段不會於欖口村興建道路影響現有球場；而擬議直接駛至元政路的新連接路初步預期於 2025 年或以後施工；
- (4) 表示根據交通及運輸影響評估顯示，覆蓋部分元朗明渠以擴闊公庵路／僑興路至各自為雙線單程行車道，已足夠應付行車需求；因應地區人士的意見，全面覆蓋近十八鄉路的一段明渠以擴闊道路為最快捷方

法，否則需先完成經改善後的唐人新村交匯處及新道路以疏導現時繁忙的交通後，才可進行該段公庵路／僑興路擴闊工程；

- (5) 表示現時的环境許可證只批准覆蓋部分元朗明渠，部門需進行可行性研究，包括獲批更改環境許可證，才能落實全面覆蓋近十八鄉路的一段明渠；若可全面覆蓋該段明渠，部門會與運輸署商討研究擴闊公庵路／僑興路近路口處至三線行車；
- (6) 表示西鐵線已增加列車的車卡數目至八卡及會進一步加密班次，預期當屯馬線全線開通後，每小時最高班次可增至 24 班，並會按需求進一步加密班次；長遠而言，政府會研究改善 2031 年後的新界西北鐵路載客量；
- (7) 表示會與運輸署商討為新發展區提供綠色專線小巴服務接駁至西鐵元朗站；
- (8) 表示現時的單車徑規劃屬初步建議，會適時就詳細規劃諮詢區議會；現時規劃的單車徑網絡為新發展區的輔助交通網絡，並會提供適當設計方便單車使用者橫過馬路及大廈車輛出入口；及
- (9) 表示會在詳細設計時與康文署研究利用休憩用地鋪設緩跑徑網絡。

7. 袁承業先生的綜合回應摘錄如下：

- (1) 期望透過元朗南整體規劃改善現時的交通及環境問題；
- (2) 表示擬議元政路公共運輸交匯處位於「政府、機構或社區」用地，該用地預期用作興建體育館，而該公共運輸交匯處則於體育館之下；
- (3) 表示是次建議改劃學校及其旁邊的土地為「政府、機構或社區」用地，並提供約十五公頃用地規劃作休憩用途，相信有空間提供球場；備悉委員就學校設施的意見，會與教育局及康文署進一步商討；
- (4) 表示興建大型游泳池的佔地需求較大，現時於第一及第二階段改劃未有相關規劃，會於其後階段審視現時未有劃定用途的土地，及會持續留意社區的需求；
- (5) 表示已計劃於今次改劃的一幅公營房屋發展用地預留土地作濕貨街市

之用；署方將與相關部門進一步研究於發展區中心位置及方便易達的「政府、機構或社區」用地增設街市的可能；及

- (6) 表示於唐人新村附近規劃多層樓宇旨在容納現有的棕地作業，而該處現時的鄉郊工業用途未必能配合整體元朗南的發展；根據經修訂的城市規劃委員會規劃指引編號 13F，棕地作業營運者可向城市規劃委員會申請在合適的土地上作臨時露天貯物用途。

8. 鄧思威先生表示，交通及運輸影響評估已考慮元朗南新發展區及附近其他新發展區的就業情況。除可使用現有的交通配套往來其他新發展區外，在元朗南發展區內亦已規劃三個新的公共運輸交匯處及建議在元政路設置公共運輸交匯處，並將提供新的穿梭巴士接駁服務，以及預留用地作可能興建的環保運輸系統，連接元朗南至洪水橋／厦村新發展區及擬議的洪水橋鐵路站。往來其他新發展區將以公共交通為主，配合原區／鄰區就業，減輕往來市區之長途交通需求。

9. 陳樹暉議員、梁德明議員、區國權議員、陳敬倫議員及黎國泳議員提出以下動議，並獲張秀賢議員、方浩軒議員、李俊威議員、何惠彬議員、李頌慈議員、巫啟航議員、石景澄議員、王百羽議員、伍軒宏議員、陳美蓮議員、麥業成議員、黃偉賢議員、王穎思議員、杜嘉倫議員、侯文健議員、林廷衛議員、張智陽議員及司徒博文議員和議。動議全文如下：

「有樁式共享單車系統在全球各大先進城市實行多年，反觀香港政府多年來漠視單車的運輸功能，單車系統規劃仍然落後，至今仍被政府視作休憩用途。

為應對氣候變化的挑戰，並同時提昇區內交通的效益，本會要求政府以元朗南、洪水橋新市鎮作為有樁式共享單車系統的先導城市，以單車作為區內環保交通核心系統。」

10. 委員以舉手及記名方式表決上述動議。司徒博文議員、陳敬倫議員、陳樹暉議員、張智陽議員、張秀賢議員、方浩軒議員、侯文健議員、何惠彬議員、郭文浩議員、黎國泳議員、林廷衛議員、李俊威議員、梁德明議員、李頌慈議員、麥業成議員、巫啟航議員、伍軒宏議員、石景澄議員、杜嘉倫議員、王百羽議員、黃偉賢議員及王穎思議員議員贊成。

11. 主席宣布，表決結果為 22 票贊成、0 票反對及 0 票棄權，動議獲通過。

12. 梁德明議員及司徒博文議員提出第二項動議，並獲方浩軒議員、李俊威議員、

李頌慈議員、張智陽議員、陳樹暉議員、張秀賢議員、林廷衛議員、侯文健議員、何惠彬議員、黎國泳議員、麥業成議員、王穎思議員、杜嘉倫議員及區國權議員和議。動議全文如下：

「元朗區缺乏就業機會，依賴對外交通，而區內人口近年大幅增長，使元朗市、唐人新村交匯處，公庵路及僑興路等存在多時的擠塞問題日益惡化。本會反對是次元朗南的規劃把改善道路的工程和新發展區的項目捆綁。政府應先在唐人新村交匯處、公庵路及僑興路等道路進行改善及擴建工程，以即時援解現時元朗南居民的交通擠塞、人車爭路的情況，再按地區承載能力審視發展。」

13. 委員以舉手及記名方式表決第二項動議。司徒博文議員、陳敬倫議員、陳樹暉議員、張智陽議員、張秀賢議員、方浩軒議員、侯文健議員、何惠彬議員、郭文浩議員、黎國泳議員、林廷衛議員、李俊威議員、梁德明議員、李頌慈議員、麥業成議員、巫啟航議員、伍軒宏議員、石景澄議員、杜嘉倫議員、王百羽議員、黃偉賢議員及王穎思議員贊成。

14. 主席宣布，表決結果為 22 票贊成、0 票反對及 0 票棄權，動議獲通過。

15. 主席總結，委員認為交通配套及道路規劃未能完善配合人口增長，表示應就有關議題諮詢交委會。主席請部門備悉委員意見，又請秘書處致函相關部門及立法會轉達獲委員通過的動議。

（會後補註：秘書處分別於 7 月 14 日及 8 月 17 日將立法會秘書處及部門就動議的回覆轉發予委員。）

~~議程第三項續議事項：~~

~~(1) 梁德明議員、黎國泳議員、陳敬倫議員、陳樹暉議員、區國權議員建議討論「『元朗橫洲公營房屋發展計劃之工地平整及基礎設施工程』的村民安置和工程安排」~~

~~(房委會文件 2020／第 10 號)~~

16. 主席歡迎下列部門代表出席會議並與委員討論：

~~杜繼祖先生 土木工程拓展署工程師／16（西）~~

~~黎慕儀女士 房屋署房屋事務經理（元朗六）~~

~~黃劍偉先生 地政總署署理首席地政主任／元朗工程項目（土地徵用組）~~

規 劃 署

屯門及元朗西規劃處
香港新界沙田上禾輦路一號
沙田政府合署 14 樓



Planning Department

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West
District Planning Office
14/F, Sha Tin Government Offices,
1 Sheung Wo Che Road, Sha Tin, N.T.
Hong Kong

來函檔號 Your Reference
本署檔號 Our Reference () in PDYL 4/1/107
電話號碼 Tel. No. : 2158 6000
傳真機號碼 Fax No. : 2489 9711

郵寄及傳真 (2478 7334)

新界元朗橋樂坊 2 號
元朗政府合署 13 樓
元朗區議會
房屋及城鄉規劃和發展委員會
(主席：區國權議員)

區主席：

元朗區議會轄下房屋及城鄉規劃和發展委員會 有關「元朗南第一及第二階段發展的改劃建議」及 「跟進元朗南規劃發展進度」的動議

貴委員會致相關部門的信件已於本年 6 月 1 日收悉，發展局、運輸署、土木工程拓展署及規劃署的綜合回覆如下：

(一) 建議以元朗南發展和洪水橋／厦村新發展區作為有樁式共享單車系統的先導城市，以單車作為區內的環保交通核心系統

「元朗南房屋用地規劃及工程研究 - 勘查研究」(下稱元朗南研究)旨在將元朗南發展成一個可持續、綠色及宜居的社區，並提供足夠基礎設施配合未來發展。為加強元朗南發展區內外的連繫，方便市民日常出行，元朗南發展會提供完善的道路、行人道、單車徑網絡和一系列的公共交通服務。

根據元朗南研究的建議，區內的主要道路旁將附設約 4 米闊的單車徑，擬議的單車徑網絡能連接區內的三個擬議公共運輸交匯處。為方便市民使用單車作日常出行工具，元朗南研究已建議在休憩用地和公共運輸交匯處內設置單車停泊處。

為落實上述規劃，政府現正就推動洪水橋／厦村新發展區及元朗南發展的行人及單車友善環境進行可行性研究，包括檢討元朗南研究建議的行人道及單車徑網絡、研究不同模式的過路設施、單車停泊處及單車租賃服務(包括傳統單車租賃服務，及有樁式和無樁式的自助單車租賃服務)。研究預計於 2020 年年底大致完成。

(二) 有關反對將元朗南規劃的道路改善工程和新發展區項目捆綁發展

我們明白議員對元朗區交通情況的關注，與此同時，回應市民的居住需要亦是當務之急。是次元朗南改劃涉及首兩階段發展，能提供超過 16 000 個單位（佔整個元朗南發展總單位數約一半），全屬公營房屋單位，目標是 2028 年開始入伙。因此，在推動元朗南發展的同時，我們會妥善處理好因發展而引致的交通問題。根據交通及運輸影響評估結果，在落實下列交通基礎設施及改善措施後，擬議整體發展將不會為元朗南受影響範圍內的主要路段帶來不可接受的交通影響：

- 新的地區主幹道，貫通發展區以連接唐人新村至沿公庵路一帶的地區；
- 新的連接路，讓車輛繞過元朗公路以北的公庵路直接駛至元朗公路及元政路的擬議公共運輸交匯處；
- 覆蓋部分元朗明渠，以擴闊公庵路／僑興路至各自為雙線單程行車道（包括原築對出的一段公庵路／僑興路）；
- 改善唐人新村交匯處和天水圍西交匯處；
- 增設更多道路接駁口，以改善周邊鄉村與元朗南發展的連接；
- 三個位於區內的公共運輸交匯處會提供小巴、接駁巴士及長途巴士服務；以及
- 連接元朗南和洪水橋／厦村新發展區的環保運輸服務（研究中）。

上述措施將按元朗南的發展時間表分階段完成。在早前的地區諮詢過程中，我們從善如流，接納了議員和區內人士的意見，同意提早落實建議內原先較後期才進行的道路改善工程，主要包括唐人新村交匯處改善工程及連接唐人新村交匯處至沿公庵路一帶地區的部分地區主幹道，讓車輛可無須利用區內的地區道路便直接經元朗公路出入元朗南及區內其他地方，以紓緩區內道路擠塞情況。

隨著規劃署開展元朗南發展第一及第二階段的法定規劃程序，土木工程拓展署亦會在短期內為道路及污水收集系統根據相關法例進行刊憲。我們爭取最快在明年年底向立法會申請工程撥款，預計工程會在 2022 年逐步展開，以配合 2028 年首期入伙的目標。

如就上述事宜有進一步查詢，歡迎與本人聯絡（電話：2158 6000）。

規劃署署長

（蕭亦豪  代行）

2020 年 8 月 14 日

**List of Representers in respect of the
Draft Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-TYST/13**

Representation No. TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-	Name of Representer
R1	饒春娣
R2	溫慶豐
R3	羅林華
R4	梁德明
R5	伍靜茵
R6	王楚山
R7	麥倩雯
R8	Leung Lai Yan
R9	方志豐
R10	蔡凱倫
R11	劉海龍
R12	彭樂欣
R13	郭慧欣
R14	Yeung Wing Chi
R15	葉卓怡
R16	Chung Yee Mei
R17	蔡映彤
R18	鄧建達
R19	蔡淑芬
R20	林宇亨
R21	甘安穎
R22	麥笑蓮
R23	梁宛兒
R24	Yeung Ching Man
R25	Capital Apex Development Limited
R26	張伯超
R27	鄭綺雲
R28	郭勇
R29	李紹蓮
R30	潘志成
R31	陳志堅

Representation No. TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-	Name of Representer
R32	黎家宜
R33	Lok Chu Hei
R34	李俊文
R35	張思敏
R36	Se-to Sai Nang
R37	黃國俊
R38	馬惠娜
R39	黃祥光
R40	黃洪光
R41	江巧華
R42	黃光明
R43	黃達光
R44	黃國政
R45	黃德光
R46	陳麗娟
R47	Cheung Chun Hin
R48	唐少萍
R49	梁錦明
R50	蕭祥斌
R51	Li Chi Chung
R52	張倩彤
R53	Best Well Holdings Limited
R54	Orlando Yiu Kui Chan
R55	Chan Anson
R56	Chan Johnson
R57	High Asset Limited
R58	Dicktec Investment Limited
R59	朱慶才
R60	邱威斌
R61	Wong Kam Yu

Representation No. TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-	Name of Representer
R62	Wong Lok Sze
R63	蔡安妮
R64	徐明團 Tsui Ming Tuen
R65	The Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd.
R66	屏山鄉鄉事委員會 Ping Shan Heung Rural Committee
R67	十八鄉鄉事委員會 Shap Pat Heung Rural Committee
R68	司徒博文
R69	方浩軒
R70	李俊威
R71	Lo Chi Shing Ivan
R72	新界倉庫及物流業經營

Representation No. TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-	Name of Representer
	者聯會 New Territories Warehouse & Logistic Business Association
R73	十八鄉區居民協會 Shap Pat Heung District Resident Association
R74	新界元朗白沙村村公所
R75	大棠村青年團 Tai Tong Village Youth Association
R76	Mary Mulvihill
R77	Honchat Limited
R78	Chu Chun Sing
R79	潘博厚

**List of Commenters in respect of the
Draft Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-TYST/13**

Comments on Representation No. TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-	Name of Commenter
C1	公庵路居民組
C2	劉俊熙
C3	杜桂根
C4	黎家宜
C5	趙粉英
C6	文英葵
C7	梁錦明
C8	胡任輝
C9	張秀玲
C10	吳達文
C11	鍾柏秋
C12	黎桂清
C13	莫枝旺
C14	潘志成
C15	Chu Wing Hang
C16	余偉強
C17	吳佩芳
C18	朱慶才
C19	Yeung Wai Leung Sunny
C20	Chu Kin Hang
C21	Lee Siu Ling
C22	Lo Lam Wa
C23	唐少萍
C24	陳錦華
C25	高勝慶
C26	鄧偉昇
C27	鄧巧兒
C28	鄧偉強
C29	Mo Wai Lin
C30	Mo Wai Yan
C31	張思敏

Comments on Representation No. TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-	Name of Commenter
C32	Law Kin Chong
C33	李作榮
C34	Li Pui Sze
C35	陳群中
C36	張伯超
C37	汪樂思
C38	饒春娣
C39	何星行
C40	張冠雄
C41	Lau Pui Shan
C42	Wong Hoi Tung
C43	Cheung Chun Hin
C44	汪卿中
C45	江美英
C46	黃河清
C47	Chiu Man Yi
C48	劉文龍
C49	余小燕
C50	黃順源
C51	王楚山
C52	蕭祥斌
C53	李秋
C54	陳添鑠
C55	陳鏗
C56	郭勇
C57	Chan Yuen Fong
C58	陳志堅
C59	余來發
C60	郭炳坤
C61	趙潔瑩
C62	郭婉彤

Comments on Representation No. TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-	Name of Commenter
C63	郭玉貞
C64	陳丁仁
C65	陳仲婷
C66	陳威
C67	郭蟬
C68	郭牛
C69	阮信儒
C70	李義會
C71	張錦昌
C72	張致階 (元朗山廈村村代表)
C73	張友強
C74	Ma Kwok Lun
C75	張國聰
C76	張植棠
C77	張達成
C78	黃連好
C79	So Po Lin
C80	溫美田
C81	張強
C82	張加慶
C83	張伙光
C84	張國基
C85	Pang Wai Yung Helen
C86	Yeung Nga Wun
C87	Tang Tse Ching
C88	張安南
C89	邱錦榮
C90	張彧峯
C91	張根伙
C92	張土南
C93	張業祥
C94	鄧嘉亭
C95	張福賢
C96	李彩蓮
C97	張伯倫

Comments on Representation No. TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-	Name of Commenter
C98	張炳祥
C99	張煜照
C100	鄧玉芬
C101	張錦貴
C102	馬啟賢
C103	張添祥
C104	張捷興
C105	張兆金
C106	葉遠紅
C107	袁侃榮
C108	鄧蘭芳
C109	張招財
C110	張永明
C111	廖玉鳳
C112	莫月平
C113	張偉芳
C114	Wong Lai Chu
C115	葉概昌
C116	葉玉清
C117	Lau Tip Shing
C118	張彬棠
C119	Lau Kin Bong
C120	張群芳
C121	張英貴
C122	張泉新
C123	Chan Yin Shek
C124	張祖
C125	張定有
C126	張繼興
C127	張秀祥
C128	張國興
C129	陳啟文
C130	Li Ka Wing Karen
C131	文蘭芳
C132	張兆琮
C133	Luk Joh Wing

Comments on Representation No. TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-	Name of Commenter
C134	屏山鄉鄉事委員會 Ping Shan Heung Rural Committee
C135	司徒博文
C136	林楚強
C137	黃保盛

Comments on Representation No. TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-	Name of Commenter
C138	Mary Mulvihill
C139	何俊賢
C140	鍾惠庭 鍾健康 (屯門鄉鍾屋村原居民 村代表)

**Summary of Representations and Comments and the Planning Department’s (PlanD’s) Responses
in respect of the Draft Tong Yan San Tsuen (TYST) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-TYST/13**

(1) The grounds and proposals of the representers (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-R1 to R79) as well as responses are summarised below:

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R1 (also C38) to R3 (all individuals)	Oppose All Amendment Items	
	<u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u> (a) The prevailing monetary compensation and rehousing (C&R) policy/mechanism is inadequate, incomprehensive and outdated. It neglects the housing/ operation needs and property rights of landowners and house owners. “Flat-for-flat” (at equivalent floor level and flat size) and/or “land-for-land” compensation should be offered to landowners. Reasonable compensation should be provided to affected brownfield operators.	(a) C&R is outside the scope of the subject OZP, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the area. The concerns of the affected stakeholders would be dealt with separately by the Government in firming up the implementation arrangements. That said, the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council in July 2018 endorsed the enhancement made to the ex-gratia C&R arrangements for eligible domestic occupants in squatters and business undertakings affected by Government’s development clearance exercises. The enhanced arrangements are formulated to pragmatically address the needs of different groups of people, while balancing the use of public money and public housing resources, principles of fairness, and expectations of affected clearerees as well as the wider community.
	(b) Additional land should be rezoned for village resite purpose for the affected landowners. (R1)	(b) According to the “Planning and Engineering Study for Housing Sites in Yuen Long South (YLS) – Investigation” (the YLS Study), an estimated 33 houses subject to the village removal terms (VRT) were preliminarily identified to be affected by the YLS Development. In this connection, a total of about 1.3 ha of land (including 0.76 ha within the TYST area (Item C) and 0.57 ha within the Tai Tong area) was rezoned as “Village Type Development (1)” (“V(1)”) mainly for re-provisioning of the affected village houses. The extent of the “V(1)” zone was calculated based on an assumption of 0.025 ha of land for each re-site house, including the built-over area of a typical

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>New Territories Exempted House, access/circulation area and buffer area. The proposed village resite areas are included in the current zoning amendment, as they form part of the YLS Development Stage 1 works and are required prior to commencement of land clearance of the affected houses. The location of the “V(1)” zones has taken cognisance of the existing location of the affected houses subject to the VRT, so as to minimise disturbance to affected stakeholders. Overall, the extent of the proposed village resite areas is directly linked with the estimated number of affected houses subject to the VRT as identified by the YLS Study and corresponds to actual demand. There is no strong planning justification to rezone any further site(s) for village resite purpose.</p>
	<p>(c) Other land supply options, such as land reclamation, cavern and underground space development, and development near Country Parks, etc., should be pursued instead of the YLS Development. (R2)</p>	<p>(c) The Task Force on Land Supply stressed that there was no single solution to the land shortage problem, and a multi-pronged approach to increasing land supply would be necessary. The Government has therefore been developing land resources through various measures. The supply of land in the short-to-medium term is achieved through reviewing existing land uses, while the development of new development areas (NDAs), new town extensions (including the YLS Development as an extension of Yuen Long New Town) and land reclamation, etc., will be amongst the key medium-to-long term options.</p>
<p>R4 to R24</p> <p>(R4: Mr LEUNG Tak-ming, member of Yuen Long District Council (YLDC); R5 to R24: all individuals; R6</p>	<p>Oppose All Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) The lack of employment opportunities in Yuen Long district (including the YLS Development) and the anticipated increase in population (in excess of 0.5 million) will lead to longer commutes and overload the district further. The concentration of development in Northwest New Territories (NWNT) is</p>	<p>(a) About 5,790 employment opportunities will be created as part of YLS Development Stages 1 and 2 (such as within the public housing developments in Item A3 and the MSB developments in Item D1). While YLS Development will provide about 13,630 employment opportunities, the nearby Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen NDA (HSK/HT NDA), which will be connected with YLS Development by roads, cycle tracks and the planned Environmentally Friendly Transport Services (EFTS), will provide an addition of about 150,000 employment opportunities for NWNT, including Yuen Long district.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
also C51)	pretence to pave the way for major regional (e.g. Route 11 and East Lantau Metropolis) and cross-boundary infrastructures (such as high speed rail to Shenzhen Qianhai) in the future.	<p>The implementation of the aforesaid projects will bring more jobs closer to residents in the NWNT region and help redress the current imbalance in the spatial distribution of population and jobs in the territory.</p> <p>The Government has been developing land resources through various measures. The development of YLS as an extension of Yuen Long New Town is amongst the key medium-to-long term options. A number of strategic road links/improvement works have been proposed in the NWNT, which are expected to further enhance the transport infrastructure capacity of the area in the long term in commensurate with wider development needs (Plan H-8).</p>
	(b) The Government should pursue other land supply options, such as military sites and vacant Government land.	<p>(b) Response (c) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.</p> <p>All existing military sites are used for defence purposes with none left idle. The HKSAR Government has no plan to seek any change to the use of these sites. Military sites are not an option for increasing land supply.</p> <p>Vacant government sites managed by the Lands Department (LandsD) include works sites returned by works departments after completion of projects; sites earmarked for long-term or permanent development; sites available for short-term community, institutional or non-profit making uses; and sites under processing for short-term uses, etc. As these sites have different backgrounds, coupled with the fact that some may not be suitable for or may only have a low potential for development due to their physical conditions and technical constraints (e.g. remote in location, oddly shaped, or small and piecemeal), they should not be simply considered as sites with development potential.</p>
	(c) The existing traffic and transport network (such as West Rail Line (WRL), Tai Lam Tunnel and Tuen Mun Highway (Plan H-8)) could not cope	(c) The traffic and transport impact assessment (TTIA) of the YLS Study, which has taken into account other planned/committed developments in the vicinity at the time of the assessment, has concluded that with relevant improvement measures in place, the

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>with the anticipated developments in the district. The Government should not bundle development projects with essential transport infrastructure improvements, such as widening of Kung Um Road, Kiu Hing Road and Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange (TYSTI) improvements. All traffic improvement works should be expedited.</p>	<p>proposed YLS Development will have manageable traffic impact on the local and nearby road links, junctions and transport facilities and is acceptable from traffic impact perspective. All the assessed road links (including Tai Lam Tunnel and Shap Pat Heung Road) would be operated at a volume/capacity (V/C) ratio below 1.2, indicating a manageable degree of congestion at peak hours. The traffic conditions of the concerned roads are considered acceptable based on the TTIA results.</p> <p>A comprehensive local road network and traffic improvement schemes are proposed under the YLS Development, which will enhance the connectivity of the YLS Development (as well as the adjoining areas, such as the TYST area) and facilitate vehicular movements (Drawing H-4). According to the latest programme, the proposed road improvement works including the construction of some new roads and improvement to Kung Um Road (part), Kiu Hing Road (part) and TYSTI would be completed before the first population intake of Stage 1 in 2028. Remaining road works within Stage 2 of the YLS Development Area (DA) are now planned to be completed before 2033 to suit the population intake of Stage 2 (Drawing H-2). The exact scope of the proposed road improvement and associated works (including new roads, road closures, road widening and associated partial and full decking of nullahs) is being/will be formulated under separate studies carried out by the concerned works department(s).</p> <p>Regarding the service of the WRL, the number of train cars of the trains running on this line has increased gradually from seven to eight in the period from 2016 to 2018, resulting in an increase in the maximum passenger carrying capacity by 14% compared with that in 2015. After the completion of signaling upgrading and platform improvement works on the Tuen Ma Line (including Tuen Ma Line Phase 1, the Shatin to Central Link (Tai Wai to Hung Hom Section) and WRL), the signaling system of WRL will also be enhanced. Subject to the actual passenger demand, it is expected that the train frequency can increase to about 24 trains per hour per direction, resulting in a cumulative increase of about 37% in the passenger carrying capacity as compared</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>with that in 2015. During the busiest period of the morning peak, MTR Corporation has additionally provided a regular special train trip departing from Tin Shui Wai Station for Hung Hom, which helps carry away the passengers waiting at the stations in Yuen Long district.</p>
	<p>(d) Traffic impact assessment (TIA) should be conducted and made available for public scrutiny before proceeding with planning further.</p>	<p>(d) The TTIA results are available in the Executive Summary of the Revised Recommended Outline Development Plan (Revised RODP) in the YLS Study project website: https://www.yuenlongsouth.hk/links/ES_Revised_RODP_er.pdf</p>
	<p>(e) There are limitations and constraints regarding the proposed multi-storey buildings (MSBs) in housing the affected brownfield operations and port back-up uses. Some industries, such as concrete batching plant, could not relocate into MSBs. The future rent of the MSB floorspace would be higher than traditional open storage land, which would price out the recycling trade to the detriment of waste recycling/reduction.</p>	<p>(e) The implementation and operation details and the development model of the MSBs are outside the scope of the OZP, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the area. Nevertheless, the Government will take note of brownfield operators' concerns when formulating the development model for the MSB sites.</p> <p>Given the scarcity of land resources, MSB is expected to be a land-efficient means to consolidate and support the sustainable development of relevant industries (including vehicle repair workshops) and brownfield operations, which are in demand in our economy but need to relocate during the process of development. The YLS Development has proposed a total of about 484,110m² of floor space for storage and workshop uses and general industrial uses within the proposed MSBs (Item D1) to accommodate brownfield operations that could not be accommodated in conventional flatted factory buildings. The consolidation of brownfield operation and general industrial uses into designated purpose-designed MSBs located close to main thoroughfare and improved highway junctions (Item D4), and with buffering from proposed open spaces (Item D3), could help reduce their land-take and ameliorate their impact on the surrounding area. Most brownfield-related uses, general industrial uses and vehicle repair workshop uses are classified as Column 1 uses within the "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Storage and Workshop Use" zone (Item</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>D1) and planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board) is not required.</p> <p>While affected operators may wish to relocate their operations to the proposed MSBs in the future, on the other hand, they may also consider moving their businesses to other places zoned “Open Storage” (“OS”, to which some 5.6 ha of land is currently zoned “OS” on the TYST OZP, including Item D2), “Industrial” (“I”, to which some 14.8 ha of land is currently zoned “I” on the TYST OZP) and/or “Industrial (Group D)” in the New Territories (in which ‘Concrete Batching Plant’ is a Column 2 use in all three zonings). The revised “Town Planning Board Guidelines on Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance” (TPB PG-No. 13F) promulgated by the Board in March 2020 also set out the criteria for assessing planning applications for open storage and port back-up uses, which helps channel open storage and port back-up uses to more suitable locations.</p>
	<p>(f) The C&R arrangement is inadequate and incomprehensive, and would encourage brownfield uses to proliferate elsewhere. The compensation cap on brownfield operations neglects the needs of the trade. There should be option for village resite. Better compensation should be made available to squatters and licensed houses. The Government should render proactive assistance to relocate affected operations, livestock farmers and villagers.</p>	<p>(f) Responses (a) and (b) to R1 to R3 above are relevant.</p>
	<p>(g) Existing local community networks and local economies (including agricultural uses) will be destroyed by the YLS Development, which</p>	<p>(g) A socio-economic impact assessment has been conducted as part of the YLS Study. The assessment concluded that while some existing residents, farmers and local industries would be affected and displaced by the YLS Development leading to some</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>runs contrary to the community's desire to promote the local economy.</p>	<p>negative impact on existing social network and local culture, the YLS Development would also bring about a number of societal benefits, including new housing units, improved living environments, new employment opportunities, and new public services, etc. It is expected that through the YLS Development, the general living environment would be improved with a mixture of residential, commercial and industrial developments. The existing village communities could also be benefited by the newly provided facilities and infrastructure. With suitable mitigation measures in place, the positive impacts could outweigh the negative impacts and thus the YLS Development is considered acceptable from socio-economic perspective.</p>
	<p>(h) Farmers should be allowed to live on their farmland. "Agricultural priority area" ("APA") should be designated (R24).</p>	<p>(h) Matters concerning agricultural-related legislation, regulation, policy, and operational and licensing issues, including on-farm domestication, "Agricultural Park", APA and special agricultural land rehabilitation scheme, etc., are outside the scope of the OZP, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the area. Such concerns should be directed to the relevant bureaux/departments (B/Ds) and be dealt with under established procedures.</p>
	<p>(i) The pig farm located away from local residents should be retained; alternatively, relocation proposal should be offered to the operator (R24). Equivalent areas of land should be rezoned to accommodate the affected livestock farms. (R4)</p>	<p>(i) Regarding the affected livestock farms, based on the odour assessment of the YLS Study, no feasible and implementable environmental mitigation measures could be identified to resolve the odour nuisance from three existing pig farms and two existing chicken farms, upon full completion of YLS Development (Plan H-6). Only one existing chicken farm that is located away from main sensitive receivers could be retained (in an area zoned "AGR" on the Tai Tong OZP). While one chicken farm (within Item A4) and about 2.4 ha of active farmland (within various amendment items of the TYST OZP), which were previously zoned "Undetermined" ("U"), will be affected by the current zoning amendment, about 0.5 ha of active agricultural land in Tin Lung Tsuen will also be retained within the "Residential (Group D)" ("R(D)") zone (Item B). The aforesaid affected agricultural uses could not possibly be retained due to conflict with the proposed YLS Development, in particular for residential, open space and road uses. Besides, only one pig farm will be affected by the concurrent</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>zoning amendments for the Tai Tong OZP (Item A therein). No pig farms will be affected by the current amendment items on the TYST OZP (Plan H-6).</p> <p>Licensed livestock farmers may also choose to relocate to other “Livestock Waste Control Areas” (LWCA) provided the relocation site fulfills relevant statutory requirements. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department will provide support based on the relocation needs of individual farmers.</p>
	(j) The ratio in each type of proposed public housing should be made clear. (R4)	(j) For the housing types including Public Rental Housing/Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme (PRH/GSH) and Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) developments, the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) will maintain their interchangeability and adjust their supply in a timely manner to better respond to changes in market situations and the housing needs of the community at large.
	(k) Bicycle-priority/bicycle-only lanes should be designated on proposed roads, especially those connecting to key activity nodes, so that cyclists could enjoy equal access as car users. (R4)	(k) To harness the potential of green mobility and to promote walking and cycling in NDAs, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) is currently undertaking studies to investigate the potential EFTS arrangement to connect HSK/HT NDA with the YLS Development, as well as reviewing the pedestrian and cycle track network and associated cycling infrastructures in YLS. Furthermore, a comprehensive network of walkways, cycle tracks and open spaces will be provided to facilitate convenient and pleasant linkages amongst different development clusters and activity nodes in the YLS Development.
	(l) 1-2 ha of land should be rezoned as village resite area. (R4)	(l) Response (b) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.
	(m) Bicycle parking requirement should be prescribed as conditions in “OU” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”) and “Commercial” (“C”) sites. (R4)	(m) The subject zonings are not related to the amendment items. There are no “C” zones proposed under the Revised RODP of the YLS Development. While there are “OU(MU)” sites on the Revised RODP (Drawing H-1), they fall within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development. Land within the Remaining Stages of the YLS

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(n) The proposed sewage treatment works (STW, Item E) would be situated on higher ground, away from the main development cluster and would require additional pumping. The location of this facility is not well thought out. The proposed STW should instead be placed closer to the MSBs sites on lower ground. (R6)</p>	<p>Development will be subject to further review in due course. Nevertheless, bicycle parking requirements may be included in the relevant lease conditions if and when considered necessary.</p> <p>(n) The proposed STW (Item E, Plan H-5a) and the two associated sewage pumping stations (SPSs, Item A2, Plan H-3a) are essential infrastructures to support the entire YLS Development and nearby developments. The proposals are included in this stage of the zoning amendment to tie in with the overall works programme for the associated site formation and the targeted commissioning of the STW by 2032 tentatively.</p> <p>Gravity sewerage system will be provided as far as possible for collection of sewage flows in localised areas close to the STW. To overcome topographical constraints and to avoid excessive sewer depth for the gravity sewerage system, two new SPSs (Item A2) are proposed to convey the sewage flows to the proposed STW. The proposed STW, with a footprint of about 4.2 ha at a formation level of about 23.5mPD, is an optimum and cost-effective proposal taking into account the existing ground levels for providing new sewerage infrastructure to meet the requirements and demands of the YLS Development, and would also provide treatment capacity for nearby developments.</p> <p>The current proposed location of the STW has taken into account public views expressed during Stage 2 Community Engagement (CE) of YLS Study, i.e. that the facility should be sited away from existing villages and future residents. The current location is considered more suitable given its distance away from the core residential areas, thereby minimising any potential environmental impacts to the general public, and is commensurate with the planned urban fringe setting at the southern tip of the YLS Development. The suggestions to locate the proposed STW to the “<i>Urban Living</i>” or “<i>Employment Belt</i>” planning areas (Drawing H-3) might have environmental implications and would be incongruous with the former’s positioning</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>as a high-rise, high-density residential cluster, while undermine the use of strategically-located sites for MSB developments with convenient access to Yuen Long Highway. For these reasons, the location, extent and inclusion of the “OU(STW)” zone (Item E) are considered appropriate, justified and acceptable.</p>
<p>R25 (Capital Apex Development Limited)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Items A1, A3 and A4</p> <p><u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u> (a) Development intensities should be further optimised in the housing cluster in order to achieve other policy objectives, such as liveability and mixed tenancy development (public to private ratio of 7:3).</p>	<p>(a) The development intensities for the YLS Development Stages 1 and 2 have been further optimised under the Revised RODP of YLS Development promulgated in May 2020, so as to meet the keen demand on public housing and in response to the latest Executive Council’s decision regarding intensification of development intensities for public housing sites where technical feasibility permits. The total plot ratio (PR) of 7 for the five public housing sites in Stages 1 and 2 (Item A3) (based on an assumption of PR 6.5 for domestic (increased by about 30% from about 5 under the RODP) and PR 0.5 for non-domestic) is in line with the latest policy initiative, and is considered appropriate, justified and acceptable.</p> <p>The future tenure type of the proposed public housing development is largely outside the scope of the subject OZP, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the area. Nevertheless, to develop a harmonious community, different types of residential developments meeting different needs, aspirations and affordability have been planned in the YLS Development. The Revised RODP has suitably increased the overall public/private housing supply split from about 61:39 to about 68:32, which is generally in line with the latest Long Term Housing Strategy target. The current housing mix is considered appropriate and commensurate with the extent of proposed supporting government, institution or community (GIC) facilities and open spaces.</p>
	<p>(b) Single use “Open Space” (“O”) should be</p>	<p>(b) The proposed “O” zones (Items A4 and D3) form a network of district open spaces</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>revisited in light of the recent “single site, multiple use” initiative. Rooftop open spaces should be introduced at the two “Government, Institution or Community (1)” (“G/IC(1)”) zones (Item A1).</p>	<p>(DO) and local open spaces (LO) in support of the YLS Development. The open space can be reached with appropriate distance for all patrons including the future residents of YLS, existing residents and villagers in the vicinity to access and enjoy. The co-location of other uses within “O” zones will be considered at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Opportunity to include rooftop open spaces at the “G/IC(1)” zone will be explored at the detailed design stage. However, as rooftop open spaces are generally not countable towards the provision of open spaces, DO and LO will continue to be provided at designated “O” zones (Items A4 and D3). Moreover, as advocated in the Urban Design Guidelines of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), public and universal accessibility to open spaces should be maximised; at-grade open spaces would ensure that this objective could be achieved.</p>
	<p><u>Major Suggestion(s)/Proposal(s)</u></p> <p>(c) Two sites should be rezoned from “Residential (Group A)3” (“R(A)3”) (Item A3) to “R(A)4” with total PR of 9 (including domestic PR of 7.5 and non-domestic PR of 1.5) and building height (BH) of 180mPD.</p>	<p>(c) Response (a) above on optimisation of development intensity is relevant. Moreover, during previous CEs of the YLS Study, concerns regarding the high development intensity adjacent to existing village houses and low-rise developments in the vicinity of the subject two sites were received. The suggested total PR of 9 and domestic PR of 7.5 far exceed the development intensities adopted for public housing sites in the new town area and are considered excessive. The suggested BH is also considered excessive in both the contexts of YLS Development and the wider Yuen Long district (with the tallest buildings currently being Grand YOHO near West Rail Yuen Long Station).</p>
	<p>(d) Two sites should be rezoned from “O” (Item A4) to “R(A)4” with total PR of 9, with non-building area suitably incorporated.</p>	<p>(d) Response (c) above is generally relevant. In particular, the subject “O” zones (Item A4) are located amidst the high-rise, high-density residential cluster and is intended to serve the local residents in commensurate with the prevailing open space provision standard of the HKPSG, act as breezeways and to provide visual relief, while forming a wider network of DOs and LOs in YLS. The open spaces can be reached with</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		appropriate walking distance for all patrons, including the future residents of the “Urban Living” planning area (Drawing H-3), existing residents and nearby villagers in the vicinity.
<p>R26 (also C36), R27, R28 (also C56), R29 and R30 (also C14)</p> <p>(all individuals)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Items A1 and E; R26 also opposes Amendment Item A4</p> <p><u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) There is insufficient detail on the proposed STW. The current proposal has erroneously estimated the size, capacity and design of the STW, which is significantly larger than the one proposed under the Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP). There is doubt over the sewage treatment process as the reedbed has not been rezoned at this stage. There are sensitive receivers in the vicinity of the proposed STW site and the proposed STW will generate environmental nuisance and cause ecological damage. The siting of the proposed STW away from the rest of the Stages 1 and 2 developments is not well thought out.</p> <p>(b) The current C&R arrangement is inadequate and incomprehensive, and the upcoming</p>	<p>(a) Response (n) to R4 to R24 above is relevant. Compared with that of the PODP, the capacity of the STW had been enhanced due to an increased population under the Revised RODP. The STW will provide tertiary sewage treatment to produce Treated Sewage Effluent (TSE) of high quality for conversion into reclaimed water that is suitable for reuse within the YLS DA and adjacent developments for non-potable uses such as toilet flushing. A small amount of TSE will pass through the reedbed adjacent to the STW for further polishing prior to discharging to the Yuen Long Nullah as a continuous scenic water source. Due to the uncertain pollution removal efficiency of the reedbed, its polishing function was only regarded as an extra provision. Nevertheless, the reedbed area will be rezoned in the next stage of zoning amendment (for the YLS Development Remaining Stages) and prior to the commissioning of the STW.</p> <p>Preliminary design of the proposed STW is being carried out by the Drainage Services Department under the “HSK Effluent Polishing Plant (EPP) and YLS EPP – Investigation”. The study will take into account the potential impacts of the infrastructures during the construction and operation phases. As a Designated Project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO), a separate EIA shall be prepared and submitted by the project proponent under the EIAO to apply for Environmental Permit in due course.</p> <p>(b) Response (a) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>resumption of 85% of land within the YLS DA deprives the private property rights of individual landowners. Option for village resite should be made available to non-indigenous villagers (non-IVs).</p>	<p>Under the existing New Territories Village Removal Policy, where land resumption is required to facilitate implementation of public works, the affected indigenous villagers (IVs) who own building lots or non-IVs who have owned building lots pre-war (i.e. prior to 25.12.1941) or by succession, may be provided with village resites when their building lots are resumed.</p>
	<p>(c) Item E should be relocated nearer to the Stages 1 and 2 development, or be rezoned at a later stage.</p>	<p>(c) Response (n) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.</p>
	<p>(d) Existing local community networks and local economies (including agricultural uses) will be destroyed by the YLS Development, which runs contrary to the community's desire to promote the local economy. (R26, R30)</p>	<p>(d) Response (g) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.</p>
	<p>(e) Oppose land resumption for low-density private development, such as at “<i>LOHAS Living</i>” planning area and TYST, which is considered unlawful. Even if land is resumed for public purpose, negotiation and dialogue should be forged with the landowners to reach a mutually agreeable outcome. (R29, R30)</p>	<p>(e) Response (a) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. Except for the retention of existing residential neighbourhoods (Item B) and the proposed village resite areas (Item C), no land has been rezoned for private residential purpose in the current zoning amendment exercise. A lower density development has been proposed under the Revised RODP in the “<i>LOHAS Living</i>” and “<i>Garden Community</i>” planning areas (Drawing H-3) of the YLS Development to respect the existing low-rise residential developments and village settlements. Nevertheless, such areas generally fall within the Remaining Stages of YLS Development and is not related to the current amendment items. Land within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development will be subject to further review for more intensive development to meet the acute demand for housing and other societal need, taking into account the capacity of infrastructure, particularly the new strategic transport infrastructure.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(f) If the widening of Kung Um Road and Kiu Hing Road does not involve land resumption and disruption to existing residents, it can be supported. Full decking of the nullah should be considered to minimise the need for land resumption. (R29)</p>	<p>(f) Decking of nullah for road improvement purpose is not related to the OZP, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the area. Nevertheless, Kung Um Road and Kiu Hing Road between Shap Pat Heung Road and Wong Nai Tun Tsuen Road would be respectively widened to a two-lane carriageway by partially decking over the existing Yuen Long Nullah. Full decking of the nullah would be explored for the section between Shap Pat Heung Road and Yuen Long Highway. The southern section of the nullah would be fully revitalised without the need for decking, while amenity walkways and cycle tracks will be provided along Kung Um Road (Drawing H-4).</p>
	<p>(g) The existing transport network (such as WRL and Tai Lam Tunnel) would not be able to cope with the anticipated developments in the district. The Government should not bundle development projects with essential transport infrastructure improvements, such as widening of Kung Um Road, Kiu Hing Road and TYSTI improvements. Traffic improvement works should be expedited. (R30)</p>	<p>(g) Response (c) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.</p>
	<p>(h) TIA should be conducted and made available for public scrutiny before proceeding with planning further. (R30)</p>	<p>(h) Response (d) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.</p>
	<p>(i) Farmers should be allowed to live on their farmland. The Government should render proactive assistance to relocate affected livestock farms. (R30)</p>	<p>(i) Responses (h) and (i) to R4 to R24 above are relevant.</p>
	<p><u>Major Suggestion(s)/Proposal(s)</u></p>	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(j) A site/two sites should be rezoned from “G/IC(1)” (Item A1) to “V” for “land-for-land” compensation and village resite for affected landowners.</p>	<p>(j) Responses (a) and (b) to R1 to R3 above are relevant. Besides, the proposed “G/IC(1)” zones (Item A1) form part of the key activity node for the “<i>Urban Living</i>” planning area (Drawing H-3) where various GIC and public transport interchange (PTI) facilities are proposed. The suggestion to use the site for village resite area is considered inappropriate and unjustified. Furthermore, there are no strong justifications or technical assessments to substantiate the proposal; without the necessary details, the technical feasibility and possible impact of which cannot be ascertained.</p>
	<p>(k) A site to the south of Shan Ha (Item A4) should be rezoned to “V(1)” for village resite purpose for affected landowners. (R26)</p>	<p>(k) Response (b) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. In particular, the subject “O” zone (Item A4) is intended to provide a sizeable DO to serve the local residents in commensurate with the prevailing open space provision standard of the HKPSG, act as breezeways and to provide visual relief, while forming a wider network of DOs and LOs in YLS. The open spaces can be reached with appropriate walking distance for all patrons, including the future residents of the “<i>Urban Living</i>” planning area (Drawing H-3), existing residents and nearby villagers in the vicinity. The suggestion to use the site for village resite area is considered inappropriate and unjustified. Furthermore, there are no strong justifications or technical assessments to substantiate the proposal; without the necessary details, the technical feasibility and possible impact of which cannot be ascertained.</p>
<p>R31 (also C58), R32 (also C4) to R35 (also C31) (all individuals)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A2; R31 also opposes Amendment Items A1, D2 and D3; R35 also opposes Amendment Item A4</p> <p><u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) Land should be allocated for public housing/designated Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) rehousing estate with priority given to those residents affected by the YLS Development.</p>	<p>(a) When formulating the land use proposal for YLS, a ‘minimal-impact approach’ was adopted to retain the well-established residential clusters/communities and to minimise impact on the existing residents as far as possible. Although no HKHS rehousing estates have been proposed within the YLS DA, there are two local rehousing sites in HSK/HT NDA designated for local rehousing purpose, providing about 2,600 units. Eligible affected residents could also be rehoused to HKHA’s PRH if they fulfil all</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>rehousing and PRH eligibility criteria, including income and asset test. According to the Revised RODP for the YLS Development, about 19.6 ha of land has been designated for public housing development (including 13.3 ha under Item A3), which would provide about 22,320 public flats (including 16,920 public flats under Item A3). Furthermore, a total of about 1.3 ha of land (including 0.76 ha within the TYST area (Item C) and 0.57 ha within the Tai Tong area) were rezoned as “V(1)” mainly for re-provisioning of village houses affected by Government projects. Overall, the range of C&R options available for eligible domestic occupants is in line with other development projects.</p>
	<p>(b) The “OS” zone (Item D2) and industrial land is insufficient to accommodate all those affected brownfield operations that cannot be accommodated into MSBs. Such land should be suitably expanded. (R31)</p>	<p>(b) Response (e) to R4 to R24 above is relevant. Furthermore, there are no strong justifications or technical assessments to substantiate the proposal; without the necessary details, the technical feasibility and possible impact of which cannot be ascertained.</p>
	<p>(c) There are challenges and practical constraints for brownfield operations to relocate into the proposed MSBs; the extent of “O” zone (Item D3) should be reduced to release land for brownfield operators. (R31)</p>	<p>(c) Response (e) to R4 to R24 above is relevant. The proposed DO and LO strips (Item D3) adjacent to the MSB area are primarily intended to minimise the interface between the proposed MSBs and the existing low-rise residential developments near TYST, as well as to provide open space for the enjoyment of workers in the MSBs area as required under the HKPSG, and is considered appropriate and justified. Furthermore, there are no strong justifications or technical assessments to substantiate the proposal; without the necessary details, the technical feasibility and possible impact of which cannot be ascertained.</p>
	<p>(d) The transport infrastructure in TYST should be enhanced in view of the influx of brownfield operations. (R31)</p>	<p>(d) Response (c) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.</p>
	<p>(e) The current C&R arrangement is inadequate</p>	<p>(e) Response (a) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/ YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	and incomprehensive; it also neglects the rights of individual non-IV landowners and tenants. The Government should proactively negotiate with brownfield operators on the C&R arrangement. (R31)	
	(f) Option for village resite should be made available to affected landowners. (R35)	(f) Response (b) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.
	<p><u>Major Suggestion(s)/Proposal(s)</u></p> <p>(g) One of the Item A2 sites (originally zoned “O” and “OS” as claimed) should be rezoned to “R(A)3” annotated “HKHS Rehousing Estate/ Public Housing”.</p>	(g) Response (a) above is relevant. In particular, two of the proposed “G/IC(2)” zones (Item A2) are located adjacent to Yuen Long Highway subject to adverse environmental impact (noise and air pollution) and are generally not suitable for habitable uses. The other proposed “G/IC(2)” zone (Item A2) is intended for a electricity substation located amidst two large “O” zones (Item A4) which forms a wider network of DOs and LOs in YLS. The suggestion to use one of the aforesaid sites for public housing is considered inappropriate and unjustified. Furthermore, there are no strong justifications or technical assessments to substantiate the proposal; without the necessary details, the technical feasibility and possible impact of which cannot be ascertained.
	(h) Item A1 should be rezoned to “V” for “land-for-land” compensation and village resite for affected landowners. (R31)	(h) Response (j) to R26 to R30 above is relevant.
	(i) The extent of “OS” zone should be increased (Item D2). (R31)	(i) Response (b) above is relevant.
	(j) The extent of “O” zone should be reduced to enable more land for brownfield purposes	(j) Response (c) above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(Item D3). (R31)	
	(k) A site to the south of Shan Ha (Item A4) should be rezoned to “V(1)” for village resite for affected landowners. (R35)	(k) Response (k) to R26 to R30 above is relevant.
R36 and R50 (also C52) (all individuals)	Oppose Amendment Items A4, C, D1 and E; R36 also opposes Amendment Item A2	
	<u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u> (a) If the Remaining Stages are not materialised, the location of the proposed STW (Item E) would be incompatible with the rest of the development nearby and could not support the new population. The proposed STW should be relocated to the northern part of Kung Um Road; alternatively, it should be rescheduled to the next phase of zoning amendment.	(a) Responses (n) to R4 to R24 , and (a) to R26 to R30 above are relevant.
	(b) Insufficient land has been reserved to accommodate the affected brownfield operations and vehicle repair workshops; this would lead to closure of many vehicle repair workshops with severe impact to vehicle safety in Hong Kong.	(b) Response (e) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.
	(c) Land should be allocated for public housing/designated HKHS rehousing estate with priority given to those residents affected by the YLS Development. (R36)	(c) Response (a) to R31 to R35 above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/ YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(d) The nullah along Kung Um Road should be fully decked such that Kung Um Road and Pak Sha Shan Road could be widened without the need for land resumption and to avoid environmental impact. (R50)	(d) Responses (f) to R26 to R30 above is relevant.
	<u>Major Suggestion(s)/Proposal(s)</u> (e) One of the Item A2 sites (originally zoned “O” and “OS” as claimed) should be rezoned to “R(A)3” annotated “HKHS Rehousing Estate/ Public Housing”. (R36)	(e) Response (g) to R31 to R35 above is relevant.
	(f) Part of Item A4 (R36)/some proposed open spaces (R50) should be rezoned as multi-storey vehicle repair centres.	(f) Response (d) to R25 above in relation to the subject “O” zone (Item A4) is relevant. Moreover, the suggestion to place multi-storey vehicle repair workshops adjacent to the new and existing residential neighbourhoods may create potential industrial/residential (I/R) interface issues, and is considered generally inappropriate. Furthermore, there are no strong justifications or technical assessments to substantiate the proposal; without the necessary details, the technical feasibility and possible impact of which cannot be ascertained.
R37 to R47 (also C43) (all individuals)	Oppose Amendment Item A3 <u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u> (a) Aggrieve by the upcoming land resumption of Lot 1440 S.B in D.D. 119, which infringes private property rights. The subject land parcel is not suitable for residential development due to its location at the corner/fringes of the “R(A)3” zone near a main road and a nullah. (R37 to R46)	(a) The concerned lot falls mainly within Item A3 and partly within Item A4; it is also zoned “Special Residential – Zone 1 – Public Rental Housing (with Commercial)” and “LO” respectively on the Revised RODP under YLS Development Stage 2 (shown as ‘R37 to R46’ on Plan H-3c). Omission of the subject lot from the amendment would lead to a decrease in developable site area for public housing development (about 550m ² , within Item A3), decrease in the extent of LO (about 205m ² , Item A4) and impact on the integrity of the LO strip (such as a significant reduction in the width of

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>the 20m-wide LO strip to about 6m at its narrowest point, Item A4). For these reasons, retention of the concerned lot as “R(A)3” (Item A3) and “O” zones (Item A4) is considered appropriate and necessary. Furthermore, there are no strong justifications or technical assessments to substantiate the suggestion to exclude the subject lot from development; without the necessary details (such as proposed revised zoning), the technical feasibility and possible impact of which cannot be ascertained.</p>
	(b) The future influx in population will worsen the existing traffic congestion problems and strain public transport services in Yuen Long District, including Shap Pat Heung Road. (R47)	(b) Response (c) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.
	(c) The population density of YLS Development should be significantly reduced. (R47)	(c) The population density of the YLS Development, as reflected in the current amendment items (for Stages 1 and 2), has taken into account the development constraints and opportunities of the area, the prevailing density zonings, the physical setting, local characteristics, guiding principles on planning and urban design, capacity of public infrastructure, findings of the technical assessments, as well as the public views received in the three stages of CE under the YLS Study, etc., and is considered appropriate. Moreover, traffic improvement works and transport infrastructure will be provided timely in commensurate with the population intake by phases, which would be monitored in tandem with the progress of the YLS Development by relevant works department(s).
R48 (also C23) and R49 (also C7) (all individuals)	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A4</p> <p><u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) Land should be allocated for public housing/designated HKHS rehousing estate with priority given to those residents affected by the YLS Development.</p>	(a) Response (a) to R31 to R35 above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p><u>Major Suggestion(s)/Proposal(s)</u> (b) The two “O” sites to the south of Tin Liu Tsuen (Item A4) should be rezoned to “R(A)” annotated “HKHS Rehousing Estate/Public Housing”.</p>	<p>(b) Response (d) to R25 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R51 (individual)</p>	<p>Supports Amendment Items D1, D3 and D4</p> <p><u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u> (a) Consolidation of brownfield operations into MSBs (Item D1) could help ameliorate their existing environmental and safety impacts on nearby residents.</p> <p>(b) The proposed continuous open space strip (Item D3) could act as a buffer between the brownfield operations and existing residents, thereby ameliorate existing environmental nuisances and environmental hygiene problems.</p> <p>(c) The additional access from Yuen Long Highway to TYST Road (Item D4) could alleviate existing traffic congestion in the area.</p> <p>(d) The proposed buildings and development areas should be compatible with the surrounding environment and landscape character.</p>	<p>(a) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p> <p>(b) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p> <p>(c) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p> <p>(d) Efforts should be made by the project proponent(s) to create harmonious integration between the new development and the surrounding environment/landscape at the detailed design stage.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(e) The construction of access roads should be expedited.	(e) Implementation phasing of road works would be dealt with separately by relevant works department(s) in firming up the works programme and implementation details.
<p>R52</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Item D</p> <p><u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) “Green Belt” (“GB”) serves as buffers to control excessive development, protect natural habitats and forms the foundations of biodiversity. Rezoning “GB” land for development will damage local habitats and undermine its enjoyment by the public. Instead of “GB” land, development should take place on disturbed land and brownfields first.</p>	<p>(a) The affected “GB” land (Items D1 to D4) of about 8.3 ha is located at the northern fringes of the subject “GB” zone adjacent to Yuen Long Highway. The subject area is primarily located adjacent to the to-be-restructured Tin Shui Wai West Interchange (TSWWI), offering direct and convenient access to the strategic road network. In terms of the existing site condition, the part of the proposed MSB sites falling within the previous “GB” zone (Item D1) is generally disturbed and formed, while the proposed open storage site (Item D2) is largely disturbed and occupied by temporary uses with limited tree cover (Plans H-4e and H-4f). In view of these considerations, the subject “GB” land was rezoned to provide essential road infrastructure (Item D4), sites for MSB (Item D1) and open storage purpose (Item D2). Overall, rezoning of this peripheral area of “GB” land would not have a detrimental effect on the integrity of the subject “GB” zone.</p>
<p>R53</p> <p>(Best Well Holdings Limited)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Items D1 and D4</p> <p><u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) The existing Tong Tai Road should be recognised as it provides important access for existing and future businesses in the area.</p>	<p>(a) Tong Tai Road is currently a substandard road (Plan H-4b). Under the Revised RODP, Tong Tai Road is planned to be re-aligned and widened (in the form of proposed Road L11) to support the implementation of the proposed MSB sites, and is subsumed under Item D1. The area will be served by the proposed carriageways of Roads L11 and L12 (Item D4) in the future (Plan H-4c). For the same reasons as response (b) below, the existing Tong Tai Road shall be re-aligned and widened, or else it would severely impact the implementation of the proposed MSB sites (Item D1). The retention of Tong Tai Road is considered inappropriate, unnecessary and unjustified.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/ YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) The widening of TYST Road would encroach onto an existing industrial premise (hereafter referred to as ‘A-Chow Metal Workshop’¹) and may affect its daily operations. The proposed road works should be reconsidered/carried out once the EFTS mode is confirmed.</p>	<p>(b) ‘A-Chow Metal Workshop’ falls mainly within Item D1 and marginally within Item D4; it is also mainly zoned “OU(Storage and Workshop Uses)”, partly zoned “OU(Storage Use)” and marginally shown as ‘Road’ on the Revised RODP under YLS Development Stage 2 (shown as ‘R53’ on Plan H-4c). The subject premises is located at the centre of the “OU(SW)” zone within the “<i>Employment Belt</i>” planning area (Plans H-9a to H-9c). Omission of the subject premises from the amendment would lead to a corresponding decrease in developable site area for MSBs (about 0.57 ha within Item D1) and may have further knock-on impact on the residual MSB sites due to setback requirements. It would also primarily affect the implementation of proposed Road L11 (Plan H-4c), which provides essential access for the proposed MSB developments and the wider area. For these reasons, retention of the concerned lots as “OU(SW)” zone (Item D1) and ‘Road’ (Item D4) is considered appropriate and necessary.</p>
	<p><u>Major Suggestion(s)/Proposal(s)</u> (c) Tong Tai Road should be rezoned as ‘Road’ and be included in Item D1.</p>	<p>(c) Response (a) above is relevant.</p>
	<p>(d) Proposed partial cancellation (northern section of TYST Road) and extension (western and southern section of TYST Road and Sha Tseng Road) of Item D4.</p>	<p>(d) Responses (a) and (b) above are relevant. For the suggested extension of the area shown as ‘Road’, in general, major road junctions and alignment of major roads will be shown on the OZP as detailed planning/design are confirmed and whenever opportune. While some proposed road works would not be shown on the OZP, nevertheless, they are generally mentioned in the Explanatory Statement to the OZP and/or shown on the Revised RODP of the YLS Development.</p>
<p>R54 to R56</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Items D1, D2, D3 and D4</p>	

¹ Lots 1268 S.A, 1268 S.B, 1268 S.C, 1268 S.D, 1268 RP, 1782 RP and 2008 S.A RP in D.D. 121.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
(all individuals)	<p><u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) The proposed YLS Development would damage a memorial hall (陳家祠堂 or 陳氏家族紀念堂, hereafter referred to as ‘Chan’s Memorial Hall’) and its <i>fung shui</i>/natural landscape (Plans H-10a to H-10c).</p> <p>(b) Various ancestral land parcels² (shown as ‘R54 to R56’ on Plan H-4c) should not be resumed without prior consultation with the landowners. Aggrieved that LandsD’s letter was received in</p>	<p>(a) The concerned lots and the ‘Chan’s Memorial Hall’ (Plans H-10a to H-10c) thereon fall partly within Items D1, D3 and D4 and marginally within Item D2, with the remainder falling outside the amendment items (shown as ‘R54 to R56’ on Plan H-4c). They are also mainly zoned “OU(Storage Use)” and “Amenity” (“A”) and shown as ‘Road’, and marginally zoned “OU(Open Storage)”, “DO” and “Residential - Zone 5 (Existing Development Area)” (“R5(EDA)”) on the Revised RODP under YLS Development Stage 2 and Remaining Stages, with the remainder falling outside the YLS DA. Omission of the subject lots from the amendment would virtually render the concerned MSB site (1.7 ha, Item D1) unsuitable for its intended use, leading to a loss of about 60,500 m² of non-domestic floor space for MSB to house brownfield operations. The suggestion would also primarily affect the implementation of the proposed TSWWI improvement works and the proposed Roads L20 and L22 (Plan H-4c), which would significantly affect the overall feasibility of the YLS Development, given its role as one of two main access points connecting the YLS Development with the strategic highway network. Likewise, it would also undermine the technical feasibility and timely implementation of the committed Near Tan Kwai Tsuen public housing development (Plan H-4a), the access of which would fundamentally rely on the proposed Road L22 and connecting road (Drawing H-4). For these reasons, retention of the concerned lots as “OU(SW)” (Item D1), “OS” (Item D2) and “O” zones (Item D3) and ‘Road’ (Item D4) is considered appropriate, necessary and justified.</p> <p>(b) Response (a) above is relevant. Regarding the “cut-off” date issue, when it is anticipated that land resumption may be required in order to implement a government project in accordance with the planned uses on the OZP, LandsD will issue a letter to the owners of building lot within the project limit that their lots may be subject to land</p>

² Lots 472 to 475, 477, 478 S.A&S.B., 479 RP, 480, 491 RP, 492 RP, 493 RP, 494 RP, 495 RP, 496 to 499, 501 RP, 503, 507 RP, 508, 510 to 514, 516 to 520, 1829 RP and 1829 S.A ss.4 in D.D. 121.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	August 2020 when the “cut-off” date to determine the eligibility for compensation under the Government’s VRT was set at 10.7.2020. (R54)	resumption in the future. The letter will specify a “cut-off” date for determining the eligibility for compensation under the existing New Territories Village Removal Policy if their lots are resumed by the Government in the future. To implement the YLS Development, amendments to the approved TYST OZP No. S/YL-TYST/12 and the approved Tai Tong OZP No. S/YL-TT/16 were gazetted on 10.7.2020, which was the “cut-off” date for determining the eligibility for compensation under the existing New Territories Village Removal Policy if their lots are resumed by the Government in the future.
	(c) The permissible use of ‘Petrol Filling Station’ (‘PFS’) under Item D1 will generate environmental pollution and traffic congestion. (R55, R56)	(c) The Schedule of Uses of the “OU(SW)” zone was formulated to tie in with the planning intention while at the same time allow due flexibility in future land use composition. While ‘PFS’ is considered generally not incompatible with storage and workshop uses, having regard to the potential traffic, environmental and safety implications of ‘PFS’, the subject use was placed under Column 2 of the “OU(SW)” zone such that the impact of any such proposal could be gauged and scrutinised as part of the s.16 planning application process. Any such proposal will be considered on their individual merits. Overall, the inclusion of ‘PFS’ as a Column 2 use under the “OU(SW)” zone is considered appropriate and prudent.
	(d) The proposed “OS” zone (Item D2) will generate environmental pollution and traffic congestion. (R55, R56)	(d) Response (c) to R4 to R24 above on traffic impact is relevant. The approved EIA Report, subsequent environmental review and relevant technical assessments have concluded that no insurmountable problems concerning air quality, noise, sewerage and sewage treatment, waste management, water quality, land contamination, landscape and visual impacts, ecology, fisheries and cultural heritage are envisaged during the construction and operation phases of the YLS Development.
	(e) There is no need to rezone land for “O” (Item D3) as the area is already well landscaped by the landowner and is occupied by 陳氏家族紀	(e) Part of the concerned lots falling within an area zoned “O” under Item D3 is mainly for slope works for the proposed Road L22 (Plan H-4c). It is essential for the implementation of the subject proposed road. The extent of slope works is subject to

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	念堂. (R55, R56)	review at detailed design stage.
R57 and R58 (all companies)	<p>Oppose Amendment Item D3</p> <p><u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) Lots 1145 S.PRP and 1145 S.Q RP in D.D. 121 should be excluded from the zoning amendment; the lots are too small to contribute towards the overall provision of open space. The “O” zone serves no tangible environmental purpose. Private land should not be resumed for public parks. There is already sufficient buffer in place for the existing residential developments. Besides, there are active plans to develop private residential development (about 4-6 houses) at the subject concerned lots. (R57)</p> <p>(b) The original “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) zoning is considered more compatible with the surrounding area and in line with housing policy. Resumption of “R(B)1” land for open space contradicts the Government’s efforts in developing housing land. (R57)</p> <p>(c) Lots 1049 to 1052, and 1125 in D.D. 121 should be excluded from the zoning amendment. (R58)</p>	<p>(a) The concerned lots fall within Item D3 (shown as ‘R57’ on Plan H-4c) and also on land zoned “DO” on the Revised RODP under YLS Development Stage 2. Omission of the subject lot from the amendment would lead to a decrease in the extent of DO (about 740 m², Item D3). Moreover, the subject DO is to serve the new/existing population in the “Garden Community” planning area (Drawing H-3). The concerned lots are isolated and located towards the centre of the subject “O” zone, which would affect the integrity of the subject DO if retained for residential-based uses. For this reason, retention of the concerned lots as “O” zone (Item D3) is considered appropriate, necessary and justified.</p> <p>(b) Response (a) above is relevant. The proposed “O” zone (Item D3) for the provision of outdoor open-air public space for active and/or passive recreational uses not only complements the low-rise residential uses generally to its south, it would also provide visual and landscape buffer between the proposed MSBs to its north and the residential uses to its south.</p> <p>(c) The concerned lots fall outside the amendment items (shown as ‘R58’ on Plan H-4c) and within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development. Land within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development will be subject to further review in due course.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p><u>Major Suggestion(s)/Proposal(s)</u> (d) Item D3 should be reverted back to its original “R(B)1” zoning.</p>	<p>(d) Responses (a) and (b) above are relevant.</p>
<p>R59 (also C18) to R64 (all individuals)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item E</p> <p><u>Major Ground(s)/Comment(s)</u> (a) There are sensitive receivers in the vicinity of the proposed STW site and the proposed STW (including construction phase) will generate environmental nuisance and cause ecological damage. (R59, R61 to R63)</p> <p>(b) There is insufficient detail on the proposed STW. The current proposal has erroneously estimated the size, capacity and design of the STW, which is significantly larger than the one proposed under the PODP. There is doubt over the sewage treatment process as the reedbed has not been rezoned at this stage. The siting of the proposed STW away from the rest of the Stages 1 and 2 developments is not well thought out. (R59)</p> <p>(c) Item E should be relocated nearer to the Stages 1 and 2 development. (R59)</p> <p>(d) The Government has underestimated the importance of local agriculture (in terms of</p>	<p>(a) Response (a) to R26 to R30 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (a) to R26 to R30 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (n) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.</p> <p>(d) Responses (h) and (i) to R4 to R24 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>food security, local culture and local employment) and the complicated procedures with relocation of livestock farms. The Government's intention for livestock farms to relocate elsewhere within the "LWCA" is flawed and would actually signal the end of the industry. The Government should pay heed to the trade's proposal for multi-storey livestock farms. (R60)</p>	
	<p>(e) Construction of the proposed STW should take place only after land resumption for all development phases is completed (R62). The construction works would cause traffic congestion to the detriment of existing residents; local residents should be thoroughly consulted (R63).</p>	<p>(e) Response (n) to R4 to R24 above is relevant. In particular, the proposed Roads D1 and D2 (Drawing H-4) linking the TYSTI and the proposed STW via a short section of the improved Kung Um Road would divert construction traffic from the existing road networks and thus minimise traffic impact to existing residents. As such, construction of part of proposed Roads D1 and D2 is planned earlier in conjunction with the works under YLS Development Stage 1 works.</p>
	<p>(f) The land resumption boundary to effectuate the proposed STW should be slightly adjusted such that an existing fire service installations (water tank) at Lot 744 S.B in D.D. 117 (shown as 'R64' on Plan H-5c) could be retained until the Remaining Stages of YLS Development. (R64)</p>	<p>(f) Implementation phasing and land resumption limit are not related to the OZP, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the area. The implementation programme and the exact extent of land resumption would be worked out separately by relevant works department(s) in firming up the implementation details.</p>
	<p>(g) The Government should issue licences to certain long-established, lease-abiding and sizeable affected warehouse/ logistic centre operators so that they can relocate their operations elsewhere. (R64)</p>	<p>(g) Response (a) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p><u>Major Suggestion(s)/Proposal(s)</u> (h) The extent of the “OU(STW)” zone (Item E) should be reduced (R60, R64). The resultant area should be rezoned as “OU” annotated “Rural Use” or “Agriculture” (“AGR”) to enable livestock farms to relocate (R60).</p>	<p>(h) Responses (h) and (i) to R4 to R24 above on agricultural aspect, and (n) to R4 to R24 above on the required size of the STW are relevant.</p>
<p>R65 (The Hong Kong & China Gas Company Limited)</p>	<p>Comment on Amendment Item B</p> <p><u>Major Comment(s)</u> (a) The future project proponent shall consult his company and conduct a quantitative risk assessment in view of the presence of a high pressure gas pipeline in the vicinity of the site.</p>	<p>(a) Item B is mainly to reflect the existing residential developments on site, which are proposed to be retained under the YLS Study. Future development thereon will need to conform to the Notes of the OZP, any other relevant legislation, the conditions of the lease concerned, and any other government requirements, as may be applicable.</p>
<p>R66 (also C134) (Ping Shan Heung Rural Committee)</p>	<p>Other Comments and Suggestions</p> <p><u>Major Comment(s)</u> (a) The “OS” zoning for a piece of land to the east of Shan Ha Road (Item A2 (part)) should be retained for use by existing operators.</p>	<p>(a) The concerned area falls partly within Item A2 and mainly outside the amendment items (shown as ‘R66’ on Plan H-3c). Within Item A2, the subject area is partly zoned “OU(Sewage Pumping Station and Refuse Collection Point)” (“OU(SPS&RCP)”) and partly zoned as “A” on the Revised RODP within YLS Development Stage 2. SPS and RCP are needed to support the YLS Development, and are intentionally sited away from potential sensitive receivers. The proposed amenity area therein also forms the reserve area for the adjoining TYSTI improvement works and related uses. For these reasons, retention of the concerned “G/IC(2)” zone (Item A2) is considered appropriate, necessary and justified. As for the concerned area outside the amendment items within the YLS Development Remaining Stages, they will be subject to further review in due course.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) Existing storage/warehouse operations should be retained around Tin Lung Tsuen (Items A2 (part), A4 (part) and A5 (part)).</p>	<p>(b) The concerned area falls within Items A2, A4, A5 and B; it also falls partly within “OU(SPS&RCP)”, “A”. “DO”, “LO”, “R5(EDA)” and area shown as ‘Road’ on the Revised RODP within YLS Development Stages 1 and 2 (shown as ‘R66’ on Plan H-3c). The subject SPS and RCP (Item A2) are needed to support the YLS Development, and are intentionally sited away from potential sensitive receivers. The proposed amenity area therein also forms the reserve area for the adjoining improvement works. The proposed DO and LO therein (Item A4) are required to serve the existing/new population in the vicinity of the “<i>Urban Living</i>” planning area (Drawing H-3) in accordance with the HKPSG, while also serving as landscape buffer to the retained Tin Lung Tsuen and its environ (Item B). The proposed Road L1 (Item A5) provides essential access to the YLS Development Stage 1, the rest of the “<i>Urban Living</i>” planning area and beyond. For these reasons, retention of the concerned “G/IC(2)” (Item A2), “O” (Item A4) and “R(D)” zones (Item B) and area shown as ‘Road’ (Item A5) is considered appropriate, necessary and justified. Moreover, the suggestion to preserve the area for brownfield uses would be incongruous with the positioning of the area as one of the main gateways to YLS Development, while perpetuating the I/R interface issue with the retained Tin Lung Tsuen (Item B).</p>
	<p>(c) An additional vehicular access should be provided connecting the proposed Roads D1/D2 and Shan Ha (Item A4 (part)).</p>	<p>(c) A village access road has been planned connecting the proposed Road D2 and Shan Ha Tsuen according to the Revised RODP (Drawing H-4).</p>
	<p>(d) Lam Hi Road and Lam Yu Road should be widened into a standard carriageway. A section of the proposed road connecting Kung Um Road and Lam Hau Tsuen (i.e. proposed Road L1, Item A5) should be deleted.</p>	<p>(d) Response (b) above on the need of proposed Road L1 is relevant. Although Lam Hi Road and Lam Yu Road fall outside the amendment items (Plan H-3a), widening of a section of Lam Yu Road between Lam Hau Tsuen Road and Lam Hi Road has been included under YLS Development Stage 1 works to meet the traffic needs of YLS Development. Nevertheless, traffic from YLS DA is expected to use Road L1, instead of Lam Hi Road which runs parallel to Road L1. Moreover, Lam Hi Road falls outside the YLS DA and it does not form part of the proposed road network of</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/ YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>YLS Development.</p> <p>(e) Response (c) to R1 to R3 above concerning the need of the “V(1)” zone (Item C) is relevant. The suggested area falls outside the amendment items and is currently partly zoned “R5(EDA)”, partly zoned “AGR” (covering Lots 1536 and 1975 in D.D. 121) and ‘Road’ (covering the proposed Road L3) on the Revised RODP within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development (shown as ‘Shan Ha Small House Site’ on Plan H-3c). Overall, there is scope to review the matter under the forthcoming further review for the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development to be carried out in due course.</p> <p>(f) Response (e) to R4 to R24 above is relevant. The concerned area to the south/west of Long Hon Road falls outside the amendment items; it is generally zoned “R5(EDA)”, “GB”, “GB(1)”, “AGR” and “LO” on the Revised RODP within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development (shown as ‘R66’ on Plans H-3c and H-4c). Land within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development will be subject to further review in due course.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, secondary woodland, active agricultural farmland, orchard, nursery, and watercourses with moderate to high ecological value have been identified in the area. The suggestion to relocate brownfield operations to the subject area is generally considered not compatible with the rural setting of the area.</p>
<p>R67</p> <p>(Shap Pat Heung Rural Committee)</p>	<p>Other Comments and Suggestions</p> <p><u>Major Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) Some lots (including Lots 1334 S.A RP, 1334 S.A, 1335 S.A and 1550 S.A in D.D.119, etc.) are being used as private gardens and should</p>	<p>(a) The subject lots fall outside the amendment items and are currently partly zoned “Residential – Zone 2 (with Commercial)” and on area shown as ‘Road’ on the Revised RODP within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development, and partly fall outside</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/ YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>not be included in the land resumption limit. They should be rezoned as “U” or “OU” instead. While the entire Lots 1323 and 1325 in D.D. 119 should be included in the YLS DA and be resumed.</p>	<p>the YLS DA (shown as ‘R67’ on Plan H-3c). Land within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development will be subject to further review in due course.</p>
	<p>(b) The entire proposed Road D1 should be advanced to Stage 1 works to alleviate traffic congestion in the area.</p>	<p>(b) Response (c) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R68 (also C135) to R70</p> <p>(Mr SZETO Pok-man, Mr FONG Ho-hin and Mr LEE Chun-wai respectively, all three are members of YLDC)</p>	<p>Other Comments and Suggestions</p>	
	<p><u>Major Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) The Government should not bundle development projects with transport infrastructure improvements. Road improvement works, such as widening of Kung Um Road and Kiu Hing Road (with additional cycle tracks on both sides that could connect to Yuen Long town centre), should be expedited before developing public housing.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) and (k) to R4 to R24 above are relevant. In particular, due to spatial constraint, cycle track has not been planned along the northern part of Kung Um Road and Kiu Hing Road. Nevertheless, cycle tracks are generally proposed along the internal local roads running parallel to the aforesaid thoroughfares serving the nearby residential community within the “<i>Urban Living</i>” planning area.</p>
	<p>(b) The expected new population of 98,700 will strain the capacity of public services, transport network and health system of Yuen Long District. The proposed 13,000 job opportunities are insufficient. The scale of the YLS Development should be reassessed once road improvement works have been completed.</p>	<p>(b) Responses (a) and (c) to R4 to R24 above are relevant.</p> <p>Based on the HKPSG requirements, the planned provision for GIC facilities in Yuen Long District is generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population (including the amendment items), except for hospital beds, child care services facilities, community care services facilities, residential care home for the elderly (RCHE), libraries, sports ground/sport complex and swimming pool (Annex VII). Taking into account the advice of relevant B/Ds, public views received from</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>the CEs of the YLS Study and in commensurate with local circumstances, a diverse range of GIC facilities are proposed in the YLS Development, including clinic, markets, police station, fire station, post office, youth facilities, community hall, primary schools, RCHE, sports and recreation and other social facilities, etc., which will be implemented incrementally, with some of the facilities falling within the current amendment items.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) will continue to explore the scope to provide additional libraries, sports ground/sport complex and swimming pool within Yuen Long District as appropriate. Hospital services are assessed on a wider regional basis and can be partly addressed by the provision in adjoining areas. The HKPSG requirements for social welfare facilities are a long-term goal and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of relevant B/Ds in the planning and development process as appropriate, and as detailed design proceeds. PlanD and the Social Welfare Department (SWD) will also work closely to ensure that more community facilities can be included in new and redevelopment proposals from both public and private sectors in Yuen Long District. In this connection, the Notes of the OZP for the “R(A)3” zone (Item A3) has allowed due flexibility to disregard any floor space that is constructed or intended for use solely as GIC facilities as required by the Government when determining the maximum PR.</p>
	<p>(c) The YLS Development should adopt a per capita living space standard of 300 sq ft per person for public housing. The median family income should be used to evaluate the price of subsidised sales flats (SSF); while repayment limits/caps should be prescribed. The Government should also establish policies and measures to set a minimum living space per capita standard and to control house prices</p>	<p>(c) Living space standard and pricing of residential units are outside the scope of the subject OZP, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the area. Notwithstanding the above, there is a need for the Government to strike a reasonable balance between housing production and average living floor area per person, as both the increase in housing production to address needs for accommodation and the increase in average living floor area per person to improve living standard would require additional land. Priority is currently given to increasing housing production to meet the basic accommodation needs of the people. To this end, all housing sites in YLS Development Stages 1 and 2 (i.e. Item A3) are currently</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	at a reasonable level.	designated for public housing, with the exact tenure type to be determined by the relevant department(s) in due course. For the price of SSFs, it is subject to the pricing policy at that time.
	(d) The Government should assist in identifying suitable land to relocate farmland and affected livestock farms. No development should take place on the active farmland near Yeung Ka Tsuen (Plan H-6). The Government should also assist brownfield operators to relocate into MSBs.	(d) Responses (h) and (i) to R4 to R24 above on agricultural aspect, and (e) to R4 to R24 above on MSBs are relevant.
	(e) Compensation packages for affected stakeholders should be enhanced (such as increasing the domestic removal allowance to \$15,000 per person). The Government should render assistance to affected residential flat tenants. Early rehousing of affected residential care home occupants should be carried out.	(e) Response (a) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. While there is one residential care home for persons with disabilities (RCHD) and one residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) within the YLS DA, only the former falls within the amendment items. The subject RCHD, known as Joyful House (Rehabilitation Dormitory), falls within land zoned “R(A)3” (Item A3) and is currently operating with valid planning permission under planning application No. A/YL-TYST/967 (Plan H-3b). The operator is aware of the forthcoming YLS Development. Sufficient time would normally be allowed for the operators to prepare for necessary arrangements including those for the users. SWD would offer assistance to users if necessary. Moreover, four 100-place RCHEs have been proposed in the housing sites to be constructed in Stages 1 and 2 (i.e. Item A3), and a 40-place RCHD is proposed to be co-located with other GIC facilities in a GIC site under Stage 2 development (i.e. Item A1).
R71	Other Comments and Suggestions	
(individual)	<u>Major Comment(s)</u> (a) Aggrieved by the upcoming land resumption and demands “no removal”.	(a) Response (a) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) Land should be designated in Yuen Long for a rehousing estate to rehouse those residents and landowners affected by the YLS Development. The price of the rehousing flats should be equivalent to its construction cost. Associated restrictions and eligibility criteria should be relaxed and/or removed.</p>	<p>(b) Response (a) to R31 to R35 above is relevant. Moreover, pricing of residential units and restrictions/eligibility criteria for rehousing are outside the scope of the subject OZP, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the area.</p>
	<p>(c) The current C&R arrangement is inadequate and incomprehensive, it also neglects the private property rights of individual landowners. Reasonable compensation should be offered to all affected land and structures. Flexibility should be exercised to allow affected stakeholders to choose when to move out. Relevant officials should discuss with the affected stakeholders directly over the C&R arrangement for the YLS Development.</p>	<p>(c) Responses (a) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R72 to R75 (all local organisations)</p>	<p>Other Comments and Suggestions</p> <p><u>Major Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) All road works, including the entire proposed Road D1, should be advanced to Stage 1 works. All road works should be shown on the OZP (R74). The proposed Route 11 should connect with YLS Development (R72, R73, R75).</p>	<p>(a) Response (c) to R4 to R24 above is relevant. In general, major road junctions and alignment of major roads will be shown on the OZP as detailed planning/design are confirmed and whenever opportune. While some proposed road works would not be shown on the OZP, nevertheless, they are generally mentioned in the Explanatory Statement to the OZP and/or shown on the Revised RODP of the YLS Development. As for Route 11, the alignment of which is currently being investigated under separate study by the Highways Department (“Feasibility Study on Route 11 (between North</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		Lantau and Yuen Long)” (Route 11 Study)), and the public are being/will be consulted in due course.
	(b) The current C&R arrangement is inadequate and incomprehensive. Reasonable compensation should be provided to stakeholders, including affected squatters and tenants (R72, R75).	(b) Response (a) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.
	(c) Early dialogue and discussion should be forged regarding the land resumption boundary so as to avoid disputes at the implementation stage. (R72, R75)	(c) Response (f) to R59 to R64 above is relevant.
	(d) More “OS” land should be designated to accommodate those brownfield operations that cannot be relocated into MSBs, preferably within the same ‘Heung’. The future rent of the proposed MSBs (Item D1) should be made affordable. (R72)	(d) Response (e) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.
	(e) Development intensities should be suitably enhanced in the Remaining Stages. (R73)	(e) A number of strategic transport infrastructures are being studied and planned to support the developments in NWNT (Plan H-8). The substantive findings of these studies may shed light on whether the development potential within the YLS area, including the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development, could be further optimised to meet the acute demand for housing and other societal needs. To allow flexibility to adjust the scale of the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development, where appropriate, zoning amendment for Stages 1 and 2 of the YLS Development has been carried out, so as to meet the acute demand for housing and the

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/ YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>expected demand for MSB floorspace once clearance of brownfield land in YLS ensues. Subject to the substantive findings of the aforesaid strategic transport infrastructure studies, a further review would be carried out to explore the feasibility to further optimise the development intensities for the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development. Having regard to the outcome of the further review, further amendments to the OZPs would be carried out to effectuate the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development in due course.</p>
	(f) The proposed Road L27 and a “OU(MU)” site (including the PTI therein) to the south of Item A1 near Pak Sha Tsuen should be expedited to Stage 1 works and be included in the amendment. (R74)	(f) The subject site and road fall outside the amendment items, they are zoned “OU(MU)” and shown as ‘Road’ respectively on the Revised RODP (shown as ‘R74’ on Plan H-3c) within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development. Land within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development will be subject to further review in due course. Under the Revised RODP of YLS Development, the PTI originally proposed at the subject “OU(MU)” zone has been relocated to its opposite “G/IC(1)” zone (Item A1), which would be implemented in YLS Development Stage 2.
	(g) Planning applications should continued to be entertained during the interim. (R75)	(g) All planning applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) will be considered by the Board as per the provisions of the Ordinance.
R76 (also C138)	Other Comments and Suggestions	
(individual)	<u>Major Comment(s)</u>	
	(a) The proposed roads under Item D4 could be placed underground, thereby releasing space for more open space or recreation uses at-grade.	(a) The proposed roads under Item D4 need to match the existing road level and connect with the existing road networks (i.e. TYST Road and TSWWI), hence Item D4 could not be placed underground.
	(b) The extent of “V” zones, in particular the Government land therein, should be reviewed and the released land should be used for “V(1)”	(b) No “V” zones are affected by the amendment items and there are no “V” zones within the YLS DA. The boundaries of the “V” zones on the OZP are drawn up having regard to the existing village environs, the approved applications for Small House

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	or put to public use.	development, the number of outstanding Small House applications, the anticipated Small House demand for the next ten years, topography, site constraints and the provision of public services. Taking the aforesaid factors into account, it is considered appropriate to retain the “V” zones on the OZP.
	(c) Affected residential care home occupants should be rehoused in larger accommodations and the replacement site should be identified.	(c) Response (e) to R68 to R70 above is relevant.
	(d) The open space and GIC provision targets under Hong Kong 2030+ should be adopted; a higher GIC provision standard should be adopted instead of the minimum standard.	<p>(d) Response (b) to R68 to R70 above on GIC provision is relevant.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of open space, there is planned surplus in the provision of DOs (+36.5 ha) and LOs (+79.9 ha) in Yuen Long District. Moreover, the proposed DO and LO provision for both the YLS Development as a whole and for YLS Development Stages 1 and 2 alone (i.e. the subject of the current amendment) are more than the prevailing HKPSG requirement. Under the Revised RODP, about 15.5 ha and 13.2 ha of land have been designated as DO and LO respectively, which exceeds the prevailing standard under the HKPSG for a total population of about 101,200. In terms of the YLS Development Stages 1 and 2 alone (i.e. the subject of the current amendment items), about 7.5 ha of DO and 6.3 ha of LO will be provided, which also exceed the prevailing standards under the HKPSG for a new population of about 51,760. Besides, there is a planned surplus of DO in Yuen Long district, particularly adjacent to Yuen Long Highway in the proximity of TYST, which could serve the expected need.</p> <p>The current zoning amendments only cover Stages 1 and 2 of the YLS Development. Some of the shortfalls in GIC facilities and open spaces in the TYST planning scheme area (Annex VIII) could be met under the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development. Moreover, the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development would be subject to further review, upon which there may be scope to further enhance the provision of open spaces</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/ YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>and GIC facilities.</p> <p>(e) The population figure for YLS Development is underestimated.</p> <p>(e) The new population for YLS Development is estimated based on appropriate persons per flat (PPF) assumptions. Minor difference is expected during the detailed design stage. The estimated PPF that have been adopted under the YLS Study are 3.06 for public housing sites and 2.88 for private housing sites. The PPF for public housing sites is based on the recommendations of Housing Department; while the PPF for private housing sites is derived from the population in private permanent housing and the number of households in private permanent housing based on population census for Yuen Long District Council District.</p> <p>(f) The quality of the proposed “O” strip (Item D3) is questioned.</p> <p>(f) The “O” strip between the proposed MSB sites and the existing residential developments is intended to serve as buffer and recreational space for future and existing residents, as well as the workers. Active and passive uses of the space are expected, subject to detailed design by the LCSD in the future.</p>
R77	Other Comments and Suggestions	
(a company)	<p><u>Major Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) Aggrieved by the upcoming land resumption of Lots 1048 S.B RP and 1825 S.B in D.D. 121 as there are active plans to put the site to private residential use.</p>	<p>(a) The concerned lots fall outside the amendment items (shown as ‘R77’ on Plan H-4c) and within YLS Development Remaining Stages. Land within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development will be subject to further review in due course.</p>
R78	Other Comments and Suggestions	
(individual)	<p><u>Major Comment(s)</u></p> <p>(a) Questioned the adequacy/sufficiency of the proposed GIC facilities.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R68 to R70 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(b) The Government should not bundle development projects with transport infrastructure improvements. Road improvement works, such as at Kung Um Road and Kiu Hing Road, should be expedited to alleviate the traffic burden brought by the influx of new population under Item A3.	(b) Response (c) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.
	(c) A direct cycle track to Yuen Long Town should be provided.	(c) Responses (k) to R4 to R24 and (a) to R68 to R70 above are relevant.
R79 (individual)	Other Comments and Suggestions	
	<u>Major Comment(s)</u> (a) The value of local agriculture, local economies and brownfield operations should be recognised and be supported. Affected stakeholders should be appropriately compensated and rehoused, irrespective of their indigenous or non-IV status. “V” zones should be put to its intended use. There should be harmonious connection between the new development and existing communities.	(a) Responses (a) to R1 to R3 above on C&R aspect, (e) to R4 to R24 on brownfield operations, (g) to (i) to R4 to R24 on local economy/agricultural aspect, (d) to R51 on harmonious design, and (b) to R76 on “V” zone aspect are relevant.
	(b) Apart from housing, former brownfield land can also be used for open space, other community facilities or agricultural rehabilitation.	(b) Through comprehensive planning under the Revised RODP of YLS Study, about 100 ha of brownfield land in YLS will be transformed into a green and liveable community, contributing to the medium to long term housing supply of Hong Kong whilst supported by ample infrastructures, community facilities and open spaces. Under the zoning amendment to the Tai Tong OZP, some of the former brownfield land will be converted into designated GIC uses (Item A). Together with some supporting

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/13-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		infrastructures, such as the provision of comprehensive cycle paths and pedestrian walkways, and the preservation of natural landscapes and environment, such as the preservation of active farmland and the preservation of river streams with higher ecological value, a sustainable and liveable neighbourhood upon full development of YLS is envisioned.
	(c) The role of buses, minibuses and cycling should be elevated; cycling facilities should be improved in line with other world cities. The proposed EFTS should endeavour to complement the Light Rail system.	(c) Response (k) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.
	(d) More employment opportunities should be created to provide more choices for future residents.	(d) Response (a) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.

- (2) The 140 valid comments on representations were submitted by some of the representers themselves (**R1, R6, R26, R28, R30 to R32, R35, R47 to R50, R59, R66, R68 and R76**) and by other organisations/individuals.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/YL- TYST/13-)	Related Rep'	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
C1	Provides responses to R1 to R24, R26 to R36, R48 to R50, R59 to R63, R68 to R71	<p>(a) Opposed the YLS Development unless the C&R arrangement is reasonable and acceptable to affected stakeholders, including non-IVs and squatter residents. Various restrictions and eligibility criteria for C&R should be lifted/ relaxed for all affected residents. Option for village resite should be made available. The Government should proactively assist brownfield operators and farmers to relocate elsewhere.</p> <p>(b) Land should be designated within the YLS Development for public housing or designated HKHS rehousing estate to rehouse those affected by the development in-situ.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (a) to R1 to R3 and (b) to R26 to R30 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (a) to R31 to R35 above is relevant.</p>
C2, C3, C4 (also R32), C5, C6, C7 (also R49), C8 to C13, C14 (also R30), C15 to C17, C18 (also R59), C19 to C22, C23 (also R48), C24 to C30, C31 (also R35), C32 to C35, C36 (also	Support R1 to R24, R26 to R36, R48 to R50, R59 to R63, R68 to R71	<p>(a) Opposed the bundling of the YLS Development with transport infrastructure improvement works. Traffic improvement works should be expedited first before proceeding with planning further.</p> <p>(b) The proposed STW (Item E) should be developed in conjunction with YLS Development Stages 1 and 2 and be relocated closer to the Stages 1 and 2 developments. The siting of the proposed STW away from the rest of the Stages 1 and 2 developments is not well thought out. There are sensitive receivers in the vicinity of the proposed STW site and the proposed STW will generate environmental nuisance and cause ecological damage.</p> <p>(c) The C&R packages should be enhanced and its applicability be extended to cover all affected stakeholders and structures. Option for village resite should be made available. The pricing of the rehousing flats should be equivalent to its construction cost. Various restrictions and eligibility criteria for C&R should be lifted/ relaxed for all affected residents. The</p>	<p>(a) Response (c) to R4 to R24 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (n) to R4 to R24 and (a) to R26 to R30 above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (a) to R1 to R3, (b) to R26 to R30 and (b) to R71 above are relevant.</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/YL- TYST/13-)	Related Rep'	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
<p>R26), C37, C38 (also R1), C39 to C42, C43 (also R47), C44 to C50, C51 (also R6), C52 (also R50), C53 to C55, C56 (also R28), C57, C58 (also R31), C59 to C70</p>		<p>Special Ex-gratia Cash Allowance should be retained. Options for resettlement of operations should be made available.</p> <p>(d) Land should be designated within the YLS Development for HKHA public housing or designated HKHS rehousing estate to rehouse those affected by the development.</p> <p>(e) Opposed land resumption for low-density private development, such as at “<i>LOHAS Living</i>” planning area and TYST, which is unlawful. Even if land is resumed for public purpose, negotiation and dialogue should be forged with the landowners to reach a mutually agreeable outcome.</p> <p>(f) The Government should proactively coordinate the relocation of affected livestock farms and discuss with the trade. The rates of compensation and associated details for affected livestock farms should be made clear.</p> <p>(g) Relevant officials should discuss with the affected stakeholders directly over the C&R arrangement for the YLS Development.</p>	<p>(d) Response (a) to R31 to R35 above is relevant.</p> <p>(e) Response (e) to R26 to R30 above is relevant.</p> <p>(f) Responses (a) to R1 to R3 and (h) and (i) to R4 to R24 above are relevant.</p> <p>(g) Response (a) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.</p>
C71	Supports R66	<p>(a) The increased employment opportunities brought about by the proposed “I” land would enable villagers to work closer to their homes in Shan Ha, saving commuting time and costs in the process.</p>	<p>(a) Response (f) to R66 above is relevant. Moreover, Response (a) to R4 to R24 above on employment aspect is also relevant.</p>
C72	Opposes R66	<p>(a) The proposed industrial area is too close to the village of Shan Ha; environmental nuisance, pollution and traffic congestion are anticipated. Consideration may be given to rezone the area to the west of Long Hon Road near TYST instead.</p> <p>(b) The transportation needs of villagers should be recognised and be responded to.</p>	<p>(a) Response (f) to R66 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (c) to R4 to R24 above is relevant. The existing roads including Lam Tai West</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/YL- TYST/13-)	Related Rep'	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
		<p>(c) Generally agreed with the proposed village resite area to the west of Shan Ha (Item C), though the area should be extended to cover Lots 1536 and 1975 in D.D. 121 ('Shan Ha Small House site', Plans H-11a to H-11c) in order to honour the efforts and rights of IVs to build Small Houses thereon.</p> <p>(d) An emergency vehicular access should be provided at the fringes of Shan Ha "V" zone so as to reduce fire safety risks and improve traffic conditions.</p> <p>(e) A road should be constructed at Lots 1534, 1538 and 1539 in D.D. 121 (shown as 'C72' on Plan H-3c) to connect with Long Hon Road/Shan Ha Road.</p>	<p>Road and Long Hon Road located in the vicinity of Shan Ha will be widened under YLS Development. Moreover, new village access roads to Shan Ha have been planned (Drawing H-4).</p> <p>(c) Response (e) to R66 above is relevant.</p> <p>(d) According to the Revised RODP, new village access roads have been planned at the southern and eastern side of Shan Ha for connection with the road network of YLS Development (Drawing H-4).</p> <p>(e) Under YLS Development, a new road has been planned to connect the proposed village resite to Long Hon Road (Plan H-3c). The planned new road would be terminated at the boundary of YLS DA. Resumption of private land within the existing village would be required for extending the new road, which is considered undesirable.</p>
C73 to C133	Oppose R66	<p>(a) The proposed industrial area is too close to the village of Shan Ha, and could affect the living quality and health quality of villagers. Given the large vacancies in industrial areas and industrial buildings in Hong Kong, there is no strong justification for such uses in the area. Sufficient floor</p>	<p>(a) Response (f) to R66 above is relevant.</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/YL- TYST/13-)	Related Rep'	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
		<p>space has already been proposed in the MSBs to accommodate industrial operations.</p> <p>(b) Existing villagers have long suffered from the environmental and traffic impacts brought by the brownfield operations around Shan Ha. The perpetuation of these impacts from the proposed industrial area would be unfair on the villagers and would contradict the visions of a liveable YLS.</p> <p>(c) Consideration may be given to rezone the area to the west of Long Hon Road near TYST as industrial area; though the area to the south of Long Hon Road is not suitable for such purpose (C111 to C133).</p>	<p>(b) Response (f) to R66 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (f) to R66 above is relevant.</p>
C134 (also R66)	Provides responses to R66	<p>(a) Largely the same as R66.</p> <p>(b) The proposed roads straddling Lot 1504 in D.D. 121 (shown as 'C134' on Plan H-4c) should be deleted/realigned and be rezoned for "Residential" use.</p>	<p>(a) Responses to R66 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) The subject lot falls outside the amendment items and is currently mainly zoned "DO(1)" on the Revised RODP within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development. Land within the Remaining Stages of the YLS Development will be subject to further review in due course.</p>
C135 (also R68)	Nil	<p>(a) Same as R68.</p>	<p>(a) Responses to R68 to R70 above are relevant.</p>
C136 and C137	Nil	<p>(a) Opposed inclusion of Lots 2736 S.A, 2737 S.A, 2737 RP and 2738 in D.D. 119 (C136), and Lots 2734 S.A, 2734 S.B., 2734 S.C, 2734 RP in D.D. 119 (C137) in the proposed YLS Development (claimed to be within Item A5), as it would affect landowners' livelihood and property rights. Proposed to retain the subject area for open storage and warehouse uses.</p>	<p>(a) The subject lot numbers are erroneous and their location could not be confirmed.</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/YL- TYST/13-)	Related Rep'	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
C138 (also R76)	Nil	(a) Disagreed with a representer's suggestion that the extent of "O" should be reduced with open spaces placed on podium rooftops. Open spaces contribute to the health of the public and there are many benefits to keep open spaces at-grade.	(a) Response (b) to R25 above is relevant.
C139	Nil	(a) Opposed the zoning amendments unless various legislative, regulatory, policy, operational, compensatory and licensing issues raised by the agricultural trade are resolved, <i>inter alia</i> , relaxation of restrictions on agricultural structures and provision of free-of-charge services to affected farmers to help them relocate; relaxation of restrictions to relocate livestock farms; and expedite the implementation of "agricultural park", "APA" and special agricultural land rehabilitation scheme; and the Government should also help consolidate sporadic agricultural land.	(a) Responses (h) and (i) to R4 to R24 above are relevant.
C140	Nil	(a) Opposed the zoning amendments if public works are carried out within 200m of the ancient graves of Chung Uk Tsuen near Tan Kwai Tsuen.	(a) The subject ancient graves are located about 800m away from the nearest amendment item (Item D2) and the YLS DA (shown as 'C140' on Plan H-4a). No public works are proposed in the vicinity of the subject ancient graves as part of the YLS Development.

Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Yuen Long District

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
District Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#]	106.06 ha	30.18 ha	142.51 ha	+36.45 ha
Local Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#]	106.06 ha	104.42 ha	185.91 ha	+79.85 ha
Secondary School	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17	1,237 classrooms	1,160 classrooms	1,550 classrooms	+313 classrooms
Primary School	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11	1,779 classrooms	1,289 classrooms	2,159 classrooms	+380 classrooms
Kindergarten/ Nursery	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to under 6	682 classrooms	473 classrooms	696 classrooms	+14 classrooms
District Police Station	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons	2	1	2	0
Divisional Police Station	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons	5	4	5	0
Hospital	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons [^]	5,963 beds	1,095 beds	3,695 beds	-2,268 beds
Clinic/Health Centre	1 per 100,000 persons	10	5	11	+1
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms)	1 per 660,000 persons	1	0	1	0
Child Care Centre	100 aided places per 25,000 persons ^{#@}	4,242 places	430 places	1,118 places	-3,124 places
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 [#]	15	11	16	+1
Integrated Family Services Centre	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons [#]	7	6	10	+3
District Elderly Community Centres (DECC)	One in each new development area with a population of around 170,000 or above [#]	1	2	3	+2

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Neighbourhood Elderly Centres (NEC)	One in a cluster of new and redeveloped housing areas with a population of 15,000 to 20,000 persons, including both public and private housing [#]	N.A.	8	12	N.A.
Community Care Services (CCS) Facilities	17.2 subsidised places per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above ^{**@}	4,274 places	749 places	1,269 places	-3,005 places
Residential Care Homes for the Elderly	21.3 subsidised beds per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above ^{#@}	5,293 beds	1,801 beds	3,161 beds	-2,132 beds
Library	1 district library for every 200,000 persons	5	3	3	-2
Sports Centre	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons [#]	16	8	16	0
Sports Ground/ Sport Complex	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons [#]	4	2	3	-1
Swimming Pool Complex – standard	1 complex per 287,000 persons [#]	3	1	2	-1

Notes:

1. The planned resident population in Yuen Long District is about 1,060,600. If including transients, the overall planned population is about 1,084,300.
2. Provision of DECC is only applicable for new development area with 170,000 persons or above. As such, only the Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area is applicable within Yuen Long District.
3. Provision of NEC is only applicable for clusters of new and redeveloped housing areas with 15,000 to 20,000 persons.

[#] The requirements exclude planned population of transients.

[^] The provision of hospital beds would be monitored and assessed by the Hospital Authority on a regional basis.

^{*} Consisting of 40% centre-based CCS and 60% home-based CCS.

[@] This is a long-term goal and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department (SWD) in the planning and development process as appropriate. The Planning Department and SWD will work closely together to ensure that additional social welfare facilities will be included in new and redevelopment proposals from both public and private sectors.

MARCH 2021

Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Tong Yan San Tsuen Area

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
District Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#]	11.38 ha	0 ha	5.57 ha	-5.81 ha
Local Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#]	11.38 ha	3.46 ha	14.78 ha	+3.40 ha
Secondary School	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17	103 classrooms	60 classrooms	60 classrooms	-43 classrooms
Primary School	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11	190 classrooms	16 classrooms	196 classrooms	+6 classrooms
Kindergarten/ Nursery	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to under 6	108 classrooms	10 classrooms	96 classrooms	-12 classrooms
District Police Station	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons	0	0	0	0
Divisional Police Station	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons	0	0	0	0
Hospital	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons [^]	636 beds	0 bed	0 bed	-636 beds
Clinic/Health Centre	1 per 100,000 persons	1	0	1	0
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms)	1 per 660,000 persons	0	0	0	0
Child Care Centre	100 aided places per 25,000 persons ^{#@}	455 places	0 place	200 places	-255 places
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 [#]	1	0	2	+1
Integrated Family Services Centre	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons [#]	0	0	1	+1
District Elderly Community Centres (DECC)	One in each new development area with a population of around 170,000 or above [#]	N.A.	0	0	N.A.

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Neighbourhood Elderly Centres (NEC)	One in a cluster of new and redeveloped housing areas with a population of 15,000 to 20,000 persons, including both public and private housing [#]	5	0	4	-1
Community Care Services (CCS) Facilities	17.2 subsidised places per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above ^{##@}	237 places	14 places	414 places	+177 places
Residential Care Homes for the Elderly	21.3 subsidised beds per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above ^{##@}	294 beds	0 bed	520 beds	+226 beds
Library	1 district library for every 200,000 persons	0	0	0	0
Sports Centre	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons [#]	1	0	1	0
Sports Ground/ Sport Complex	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons [#]	0	0	0	0
Swimming Pool Complex – standard	1 complex per 287,000 persons [#]	0	0	0	0

Notes:

1. The planned resident population in Tong Yan San Tsuen is about 113,800. If including transients, the overall planned population is about 115,800.
2. The 4 nos. of planned primary schools in Yuen Long South (YLS) Development Stage 2 within the Tai Tong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) have been included in the planned provision herein as they are intended to serve the new residential cluster within Tong Yan San Tsuen OZP.
3. Provision of DECC is only applicable for new development area with 170,000 persons or above. As the planned population of YLS Development is about 101,200, the requirement is not applicable.
4. Provision of NEC is only applicable for clusters of new and redeveloped housing areas with 15,000 to 20,000 persons.

[#] The requirements exclude planned population of transients.

[^] The provision of hospital beds would be monitored and assessed by the Hospital Authority on a regional basis.

^{*} Consisting of 40% centre-based CCS and 60% home-based CCS.

[@] This is a long-term goal and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department (SWD) in the planning and development process as appropriate. The Planning Department and SWD will work closely together to ensure that additional social welfare facilities will be included in new and redevelopment proposals from both public and private sectors.