

**DRAFT MA ON SHAN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/MOS/23
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. R1 TO R5699
AND COMMENTS NO. C1 TO C1587**

Subject of Representation/ Representation Site	Representers	Commenters
<p><u>Amendment Item (Item) A:</u> Rezoning of a site to the east of Cheung Muk Tau Village from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Residential (Group A)11” (“R(A)11”) with stipulation of building height (BH) restriction.</p> <p><u>Item B1:</u> Rezoning of a site to the west of Cheung Muk Tau Village from “GB” to “R(A)11” with stipulation of BH restriction.</p> <p><u>Item B2:</u> Rezoning of a strip of land abutting Ma On Shan Bypass and to the further west of Cheung Muk Tau Village from “GB” to an area shown as ‘Road’.</p> <p><u>Item C:</u> Rezoning of a site at the lower and northern end of Ma On Shan Tsuen Road (MOST Road) from “GB” to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) with stipulation of BH restriction.</p> <p><u>Item D:</u> Rezoning of a site at the lower end and on the eastern side of MOST Road from “GB” to “R(A)11” with stipulation of</p>	<p><u>Total: 5,699</u></p> <p><u>Support all or individual items (46):</u> R1 to R38, R2674, R2675, R2686 to R2688, R2742, R2775 and R2787: Individual</p> <p><u>Object to and also Support Individual Items (4)</u> R39 to R42: Individuals</p> <p><u>Oppose all or individual items (5,645):</u></p> <p><i>Members of Sha Tin District Council (STDC) (17)</i> R56: 沙田區政、沙田區議員 (with signatures of 14 STDC Members)</p> <p>R57: 李永成 (with 624 signatures)</p> <p>R58: 容溟舟</p> <p>R59: 石威廉</p> <p>R60: 黎梓恩</p> <p>R61: 丁仕元 (ex-Member)</p> <p>R62: 趙柱幫</p> <p>R63: 陳運通</p>	<p><u>Total: 1,587</u></p> <p><u>Support all items (1)</u> C1: Individual</p> <p><u>Object to and also Support Individual Items and Providing Views (1)</u> C2: Individual</p> <p><u>Oppose all or individual Items (1,584)</u></p> <p><i>Members of Sha Tin District Council (STDC)(4)</i> C7 (also R71): 鍾禮謙</p> <p>C8 (also R64): Chan Pui Ming</p> <p>C9 (also R58): Yung Ming Chau</p> <p>C10 (also R72): 吳錦雄</p> <p><i>Members of Sai Kung District Council (1)</i> C11 (also R75): Leung Hin Yan</p> <p><i>Green Groups or Individuals (6)</i> C3 (also R47): Hong Kong Bird Watching Society</p> <p>C4 (also R48): Designing Hong Kong Limited</p>

Subject of Representation/ Representation Site	Representers	Commenters
<p>BH restriction.</p> <p><u>Item E:</u> Rezoning of a site at the lower end and on the western side of MOST Road from “GB” to “G/IC” with stipulation of BH restriction.</p> <p><u>Item F:</u> Rezoning of a site at the upper end and on the eastern side of MOST Road from “GB” to “G/IC” with stipulation of BH restriction.</p> <p><u>Item G:</u> Rezoning of a site at the upper end and on the western side of MOST Road from “GB” to “Residential (Group B)6” (“R(B)6”) with stipulation of BH restriction.</p> <p><u>Item H:</u> Rezoning of a site near Chevalier Garden from “GB” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sewage Treatment Works” (“OU(STW)”).</p>	<p>R64: 陳珮明</p> <p>R65: Liao Pak Hong Ricardo</p> <p>R66: 麥潤培</p> <p>R67: 冼卓嵐</p> <p>R68: 鄭仲恒</p> <p>R69: 周曉嵐</p> <p>R70: 曾素麗</p> <p>R71: 鍾禮謙</p> <p>R72: 吳錦雄</p> <p><u>Members of Tai Po District Council (TPDC) (1)</u></p> <p>R73: 譚爾培 (with 42 signatures)</p> <p><u>Political Parties and Members of Other District Councils (7)</u></p> <p>R53: 民建聯沙田支部</p> <p>R54: 民主黨沙田黨團 (with 132 signatures)</p> <p>R55: 新民主同盟</p> <p>R74: 呂文光</p> <p>R75: 梁衍忻</p> <p>R76: Chan Ka Lam</p> <p>R77: 楊雪盈</p>	<p>C5 (also R49): The Conservancy Association</p> <p>C6 (also R51): Green Sense</p> <p>C15 (also R93): NISSIM, Roger Anthony</p> <p>C16 (also R92): Mary Mulvihill</p> <p><u>Concern Groups (3)</u></p> <p>C12 (also R84): 馬鞍山村關注組</p> <p>C13 (also R88): ELCHK, Grace Youth Camp</p> <p>C14: TourisMan.hk</p> <p><u>Individuals (1,570 with 110 of them are also representers)</u></p> <p>C17 to C1586: individual</p> <p><u>No clear indication of views (1)</u></p> <p>C1587: individual</p>

Subject of Representation/ Representation Site	Representers	Commenters
	<p><i>Green Groups or Individuals</i> (15)</p> <p>R43: Association for Geoconservation, Hong Kong</p> <p>R44: Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden</p> <p>R45: 香港野生雀鳥保育關注組</p> <p>R46: World Wide Fund For Nature Hong Kong</p> <p>R47: Hong Kong Bird Watching Society</p> <p>R48: Designing Hong Kong Limited</p> <p>R49: The Conservancy Association</p> <p>R50: 綠惜地球</p> <p>R51: Green Sense</p> <p>R52: Centre for Community and Place Governance, Institute of Future Cities, CUHK</p> <p>R92: Mary Mulvihill</p> <p>R93: Roger Anthony Nissim</p> <p>R94: Ruy Barretto S.C.</p> <p>R1640: Greeners Action</p> <p>R2465: Chu Kong (Green Peace)</p>	

Subject of Representation/ Representation Site	Representers	Commenters
	<p><u><i>Incorporated Owners (4)</i></u> R78: 嘉華星濤灣業主立案法團 R79: 凱琴居業主立案法團 R80: 帝琴灣凱琴居民綠化關注組 R1670: The Incorporated Owners of Villa Oceania <u><i>Village Affairs Committee and Village Representatives of Cheung Muk Tau Village and Ma On Shan Mutual Aid Committee (4)</i></u> R81: Hau Lap Fai R82: 廖歡真 R83: Cheung Muk Tau Village Affairs Committee R89: Ma On Shan Mutual Aid Committee <u><i>Concern Groups (6)</i></u> R84: 馬鞍山村關注組 (with 1,612 signatures) R85: 守護馬鞍山智庫 (with 118 signatures) R86: 沙田交通關注組 R87: 馬鞍山交通關注組 R88: 基督教香港信義會恩青營(鞍山探索館) R91: 馬鞍山民康促進會 <u><i>Individuals/Companies (5,591)</i></u> R95 to R1639, R1641 to R1669, R1671 to R2464,</p>	

Subject of Representation/ Representation Site	Representers	Commenters
	<p>R2466 to R2673, R2676 to R2685, R2689 to R2741, R2743 to R2774, R2776 to R2786 and R2788 to R5696</p> <p><u>Providing Views (4)</u> R90: 馬鞍山單車會</p> <p>R5697: 香港中華煤氣有限公司 Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd.</p> <p>R5698 and R5699: Individual</p>	

Note: The names of all representers and commenters are attached at **Annexes III and IV**. Soft copy of their submissions is sent to the Town Planning Board (the Board) Members via electronic means, and is also available for public inspection at the Board's website at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/Website_S_MOS_23_ENG.html. A set of hard copy is deposited at the Board's Secretariat for Members' inspection; and is also available for public inspection at the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department (PlanD) in North Point and Sha Tin.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 On 16.10.2020, the draft Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/23 (the draft OZP) (**Annex I**) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments is at **Annex II** and the locations of the amendment items are shown on **Plans H-1a to H-1c**.
- 1.2 During the two-month statutory exhibition period, a total of 5,699 valid representations were received. On 29.1.2021, the representations were published for 3 weeks for public comments. Upon expiry of the three-week exhibition period, a total of 1,587 valid comments on the representations were received¹.
- 1.3 On 23.4.2021, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to consider all the representations and comments collectively in one group.

¹ A total of 7,658 representations were received during the two-month statutory exhibition period and two representations were received outside the statutory exhibition period. A total of 1,713 comments on representation were received during the 3-week public inspection period and one comment was received after this public inspection period. On 23.4.2021, the Board agreed to disregard 1,959 representations with the required identity information missing and 2 out-of-time representations pursuant to sections 6(2) and 6(3) of the Ordinance and 126 comments with the required identity information missing and one out-of-time comment pursuant to sections 6A(2) and 6A(3) of the Ordinance. As a result, the total valid representations and comments on representation are 5,699 and 1,587 respectively. For the 1,587 valid public comments, it is noted that 123 of them are also submitted by representers.

- 1.4 This Paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations and comments. A summary of the representations and comments with responses are attached at **Annexes Va and Vb**. The representation sites are shown on **Plans H-1a to H-1c**, **Plan H-2a to H-2d** and **H-3a to H-3d**. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

2. **BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The 2020 Policy Address has reaffirmed the importance to meet Hong Kong people's housing needs, and pointed out that the core of the housing problem in Hong Kong lies in the shortage of land for housing development. The Government will continue to adopt a multi-pronged land supply strategy as recommended by the Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS) following an extensive public engagement. Whilst the Government will press ahead with the eight land supply options worthy of priority study and implementation as recommended by the TFLS, concurrently, the Government still have to continue with the various ongoing land supply initiatives to increase and expedite housing land supply in the short-to-medium term. Amongst others, various land use reviews are conducted on an on-going basis, including reviews on "GB" sites.
- 2.2 To meet the pressing need, seven "GB" sites in Ma On Shan New Town have been identified for development of housing and associated supporting Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities. They comprise two sites near Cheung Muk Tau Village for public housing development (Items A and B1 on **Plans H-1a, H-2a, H-3a and H-4a**), one site at the lower part of MOST Road for public housing (Item D) and one site at the upper part of MOST Road for private housing (Item G), as well as three other sites along MOST Road for a water pumping station (Item C), a primary school (Item E) and service reservoirs (Item F) (**Plans H-1b, H-2b and H-2c, H-3b and H-3c and H-4b to H-4d**). Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) on these sites with technical assessments on the potential traffic, infrastructural, environmental, landscape, heritage, geotechnical, drainage, sewerage, waterworks, visual and air ventilation impacts etc. has been conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The EFS has concluded that there is no insurmountable technical problem for the proposed housing developments and their associated infrastructural and facilities with the adoption of appropriate mitigation measures. It is estimated that the proposed housing developments would provide a total of about 6,180 public housing units and 1,040 private housing units to accommodate about 20,430 people.
- 2.3 In connection with the above proposed amendments, opportunity has also been taken to rezone a strip of land near Cheung Muk Tau Village from "GB" to an area shown as 'Road' to reflect the existing situation (Item B2 on **Plans H-1a, H-2a, H-3a and H-4a**), and to rationalize the development boundary of the Sha Tin Cavern Sewage Treatment Works (STCSTW) by rezoning a strip of land along Mui Tsz Lam Road near Chevalier Garden from "GB" to "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Sewage Treatment Works" (Item H on **Plans H-1c, H-2d, H-3d and H-4e**).
- 2.4 On 21.8.2020 and 18.9.2020, the RNTPC considered the proposed amendments to the approved Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/22 (approved OZP) and agreed

that the proposed amendments were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance for public inspection. The relevant RNTPC Papers are available at the Board's website (RNTPC Paper No. 4/20 – https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/papers/RNTPC/652-rntpc_4-20.pdf ; RNTPC Paper No. 6/20 – Main Paper: https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/papers/RNTPC/656-rntpc_6-20.pdf ; Appendix: https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/papers/RNTPC/656-rntpc_6-20_appendix.pdf) and the minutes of the said RNTPC meetings is at **Annexes VIa** and **VIb**.

3. LOCAL CONSULTATION

- 3.1 Prior to the submission of the proposed amendments to the approved OZP for consideration by the RNTPC, CEDD and PlanD jointly consulted the Sai Kung North Rural Committee (SKNRC) on 23.6.2020, the Development and Housing Committee (DHC) of the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) on 30.6.2020 and 3.7.2020, and the Planning, Housing and Works Committee (PHWC) of the Tai Po District Council (TPDC) on 14.7.2020 on the findings of the EFS and the proposed amendments to the approved OZP. At the request of a STDC member, a meeting with the representatives of Ma On Shan Tsuen was held on 13.7.2020. The SKNRC, DHC of STDC, PHWC of TPDC and representatives of Ma On Shan Tsuen all expressed objection to the proposed amendments. The DHC of STDC passed a motion unanimously objecting the Amendment Items C to G, and passed another motion unanimously urging the TPDC to reject the proposed amendments Items A and B1. The PHWC of TPDC also passed a motion objecting Amendment Items A and B1. The major concerns raised by members of SKNRC, DHC of STDC, PHWC of TPDC and representatives of Ma On Shan Tsuen are: (i) the proposed developments are not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone; (ii) insufficient GIC, recreational and parking facilities; (iii) the existing transport network in Ma On Shan is already saturated and cannot be addressed by the proposed traffic improvement measures; (iv) landscape and ecological impacts on the Ma On Shan Country Park and Ma On Shan Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); (v) impact on the historical structures, culture and integrity of the Ma On Shan Iron Mine; (vi) adverse visual and air ventilation impacts. Views and comments received had been incorporated into the RNTPC Paper No. 4/20 for the proposed amendments to the approved OZP. In response to the motions passed by DHC of STDC and PHWC of TPDC, DEVB issued a letter on 17.8.2020 to each of the Committees explaining the Government's stand and addressing their concerns.
- 3.2 Upon gazettal of the draft OZP, PlanD, CEDD, HD and Lands Department (LandsD) were invited to attend an exchange session co-organised by Sha Tin District Office (STDO) and Ma On Shan South Area Committee (MOSSAC) on 10.11.2020, which was also attended by villagers of Ma On Shan Tsuen and some STDC members. The attendees provided various comments raising grave concerns and objections against the proposed amendments, in particular the amendment items along Ma On Shan Tsuen Road. A summary of the comments received at the exchange session was attached in **Annex VII** for reference. The grounds of objection are similar to the representations submitted during the plan exhibition period, including (i) the rezoning of the “GB” sites for high-density housing developments adjacent to Ma On Shan Country Park and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is not in line with the recommendation of Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS); (ii) inadequate community facilities to accommodate the increase in population; (iii) traffic impact on the roads and transport network; (iv)

noise disturbance, air quality and visual impacts on the villagers; (v) impacts on the heritage of former Ma On Shan Iron Mine; (vi) land clearance at Site G will impact the social fabric and the way of living of the villagers, and there is a lack of details on extent of clearance and compensation; and (vii) collusion to facilitate the private development at the upper end of MOST Road by enhancing the MOST Road and provision of supporting facilities. The major concerns raised in the representations and Government departments' responses are detailed in para. 5.2 below.

4. THE REPRESENTATION SITES AND THEIR SURROUNDING AREAS

4.1 The Representation Sites and their Surrounding Areas

4.1.1 The representation sites in relation to the proposed housing developments and associated G/IC facilities are broadly clustered in two separate areas, respectively at the northern part of the draft OZP near Cheung Muk Tau Village (Items A and B1) and at the central part of the draft OZP along MOST Road (Items C to G). The remaining two representation sites in relation to the technical amendments, namely Items B2 and H, are located adjacent to Site B1 at the northern part of the draft OZP and along Mui Tsz Lam Road near Chevalier Garden at the southern part of the draft OZP.

Representation Sites under Items A and B1 near Cheung Muk Tau Village

Site A: East of the Cheung Muk Tau Village (Plans H-1a, H-2a, H-3a and H-4a)

4.1.2 Item A (about 1.46 hectare (ha)), on government land, is located to the east of Cheung Muk Tau Village and the south of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody (with a BH restriction of 55 mPD). It is relatively flat with site levels ranging between 30 mPD and 40 mPD without any encroachment onto the 'village environs' ('VE') of the Cheung Muk Tau Village and the Permitted Burial Ground No. TP/SKN1. It is mainly covered with vegetation and there are 10 graves and six clusters with a total of 23 Kam Taps (i.e. urns) (subject to comprehensive grave/urn survey). Part of the site is currently covered by two Government Land Licenses (GLLs) for the purposes of orchard and unimproved grazing, grass cutting and growing of pine trees. A stream is running through the southeastern portion of the site. It falls within the consultation zone of the Ma On Shan Water Treatment Works (MOSWTW).

Site B1: West of the Cheung Muk Tau Village (Plans H-1a, H-2a, H-3a and H-4a)

4.1.3 Item B1 (about 1.38 ha), comprising government land and about 565m² of private lot, is located to the west of Cheung Muk Tau Village and about 140m to the west of Site A, and bounded by Sai Sha Road and Ma On Shan Bypass in the north and west. It is currently accessible by a village track. The sloping ground is covered with vegetation, and ascends from about 20 mPD in the north to about 40 mPD in the south. Same as Site A, Site B will not affect the 'VE' of the Cheung Muk Tau Village and the Permitted Burial Ground No. TP/SKN1. The eastern portion of the site falls within the consultation zone of the MOSWTW.

4.1.4 To the west of Site B1 across Sai Sha Road and Ma On Shan Bypass are MTR Wu Kai Sha Station, Lake Silver (with a BH restriction of 185 mPD) and Monte Vista (with a BH restriction of 130 mPD). To the northwest of Site B1 across Sai Sha Road is Double Cove (primarily with a stepped BH restrictions of 130mPD, 120mPD and 105mPD). To the north of Sites A and B1 across Sai Sha Road are The Entrance (with a BH restriction of 95 mPD) and Symphony Bay Villa Concerto (with a BH restriction of 36 mPD), with Li Po Chun United World College (with a BH restriction of 42 mPD) and Cheung Muk Tau Holiday Centre for the Elderly (with a BH restriction of 32 mPD) located further towards the waterfront across Nin Wah Road. Across Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody, Sai O Village and Hong Kong Baptist Theological Seminary (with a BH restriction of 6 storeys) are located to the northeast of Site A along Sai Sha Road.

Proposed Housing Developments at Sites A and B1

4.1.5 Sites A and B1 are zoned “R(A)11” for proposed public housing developments. The major development parameters are as follows and the conceptual layout plans of the proposed housing development are at **Annex VIIIa**:

	Site A	Site B1
Site Area	1.46 ha	1.38 ha
Maximum Plot Ratio (PR)	6.8 ⁽²⁾	
Maximum BH	165 mPD	165 mPD
Estimated No. of Flats (Estimated Population)	1,820 (5,100)	1,660 (4,650)
Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social Welfare Facilities⁽³⁾ - Retail Facilities - Kindergarten (for Site B1 only) 	
Parking Facilities	- To be provided with reference to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	

4.1.6 To support the proposed public housing developments at Sites A and B1, a 7.3m wide single 2-lane carriageway with 2.75m wide footpath on both sides and a roundabout at the end of the new road is proposed as the access from Nin Fung Road. On-street bus lay-bys are proposed for bus routes serving the public housing Sites A and B1 (**Annex VIIIa**). About 2,308m² of private land is proposed to be acquired for the associated infrastructural works of Sites A and B1.

² The maximum PR 6.8 includes domestic PR 6.5 and non-domestic PR 0.3). GIC facilities proposed within the public housing sites in the “R(A)11” zone were assumed to be exempted from plot ratio calculation and were included as part of the technical assessment.

³ Provision of social welfare facilities may be adjusted subject to the advice from the Social Welfare Department and Housing Department at detailed design stage.

Representation Sites under Items C to G along MOST Road

Sites C to E: Lower Part of MOST Road (Plans H-1b, H-2b, H-3b, H-4b and H-4c)

- 4.1.7 Site C (about 0.45 ha), on government land, is located at the lower part of MOST Road. Partly covered with vegetation, the site straddles over MOST Road and man-made slopes. It is situated next to the Ma On Shan Fresh Water and Salt Water Service Reservoirs.
- 4.1.8 Site D (about 2.26 ha), on government land, is located at the lower part of MOST Road. It is a green sloping ground covered with vegetation. The site levels range from 70 mPD to 100 mPD descending towards the northwest. A stream is running through the northeastern portion of the site. A fresh water pump house and about 3 temporary structures are found within the site.
- 4.1.9 Site E (about 0.73 ha), on government land, is located at the lower part of MOST Road. It is mainly covered with vegetation on a sloping ground. Site D is located to its immediate northeast across MOST Road.
- 4.1.10 Shun Yee San Tsuen consisting of Site Structures at Mining Settlement of former Ma On Shan Iron Mine (Grade 3 historic buildings) is located between Site C and Site D. The Mineral Preparation Plant (Grade 3 historic buildings) and the Exterior Walls of 110ML (Grade 2 historic buildings) of former Ma On Shan Iron Mine are located to the southwest and southeast of Site E respectively. Ma On Shan Country Park is located about 30m to 50m to the southeast of Sites C to E. Other residential developments including Yiu On Estate (with a BH restriction of 120 mPD), Park Belvedere (with a BH restriction of 130 mPD) and Kam Ying Court (with a BH restriction of 150 mPD) are located downhill at the opposite side of Ma On Shan Bypass to the northwest of Sites C to E.

Sites F and G: Upper Part of MOST Road (Plans H-1b, H-2c, H-3c and H-4d)

- 4.1.11 Item F (about 0.66 ha), on government land, is located at the upper part of MOST Road. It is covered with vegetation and about 3 temporary structures are found within the site. Ma On Shan Country Park is located to its immediate east.
- 4.1.12 Item G (about 2.73 ha), on government land, is located at the upper part of MOST Road, with Site F located to its immediate northeast across MOST Road. It is generally covered with vegetation and dotted with about 49 temporary structures/buildings (including about 37 licensed structures on five GLLs). There are streams running through the site. Elongated in shape, the site levels ranges from 140mPD to 190mPD from north to south of the site. It is about 10m from Ma On Shan Country Park on its northeast across MOST Road.
- 4.1.13 Sites F and G are located to the southeast of Ma On Shan Bypass overlooking Yiu On Estate (with a BH restriction of 120 mPD), Heng On Estate (with a BH restriction of 120 mPD) and Yan On Estate (with a BH restriction of 140 mPD).

Proposed Housing Developments at Sites D and G

4.1.14 Site D is zoned “R(A)11” for proposed public housing development, whereas Site G is zoned “R(B)6” for proposed private housing development. The major development parameters are as follows and the conceptual layout plans of the proposed public and private housing development are at **Annex VIIIb**:

	Site D	Site G
Site Area	2.26 ha	2.73 ha
Maximum PR	6.8 ⁽²⁾	3.6
Maximum BH	225 mPD	250 mPD
Estimated No. of Flats (Estimated Population)	2,700 (7,560)	1,040 (3,120)
Facilities	- Social Welfare Facilities ⁽³⁾ - Kindergarten - Retail Facilities	- Residential Care Home for the Elderly
Parking Facilities	- To be provided with reference to the HKPSG	

4.1.15 To support the proposed public housing and private housing developments at Sites D and G, the existing MOST Road is proposed to be re-aligned and upgraded to a 7.9m/7.3m wide single 2-lanes carriageway with 2.75m/2.0m wide footpath on both sides up to Site G. At the end of the new road, a cul-de-sac is proposed (**Annex VIIIb**). According to the preliminary design for the proposed upgrading works of MOST Road, although a pier (支柱)(part of the Mineral Preparation Plant (Grade 3 historic buildings)) may be affected (**Plan H-5**), effort will be made by CEDD to minimize the adverse impacts on it as far as practicable at the detailed design stage.

Proposed Supporting G/IC Facilities at Sites C, E and F

4.1.16 Site C is zoned “G/IC” for a proposed fresh water and salt water pumping station to provide sufficient feed to the proposed service reservoirs at Site F supporting the proposed housing developments. To meet the operation and maintenance requirements, the pumping station is restricted to a maximum BH of 1 storey to house the pump sets, and the numerous installations, facilities and maintenance access at the outdoor area.

4.1.17 Site E is zoned “G/IC” for a proposed 30-classroom primary school with a maximum BH of 8 storeys to support the proposed housing developments.

4.1.18 Site F is zoned “G/IC” for a proposed fresh water service reservoir and a proposed salt water service reservoir (each of 1 storey with a small penthouse, maintenance access and air vents on the roof to meet the operation and maintenance requirements) in order to meet the requirement of the minimum residual head to serve the proposed housing developments. The proposed maximum BH is 2 storeys.

Representation Sites under the Technical Amendment Item B2 and H

- 4.1.19 Site B2 (about 0.4 ha), located to the immediate west of Site B1, falls within an area shown as 'Road', which reflects the existing as-built condition (**Plans H-1a, H-2a, H-3a and H-4a**). It is on government land with a footpath and roadside amenities along Ma On Shan Bypass.
- 4.1.20 Site H (about 0.49 ha), located along Mui Tsz Lam Road near Chevalier Garden, forms part of an integral part of the STCSTW (**Plans H-1c, H-2d, H-3d and H-4e**). It is also on government land and is currently used by the Drainage Services Department (DSD) as a works site and works area. An Environmental Permit (EP) was granted by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) for the construction and operation of the STCSTW Project in 2017. The site is rezoned from "GB" to "OU(STW)" for rationalizing the whole development boundary of the STCSTW. The rezoning procedure for the remaining 98% of the STCSTW site falling on area covered by the Sha Tin OZP had been completed in 2018. With funding approval obtained in 2018, the Stage 1 works on site preparation and access tunnel construction for the relocation of Sha Tin Sewage Treatment Works (STSTW) to cavern at A Kung Kok is in progress. The target completion date for the STCSTW is 2031.

4.2 Planning Intentions

- (a) All the amendment items were previously zoned "GB" for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within the "GB" zone.
- (b) The "R(A)11" zone under Items A, B1 and D is intended primarily for high-density residential developments. Commercial uses are always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building.
- (c) The "R(B)6" zone under Item G is intended primarily for medium-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Town Planning Board.
- (d) The "G/IC" zone under Items C, E and F is intended primarily for the provision of Government, institution or community facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organizations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.
- (e) Item B2 is rezoned to area shown as 'Road' to reflect the as-built condition of the site (currently occupied by footpath and roadside amenities) forming part of the Ma On Shan Bypass.
- (f) The "OU(STW)" zone under Item H is intended primarily for the provision of sewage treatment/screening plant.

5. THE REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 Subject of Representations

5.1.1 There are a total of 5,699 representations. Amongst them, 46 representations are supportive in nature, 5,649 adverse representations (including 4 representations opposing individual items but at the same time also support other items) and 4 representations providing views.

Representer	No.
<i>Support All Amendment Items / the OZP</i>	
Individuals (R1 and R2)	2
<i>Support Individual Item(s)</i>	
Individuals (R3 to R38 , R2674 , R2675 , R2686 to 2688 , R2742 , R2775 , R2787)	44
<i>Object to and also Support Individual Item(s)</i>	
Individuals (R39 to R42)	4
<i>Object to All Amendment Items / the OZP (1,308)</i>	
STDC members (R56 to R63)	8
Political parties and members of other District Councils (R55 , R74 and R76)	3
Green group (R1640)	1
Incorporated owners (R78 and R1670)	2
Concern group (R84 , R86 and R87)	3
Individuals/Companies	1,291
<i>Object to Individual Item(s) (4,337)</i>	
STDC member (R64 to R72)	9
TPDC member (R73)	1
Political parties and members of other District Councils (R53 , R54 , R75 and R77)	4
Green groups or individuals (R43 to R52 , R92 to R94 and R2465)	14
Incorporated owners or residents' association (R79 and R80)	2
Village Affairs Committee and Village Representatives of Cheung Muk Tau Village and Ma On Shan Mutual Aid Committee (R81 to R83 and R89)	4
Concern groups (R85 , R88 and R91)	3
Individuals/Companies	4,300
<i>Providing Views (4)</i>	
The Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd. (R5697)	1
Concern group (R90)	1
Individuals (R5698 and R5699)	2

- 5.1.2 Among the 5,649 adverse representations, 4,418 of them were submitted in different types of standard formats. All the 5,699 representations received are related to all or part(s) of the Items A, B1 and C to G for housing developments and the supporting infrastructure and facilities. Amongst them, 1,415 representations are also related to Item B2, while 1,324 representations are also related to Item H.
- 5.1.3 A detailed summary of grounds and proposals of representations and Government departments' responses to the representations is attached at **Annex Va**. Major grounds, proposals and views of representations are summarised in para. 5.2 below.

5.2 **Major Grounds, Proposals and Views of Representations**

Representations in respect of Items A, B1 and C to G for the proposed housing developments and supporting GIC facilities

Supportive Representations (46)

- 5.2.1 Two representations (**R1** and **R2**) did not provide specific supporting grounds. The major grounds and views of the 44 supporting representations (**R3 to R38, R2674, R2675, R2686 to R2688, R2742, R2775, R2787**), and 4 representations supporting individual items but at the same time also opposing individual items (**R39 (part) to R42 (part)**) (counted as adverse representations) are summarised below.

Major Grounds	
(1)	There is still shortage in both public and private housing. The amendment sites are appropriate for the proposed housing developments, but the development should not be too intensive. The Government should also improve associated supporting facilities such as commercial centre and transport infrastructure. The proposed developments, which do not involve huge cost, is an efficient and more environmental-friendly way to increase housing supply compared with reclamation. Infrastructural development can help boost the economy and provide employment opportunities.
Responses	
(a)	The supportive views are noted.

Adverse Representations (5,649) and Representations Providing Views (4)

- 5.2.2 The major grounds and views of 4,458 adverse representations (including 4 opposing individual items but at the same time also support other items) and 4 representations providing views are summarised below. The remaining 1,191 adverse representations do not provide specific opposing grounds.

5.2.3 *Development Options for Increasing Housing Supply*

Major Grounds	
(1)	The Government should first develop high-density public housing in sizable sites including planned New Development Areas (NDAs), brownfield sites, reclamation sites and Fanling Golf Course. Opportunities for better utilisation of idle/under-utilised sites and urban redevelopment should also be explored first.
(2)	The proposed amendments are not in line with the recommendation of “not to explore development at periphery of Country Park” as stated in the Final Report of the Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS). Agreement of the proposed amendments would set undesirable precedents to develop the periphery of Country Park.
(3)	The proposed developments are not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone and the relevant guidelines in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 (TPB PG-No. 10) regarding development within “GB” zone and Chapter 10 of the HKPSG on Conservation. Furthermore, the amendment sites do not meet the criteria under the 2-stage review of “GB” zone.
(4)	Given the slow growth of usual population and the large amount of private housing and Subsidised Sale Flat in Ma On Shan, there is no imminent need for private housing at Site G.
Proposals	
(5)	<p>Alternative sites for housing and school developments suggested by the representers (Plan H-7) are as follows:</p> <p>(i) R48, R1627, R1654, R1655, R3807 and R3810 suggested that future development in Ma On Shan should be in a lower density and clustered in areas with adequate and direct road connections, such as the area along the Ma On Shan Bypass.</p> <p>(ii) R2766 suggested that the proposed developments at Sites A and B1 should be relocated to the site in front of Yan On Estate, which is flat and enjoys better transport provision and facilities to meet the daily needs of the residents.</p> <p>(iii) R58 suggested that the site zoned “GB” adjacent to Kam Chun Court represents a better alternative for public housing development, while the temporary works site of STCSTW in Area 73 represents a suitable site for the proposed primary school. The proposed pumping station and service reservoirs at Sites C and F, which are proposed only for supporting the proposed development at Sites D and G, would no longer be required.</p> <p>(iv) R3297 and R3298 suggested that Ma On Shan Recreation Ground, which has a site area of about 4.1 ha and is well-served by public</p>

	<p>transport, is a better alternative for Site D. Three blocks of public housing can be provided with increased flat production at a shorter time and lower cost, together with a sports complex incorporating the existing sports facilities.</p>
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1) to (3):</p> <p>The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply progressively based on the eight priority land supply options recommended by the TFLS, including developing brownfield sites and Fanling Golf Course in the short to medium term and NDAs and reclamation outside Victoria Harbour in the medium to long term.</p> <p>To expedite housing land supply in the short-to-medium term, various land use reviews including reviews on the Government land currently vacant, under Short Term Tenancies or different short-term or government uses, as well as the reviews on “GB” sites are conducted. The review of “GB” sites has been conducted since 2012 in two stages. In the first stage of “GB” review, PlanD mainly identified and reviewed areas zoned “GB” that are devegetated, deserted or formed while in the second stage of “GB” review, those vegetated “GB” sites with a relatively lower buffer or conservation value and adjacent to existing transport and infrastructure facilities were considered.</p> <p>The seven “GB” sites in Ma On Shan New Town have been identified for development of housing and associated Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities in the “GB” sites review exercise. While the amendment sites under Item A and B1 are close to existing built-up area of Ma On Shan and about 400 to 700m from the MTR Wu Kai Sha Station (Plans H-1a and H-3a), the amendment sites under Items C to G are located at the fringe of Ma On Shan town area, accessible by MOST Road, partly formed (Plans H-1b, H-3b and H-3c), and having relatively lower buffer/conservation value. These sites meet the selection criteria for a review. The recommendation of “not to explore development at the periphery of Country Park” under TFLS Final Report is noted and the sites under rezoning are all located outside the Country Park.</p> <p>The EFS with technical assessments on the potential traffic, infrastructural, environmental, landscape, heritage, geotechnical, drainage, sewerage, waterworks, visual and air ventilation impacts etc. have been undertaken to confirm that these sites are suitable for developments and no insurmountable problems are envisaged.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (4):</p> <p>There is a need for the Government to maintain a healthy and stable development of the private residential property market. The Government will continue to increase both land and housing supply to meet demand of private housing.</p>

(c)	<p>In response to (5):</p> <p>The EFS conducted for the seven “GB” sites under the current OZP amendment has confirmed that the proposed housing developments together with the proposed development intensities, and the associated infrastructure and facilities are technically feasible with no insurmountable problem and no unacceptable impact. These sites are suitable for housing and their associated developments to meet the acute housing need of the community.</p> <p>While various development constraints/ considerations including steep topography, occupied by existing/committed development, remoteness from the new housing sites, adverse air and visual impacts, etc are noted in the alternative sites for housing and GIC facilities in the representers’ proposals, technical feasibility of these proposals are yet to be ascertained.</p>
-----	--

5.2.4 *Development Intensity*

Major Grounds	
(1)	<p>The surrounding developments such as Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody and the Entrance have a much lower plot ratio than the proposed developments at Sites A and B1. PR higher than 5 would only be adopted in areas near the major transport node.</p> <p>The respective PRs of 6.8 and 3.6 for the proposed development at Sites D and G are similar to high-rise or medium-rise development in the development core of Ma On Shan, which is not compatible with the environment along MOST Road.</p>
(2)	<p>In view of the previous policy of increasing living space, as well as the importance of lowering housing and population density in Hong Kong as demonstrated by the SARS epidemic and COVID-19 pandemic, the proposed rezoning is a step backwards.</p>
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>The PR proposed for Sites A, B1, D and G are based on the policy directives of increasing the maximum domestic PR by around 20% as appropriate (except for the north of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon Peninsula) as announced in the 2014 Policy Address, and a further increase of domestic PR of 10% for public housing sites where technically feasible, as agreed by the Executive Council in December 2018. The EFS for the Ma On Shan housing sites has concluded that there is no insurmountable technical problem for the proposed housing developments and their associated infrastructure and facilities.</p> <p>Sites A, B1 and D are located close to the high-density core of Ma On Shan New Town and is not incompatible with the neighbouring developments such as Yiu On Estate and Lake Silver.</p>

	For Site G, in order to optimise the use of scarce land resources, a PR of 3.6 making reference to the medium-density private housing development (i.e. “R(B)5” zone in Lok Wo Sha) rezoned in 2014 in Ma On Shan town area, is considered appropriate taking into account the relatively flat topography of the site, previously disturbed site condition, and its accessibility via MOST Road.
(b)	In response to (2): With a view to enhancing livability whilst ensuring efficient utilisation of scarce land resources, proper design features such as the provision of building separations, minimization of podium bulk and provision of greenery will be adopted.

5.2.5 *Traffic and Transport Considerations*

Major Grounds	
(1)	The critical road links/junctions to urban areas are already saturated and the congestion will be worsened with the proposed amendments. The proposed traffic improvements are minor in nature and cannot address traffic problem of Ma On Shan fundamentally.
(2)	It is doubtful if the traffic impact assessment can reflect the actual traffic condition, and has taken into account the committed developments in Ma On Shan, Shap Sz Heung and Pak Shek Kok, as well as the traffic flow from Sai Kung, Tai Po and the North.
(3)	There is a mismatch of public transport services to the demands of residents in Sha Tin and Ma On Shan. The bus route planning is not convenient to the residents. Railway service cannot fully replace road transport and to alleviate the traffic congestion. The problem of over-capacity of East Rail Line (ERL) and Tuen Ma Line (TML) have been neglected.
(4)	There is inadequate provision of carparking space in Ma On Shan.
(5)	<u>Sites A and B1</u> The proposed developments of Sites A and B1 and the associated infrastructure will result in significant traffic impact on the local road network at the construction and operation stages. Capacities of Nin Fung Road and its roundabout junction with Nin Wah Road and Sai Sha Road are insufficient. There are also concerns regarding road safety and disturbance to Cheung Muk Tau Village due to the increase in pedestrian flow.
(6)	<u>Sites C to G</u> The proposed improvement of MOST Road will cause significant disruption, pollution and damage to this sole access road for local residents and large number of visitors. Capacities of the widened MOST Road and the Hang Hong Street Roundabout are still inadequate to accommodate the traffic associated with the proposed housing and primary school developments

	along MOST Road. Any obstruction of MOST Road will render Sites C to G inaccessible by emergency vehicles.
(7)	<p>Suggestions for traffic improvement and transport infrastructure include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) An exclusive lane from the section of Tate’s Cairn Highway across Shing Mun River (i.e. T6 Bridge) northbound to Tolo Highway southbound and the widening of the merging point of Ma On Shan Road and T6 Bridge. (ii) Provision of bus termini at Cheung Muk Tau and Shap Sz Heung, and expansion of the Nai Chung Bus Terminus. (iii) Extending TML to Cheung Muk Tau, Sai Sha and Shap Sz Heung. (iv) Addition of northern exit of MTR Tai Shui Hang Station and the southern exit of MTR Heng On Station. (v) Widening and reduction of gradient of MOST Road with the provision of pedestrian footpath and cycle track to minimise conflicts of vehicular and cycle/pedestrian traffic.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>Preliminary Traffic and Transportation Impact Assessment (PTTIA) has been conducted and the Government will undertake improvement works on critical road links and junctions within the Area of Influence (AOI), including altering Chak Cheung Street/Science Park Road roundabout to a signalized-controlled junction, providing an additional traffic island at the junction of Sai Sha Road/Kam Ying Road, widening the approaching arms to the junction of Sai Sha Road/Nin Wah Road/Nin Fung Road and widening the section of Tate’s Cairn Highway (southbound) near A Kung Kok (Annexes Xa to Xd). With the above-mentioned measures in place, except for T6 Bridge where the travelling speed is forecasted to be slightly slowed down by the design year 2035, the critical road links and junctions will operate within their capacities and Transport Department (TD) has no objection. For T6 Bridge, the Government will investigate the improvement measures and consult the public in due course.</p> <p>Outside the AOI, CEDD has started the widening of a section of Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section) between Sha Tin Plaza near Sha Tin Rural Committee Road and Man Wo House of Wo Che Estate near Fo Tan Road, and is conducting an investigation study on the construction of Trunk Road T4, which will help improve the traffic conditions of the roads connecting the New Territories East and Kowloon.</p> <p>In the long run, TD and the Highways Department (HyD) commenced the “Strategic Studies on Railways and Major Roads beyond 2030” in the end of 2020 separately to explore the layout of railway and major road infrastructure</p>

	<p>of Hong Kong (including New Territories East), and to conduct preliminary engineering and technical assessments for the alignments and supporting facilities, so that the planning of large-scale transport infrastructure will complement or even reserve capacity to meet the long-term development needs of Hong Kong.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (2):</p> <p>As advised by CEDD, the additional traffic generated by the mentioned planned / committed developments have been taken into account in the traffic forecasts. TD has no adverse comment on the findings of the PTTIA.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (3):</p> <p>TD has been continuously enhancing the existing bus service network, and planning bus routes and adjusting bus services to cater for the demand of passengers. TD will closely monitor the public transport services in a timely manner so as to meet the commuting demand from the new population intake.</p> <p>According to the PTTIA, about 55% of the public-transportation demand would be bus-to-rail. The PTTIA indicated that the proposed housing developments will not result in significant increase in patronage on the ERL and TML and TD has no adverse comment. Furthermore, Railway Development Office (RDO) of HyD advised that the diversion effect from the opening of TML will help relieve the congestion of the critical link between Tai Wai and Kowloon Tong.</p>
(d)	<p>In response to (4):</p> <p>As advised by HD, parking provision of the proposed public housing developments will be provided in accordance with the prevailing HKPSG. In any event, parking requirements will be reviewed and determined on a case-by-case basis by TD. The Government will continue to optimise the use of land resources to provide public car parking spaces in suitable G/IC facilities and public open space as appropriate. A public car park will be provided in the planned Amenity Complex in Area 103 in Ma On Shan.</p>
(e)	<p>In response to (5):</p> <p><u>Sites A and B1</u></p> <p>As advised by CEDD, with the implementation of proper traffic management measures such as controlling the number of construction vehicles and access points, the existing local road network near Site A and B1 would have sufficient capacities during construction stage. Moreover, the assessment results of the PTTIA have indicated that the access road near Symphony Bay to Cheung Muk Tau Village (Annex VIIIa) will operate within its capacity after population intake of the proposed housing developments. No undesirable performance for the roundabout junction of Sai Sha Road/ Nin Wah Road/ Nin Fung Road is envisaged with the widening of the</p>

	<p>approaching arm of Sai Sha Road (westbound) and Nin Fung Road (northbound) (Annex Xd).</p> <p>The proposed footpath along the access road for Sites A and B1 would be connected to the existing Nin Fung Road and a single track access road near Cheung Muk Tau Village (Annex VIIIa). As advised by CEDD, this new footpath of 2.75m wide on both sides is anticipated to be the major pedestrian route for the residents from Site A and B1 connecting to the MTR Wu Kai Sha Station. CEDD will further explore the improvement measures of Nin Fung Road to enhance pedestrian safety at the detailed design stage.</p>
(f)	<p>In response to (6):</p> <p><u>Sites C to G</u></p> <p>As advised by CEDD, during the upgrading works of MOST Road, appropriate temporary management measures including temporary traffic diversion schemes will be adopted to ensure that the access to Ma On Shan Tsuen and Ma On Shan Country Park will be maintained to minimize the traffic impact on visitors and local residents.</p> <p>To cater for the traffic demand of the proposed housing developments at Site D and proposed school at Site E, a pair of over 70m laybys (excluding taper) was proposed under the PTTIA (Annex VIIIb) to accommodate four 12.8m buses and two 19-seats green minibus, a taxi stand of 25m and a general layby of 50m. In addition, sufficient car-parking spaces and laybys for school bus and private car can be provided within the school site in accordance with the HKPSG.</p> <p>For the performance of the junction of MOST Road and Hang Hong Street, the PTTIA indicates that it will operate within the capacity in Year 2035. Moreover, as advised by CEDD, it will be enhanced by widening the exit arm at MOST Road (Annex Xe) to provide sufficient turning space for 12.8m-long buses.</p> <p>The proposed profile for the upgraded MOST Road with a width of 7.3m to 7.9m is up to the standard stipulated in the Transport Planning and Design Manual (Annex VIIIb). The provision of emergency vehicular access for the proposed developments will also comply with the standard under the Building (Planning) Regulation. Fire Services Department and the Hong Kong Police Force have been consulted and have no adverse comments in this regard.</p>
(g)	<p>In response to (7):</p> <p>(i) According to the PTTIA, with the proposed mitigation measure of converting the existing Chak Cheung Street/Science Park Road roundabout to a signalized-controlled junction (Annex Xb), the concerned junction would have sufficient capacity to cater for the traffic generated by the proposed housing developments, i.e. no significant traffic impact is envisaged for the vehicles travelling from</p>

	<p>T6 Bridge (northbound) to Fo Tan. Besides, the Government will implement improvement measure to widen the section of Tate’s Cairn Highway (southbound) near A Kung Kok from three lanes to four lanes (Annex Xa). The v/c ratio of the concerned road link will be reduced to 0.88. Traffic impact at the merging point of Ma On Shan Road and T6 Bridge can thus be addressed.</p> <p>(ii) There are planned public transport termini at Shap Sz Heung and Nai Chung (to be re-provided under the Sai Sha Road widening project). As advised by CEDD, the bus layby along the proposed access road for Sites A and B1 has can also accommodate three buses serving as terminal facilities.</p> <p>(iii) HyD commenced the “Strategic Study on Railways beyond 2030” in the end of 2020. HyD will consider the “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” (Hong Kong 2030+) to examine the layout of the proposed railway network in Hong Kong, as well as to conduct preliminary technical assessments on proposed railway alignment and associated facilities, in order to ensure that the planning of large-scale transport infrastructure will meet the needs for the long-term land use developments of Hong Kong.</p> <p>(iv) As advised by RDO of HyD, according to the current mechanism, planning and implementation of the station modification works are under MTR Corporation Limited’s (MTRCL) own strategy and fund. Any suggestions of additional exit in Tai Shui Hang Station and Heng On Station by the public could be conveyed to MTRCL direct.</p> <p>(v) As advised by CEDD, the upgraded MOST Road will have an improved gradient of 7.5% to 10% and with footpath on both sides to improve the safety for vehicles and pedestrian. However, cycle track will not be provided in view of road safety consideration.</p>
--	---

5.2.6 *Environmental, Ecological and Landscape Aspects*

Major Grounds	
(1)	There is a lack of holistic policy for environmental conservation. The Government should put forward comprehensive nature conservation policy under which “GB” zone and Country Park are considered as a whole.
(2)	The massive increase in population and associated traffic generated will lead to air, water, noise and light pollution, particularly the well-lit facades of residential towers, resulting in adverse ecological impacts. There are also concerns on the environmental impacts generated by the construction works of the proposed housing developments and their associated infrastructural works.

(3)	<p>The proposed housing development and associated infrastructural works are in close proximity to the Ma On Shan Country Park. They would cause irreversible impact not only on the development sites but also the surrounding areas including Ma On Shan Country Park. The increase in population will also generate impact on the Country Park given the lack of supporting facilities/measures. Sites A, B1 and C to G are ecologically connected to the surrounding woodlands within “GB” zone and Ma On Shan Country Park. Any damage to the buffer at the fringe of woodland would lead to ecological impact on the habitat at the core of the woodland.</p>
(4)	<p>There are concerns on the ecological impacts on the following habitats identified in the EcoIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The proposed developments would pose direct impacts on both the streams/watercourses and their riparian vegetation. (ii) The woodlands within the works limit of the amendment sites are of “moderate” or “moderate to high” ecological value. (iii) The plantation habitats identified have high potential to become further mature and increase in ecological value if sufficient time is allowed for natural succession.
(5)	<p>The proposed housing developments and associated infrastructural works will require felling of about 2,780 trees, including mature trees and native species, and species of conservation interest. The number of trees and their conservation value may be under-estimated in the preliminary tree survey. For instance, <i>Ixonanthes reticulata</i> (黏木) of conservation interest is spotted but it is not mentioned in the preliminary tree survey. The existing mechanism for tree compensation and transplantation and greenery in future development site would not re-create a habitat of equivalent ecological value and integrity.</p>
(6)	<p>The habitat of species of conservation interest (<i>Plestiodon elegans</i> (麗紋石龍子)) and many other wild animals (including Red Muntjac (赤麂), Leopard Cat (豹貓), Masked Palm Civet (果子狸), Chinese Porcupines (箭豬), Eurasian Wild Pig (野豬), Brown Cattle (黃牛), Chinese Pangolin (穿山甲)) would be adversely affected by the proposed developments.</p>
(7)	<p><u>Sites A and B1</u></p> <p>The ecological value of the habitats within works limit of Amendment Items A and B1 is regarded as “Moderate” while the orchard, marsh and woodland actually possess potential ecological value for wildlife. In particular, the proposed development will have significant adverse impacts on the marsh at Site B1 and the species depending on this habitat, including <i>Eleocharis equisetina</i> (木賊荸薺), which is an uncommon native wetland species.</p>

(8)	<p><u>Sites C to G</u></p> <p>Sites C to G and the associated access road proposed is located at close proximity to the Ma On Shan SSSI, which is a unique shrubland providing a unique habitat. Unique species including rare Orchid, ferns, Red Muntjac (赤麂), East Asian Porcupine (東亞豪豬) and Eurasian Wild Pig (野豬) can be found. The proposed developments will result in reduction of buffer for the SSSI from land development, and adverse impact on the biodiversity of Ma On Shan.</p>
(9)	<p>The scenic landscape of “GB” sites are integrated with the adjacent Country Park. The proposed developments and associated infrastructure will spread the development footprint of Ma On Shan over the Ma On Shan Bypass into “GB” areas. The significant change of the countryside character will have widespread implications on the view and experience for visitors in the surrounding country park areas.</p>
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>Country Parks have been designated under the Country Parks Ordinance for the purposes of nature conservation, countryside recreation and outdoor education while the “GB” zone is a zoning designated under the Town Planning Ordinance primarily intended for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets.</p> <p>Nonetheless, in order to build up land reserve to meet housing and other development needs, the Government has been carrying out the review of “GB” sites since 2012 to identify suitable sites with a relatively lower buffer or conservation value to meet the development needs of the territory.</p> <p>As detailed in the response 5.2.3(a) above, under the said “GB” sites review, the seven “GB” sites under the subject OZP amendment exercise have been identified and EFS has been conducted to confirm these sites as suitable for development with no insurmountable technical problem and unacceptable environmental impact including ecological impact. Due considerations have been given to strike a balance between conservation and development with a view to addressing the needs of different strata of society.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (2):</p> <p>Under the EFS, Preliminary Environment Studies (PES) has been prepared to assess the potential environmental impacts on the aspects of air quality, noise, water quality, ecology, waste management and land contamination during both construction and operation stages of the proposed developments. The PES concluded that with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, no insurmountable issue is envisaged. Nevertheless, detailed assessment will be carried out during the detailed design stage to confirm the environmental acceptability.</p>

	<p>According to the ecological impact assessment (EcoIA) conducted under the PES and as agreed by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), no avifauna or mammal species of conservation interest was recorded in close proximity of the proposed developments. Although lighting and human disturbance would affect the foraging behaviour of adjacent avifauna and mammal, the habitats in the vicinity is not considered as important site for them and these disturbances are considered to be only on a short-term basis as avifauna and mammal species are highly mobile and will adjust their foraging area.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (3):</p> <p>The proposed housing developments and their associated infrastructure and facilities have avoided the Ma On Shan Country Park and there is no direct impact on it. The EFS conducted for the proposed developments, including the EcoIA covering a Study Area of 500m from the works limit, has taken into account the ecological connection of the amendment sites to the Ma On Shan Country Park and confirmed that there is no insurmountable technical issues and with the adoption of the proposed mitigation measures, no insurmountable environmental impacts are envisaged.</p> <p>With the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the on-site preservation and provision of compensatory woodlands and the adoption of good site practices, the residual ecological impact (including indirect impacts on woodlands and the Ma On Shan Country Park) due to the proposed developments are considered to be acceptable. AFCD has no adverse comment in this regard.</p>
(d)	<p>In response to (4):</p> <p>(i) According to the EcoIA, the streams/ water courses/ modified watercourses which may be directly affected within the works limit have ecological values ranging from “low” to “moderate”. Most of the affected streams/ watercourses/ modified watercourses are seasonal and do not support diverse riparian vegetation and fauna species. Taking into account the nature of the works involved, species diversity of the watercourses and minimization and avoidance of direct impacts to the watercourses with aquatic fauna species of conservation interest, the overall direct impact is “low” to “low to moderate”. With the mitigation measures including maintaining surface runoff feed to the habitat through by-pass drainage system, re-provision / diversion of the stream / watercourse and green channel design to maximize the ecological opportunities in the diverted session, the residual impact to the loss of streams/ watercourses/ modified watercourses due to the project is considered to be acceptable and AFCD has no adverse comment .</p> <p>(ii) According to the EcoIA, part of the works limit of Sites A and B1 and the associated infrastructure and upgrading works of MOST Road (i.e. to the north of Site G) of the proposed developments</p>

	<p>consist of woodlands of “moderate” ecological value, while part of the works limit of Site D consists of woodland of “moderate to high” ecological value. These woodlands have been subject to constant traffic and human disturbance and most of the species recorded were common species. Considering aforementioned habitat value and species diversity, the size of woodlands loss, the loss of woodland due to the proposed developments will result in “moderate” ecological impact. With the mitigation measures, including detailed vegetation survey, mitigation plan and woodland compensation, the residual impact on the woodlands is considered acceptable and AFCD has no adverse comment.</p> <p>(iii) The ecological value of plantation within Sites A and B1 is considered as “low” in view of its dominance by cultivated exotic tree species with limited ecological value to native fauna and frequent human disturbance. Taking the small area of plantation loss, absence of species of conservation interest from plantation and the low ecological value of plantation into account, the ecological impact on plantation for Sites A and B1 is “low”. For Sites C to G, although the plantation habitat is supporting four plant species of conservation interest, most of these plantation areas have certain degree of human disturbance, the ecological value and impact are both considered as “low to moderate”. AFCD has no adverse comment on the above findings. As advised by CEDD, in order to reduce the plantation area to be affected, the boundaries of the development sites have been refined during the course of the EFS. Detailed vegetation survey will be conducted at the detailed design stage to further ascertain the potential impact to the species of conservation interest and formulate specific mitigation measures on the principles of avoidance, transplantation and compensation.</p>
(e)	<p>In response to (5):</p> <p>According to the tree group survey conducted under the EFS, there are 89 tree groups and about 3,560 existing trees within the works limit under the current proposal for the proposed housing developments and associated infrastructure and facilities. As advised by AFCD, preliminary tree survey which is a broad-brush tree survey is aimed to identify all tree groups within the Study Area for the purpose of landscape assessment. Under the EcoIA, vegetation surveys have also been conducted. The survey methodology adopted is widely employed in different environmental impact assessment studies, and AFCD have no adverse comment on it.</p> <p>Although approximately 2,780 existing trees will be affected by the proposed developments, the affected trees are of common species and do not include Old and Valuable Tree or tree of large size. Also, as advised by CEDD, the proposed works would not be in direct conflict with the <i>Ixonanthes reticulata</i> (黏木) as mentioned by the representers according to the EFS. Nevertheless, a detailed vegetation survey would be carried out in the detailed design stage. As confirmed by CEDD, with reference to the</p>

	<p>Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) (DEVB TC(W)) No. 4/2020 – Tree Preservation, tree compensation at a ratio of at least 1:1 with approximately 2,900 trees and shrubs is proposed. The species used will be native species, compatible with the surrounding landscape as far as practicable, and could enhance the vegetation diversity of the local environment. Habitat compensation will be provided in a “no net loss” and “like for like” basis as far as practicable, or by providing a compensation area with equivalent or higher ecological function. CEDD also advised that the nursery and planting of the compensatory trees will be carried out in parallel with the implementation of the proposed housing developments and an establishment period of 3 to 5 years will be allowed after tree-planting. According to the EcoIA, the residual direct impact is considered to be minor and acceptable with the implementation of woodland compensation (Annexes XIa to XIe). AFCD and Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L) of PlanD have no adverse comment. Detailed Woodland Compensation/ Enrichment Plan would be submitted to AFCD for approval.</p>
(f)	<p>In response to (6):</p> <p>As advised by AFCD and CEDD, <i>Plestiodon elegans</i> (麗紋石龍子), Red Muntjac (<i>Muntiacus muntjak</i>) (赤麂), Leopard Cat (<i>Prionailurus bengalensis</i>) (豹貓), Masked Palm Civet (<i>Paguma larvata</i>) (果子狸), Chinese Porcupine (<i>Hystrix brachyuran</i>) (箭豬) and Chinese Pangolin (<i>Manis pentadactyla</i>) (穿山甲) are considered to be species of conservation importance. <i>Plestiodon elegans</i> was found within the Study Area but outside the works limit, and has high degree of mobility. Thus, no direct impact on <i>Plestiodon elegans</i> due to the proposed developments is anticipated. For the other species of conservation interest mentioned by the representers, none of them has been recorded within the Study Area during the survey.</p> <p>For the Eurasian Wild Pig (野豬) and Brown Cattle (黃牛), they have a wide distribution in Hong Kong. They could utilize wide range of habitats throughout the Ma On Shan Country Park and therefore the indirect impact to these species was considered insignificant.</p> <p>AFCD advised that there is no additional finding of fauna species of conservation importance within the Study Area further to those identified under the PES according to its record. As advised by CEDD, detailed ecological survey will be conducted at the detailed design stage.</p>
(g)	<p>In response to (7):</p> <p><u>Sites A and B1</u></p> <p>According to the EcoIA, the ecological value of Orchard near Site A is considered as “Low”. The current habitat has low flora and fauna diversity with no species of conservation interest, and this type of habitat is common in Hong Kong and highly recreatable. With compensatory planting proposed as mitigation, no significant residual impact will be resulted.</p>

	<p>While the ecological value of Marsh near Site B1 is considered as “Moderate” according to the EcoIA, the proposed access road has avoided the majority of the marsh. To protect an uncommon native wetland species <i>Eleocharis equisetina</i> (木賊荸薺) recorded at the marsh, mitigation measures such as isolation between the construction site and the marsh, transplantation of individual <i>Eleocharis equisetina</i> to the adjacent unaffected marsh area as far as practicable and new drainage system to ensure the natural water supply to the marsh habitat will be adopted.</p> <p>Regarding the Woodland habitat, response 5.2.6 (d)(ii) above is relevant.</p> <p>AFCD has agreed with the above findings.</p>
(h)	<p>In response to (8):</p> <p><u>Sites C to G</u></p> <p>As advised by AFCD, the Ma On Shan SSSI (Annex I) is of floristic interest with a number of rare plants. The proposed housing developments and their associated infrastructure and facilities will not encroach onto the SSSI, and hence there will not be any direct impact on the SSSI. As the shortest distance of the Works Limit from the SSSI is about 330m, no significant indirect impact on the SSSI is anticipated.</p>
(i)	<p>In response to (9):</p> <p>Landscape Assessment (LA) conducted under the EFS has confirmed that the overall residual landscape impacts of the proposed housing development are acceptable with mitigations during the construction and operation phases. Amenity planting, greening and sensitive design in relation to the local context will help integrate the proposed developments into the surrounding “GB”. CTP/UD&L, PlanD considered that no significant impact on Ma On Shan Country Park is envisaged.</p> <p>Regarding the landscape impact on the route to Ma On Shan Country Park along Sites C to G, CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no objection that with the adoption of mitigation measures including compensatory and amenity planting, the impact will be alleviated from “moderate” to “slight” at Year 10 from the completion of the development.</p>

5.2.7 Geotechnical and Construction Aspects and Risk Assessment

Major Grounds	
(1)	<p>Detailed geotechnical investigations have not been conducted for the amendment sites. As indicated in the Enhanced Natural Terrain Landslide Inventory (ENTLI), Sites A, B1, D, E and G are not suitable for housing development in view of the landslides recorded. Otherwise, natural terrain mitigation measures at huge cost will be required, and future users and residents may have to bear the huge cost of slope repairing and maintenance.</p>

(2)	The potential existence of fault line and shear zone at Sites A and B1 would pose difficulty on the construction and lead to high construction cost and long construction period.
(3)	The geological condition for Sites C to G is potentially unstable as a result of the mining excavations in the past. The proposed development will affect the stability of the stratum of Ma On Shan but no geotechnical investigation has been conducted.
(4)	Ma On Shan Water Treatment Works (MOSWTW) is a potentially hazardous installation (PHI) and sizable development are normally not approved in the vicinity (i.e. Sites A and B1) according to the HKPSG.
(5)	There is a high pressure pipeline of town gas close to Sites B1 and D. Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) should be conducted to evaluate the potential risk and determine the necessary mitigation measures.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>As advised by CEDD, preliminary geotechnical appraisal (GA) has been conducted under the EFS for the concerned sites. According to the GA, landslides within the study area of the proposed development sites A, B1, D, E and G in the past 80 years were small in scale. According to the GA, The proposed site formation and infrastructure works are considered geotechnical feasible, and no insurmountable issue is anticipated from the geotechnical aspect. Adequate hazard mitigation measures such as providing rigid barrier, flexible debris barrier and check dam have been proposed based on the preliminary analysis. The appraisal has also concluded that the cost estimation for the proposed mitigation measures are reasonable. The Geotechnical Engineering Office (GEO) of CEDD has no adverse comment.</p> <p>Detailed site investigation (SI) and natural terrain hazard study (NTHS) will be conducted to formulate the detailed design including the proposed site formation works and the necessary natural terrain hazard mitigation works for the proposed developments, and to update the construction cost in the subsequent stage.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (2):</p> <p>According to the GA, Sites A and B1 may be traversed by faults or shear zones. Nonetheless, the proposed developments at both sites are considered geotechnically feasible, and the potential existence of fault line and shear zone are considered surmountable. GEO of CEDD has no adverse comment in this regard. Detailed field mapping and adequate ground investigations will be carried out in the detailed design stage to develop an optimal layout for housing development, and to accurately quantify the risk and costs.</p>

(c)	<p>In response to (3):</p> <p>As advised by CEDD, the former Ma On Shan Iron Mine was located in uphill area and fall outside of the study area of Sites C to G. The ground condition of the development sites and the structural integrity of nearby buildings and structures including those of the former Ma On Shan Mines will be examined through detailed field mapping and adequate ground investigations during the detailed design stage. CEDD and HD also advised that the proposed developments will be designed in accordance with the information revealed from the ground investigation and the Code of Practice for Foundation, to address the site specific condition, and to ascertain a stable site formation platform for piling works. Suitable construction methods and mitigation measures, if required, will also be formulated. GEO of CEDD has no adverse comment in this regard.</p>
(d)	<p>In response to (4) and (5):</p> <p>A hazard assessment on the acceptability of the Sites A and B1 due to operations of the MOSWTW and a full QRA regarding the risks associated with the operation of high pressure town gas pipeline in the vicinity of Sites B1 and D have been conducted under the EFS. The assessments have concluded that the proposed developments will not lead to unacceptable overall risk. EPD and Electrical and Mechanical Services Department have no adverse comment on the findings of the hazard assessment and the QRA respectively. The QRA will also be reviewed in the detailed design stage.</p>

5.2.8 *Visual and Air Ventilation Aspects*

Major Grounds	
(1)	The green panorama of Ma On Shan is enjoyed by residents of Ma On Shan, Sha Tin and Tai Po, and hikers and cyclers around Plover Clove. The importance of keeping the green panorama intact is neglected.
(2)	There is potential obstruction to the view of other residential developments.
(3)	Proposed developments at Sites A and B1 are totally incompatible with the developments of Cheung Muk Tau Village, Symphony Bay and the surrounding environment. Permanent and significant adverse impacts on the natural lighting, as well as the visual aspects on the ridgeline of Ma On Shan mountain range, in particular the Hunch Backs are anticipated.
(4)	Proposed development at Site D would result in sore-thumb development and is not in line with the stepped height profile of Ma On Shan. The forested mountain scenery, and the landscape of Ma On Shan Country Park and the mining settlements will be destroyed.
(5)	The proposed development at upper part of MOST Road at Site G and the section of elevated road leading to Site G are highly incompatible with the surrounding environment characterized by woodland, Ma On Shan Country Park and the heritage cluster of Ma On Shan Iron Mine, resulting in “sore-

	thumb” development. Significant visual impact on the surrounding ridgelines including Tiu Shau Ngam, the Hunch Backs and Ma On Shan will be resulted. It is misleading to state that about 60% of height buffer has been allowed to preserve the ridgeline and it is uncertain why a benchmark of 60% is adopted.
(6)	The proposed housing developments of over 40-storey at Sites A and B1 would result in adverse air ventilation impact.
(7)	Sites C to G are located at the main air ventilated channel with downhill air movement for the urban area. The increase in artificial heat source and change in wind direction will have adverse impacts on the micro-climate of the countryside and thus on biodiversity, as well as the temperature adjustment through ventilation for the residents downhill.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>Visual assessments for Sites A, B1, D and G for the proposed housing developments have been carried out. Given the high mountain backdrop from about 400mPD to 600mPD and the maximum building height of the proposed building blocks of about 165mPD to 250mPD, the visual assessments have concluded that the proposed housing developments would not affect the overall continuity of the Ma On Shan ridgeline. CTP/UD&L of PlanD considered that the findings of the VIA and VA has reasonably demonstrated the visual impacts of the proposed developments.</p> <p>The scale and layout of the proposed developments are formulated with due consideration to the site context, site constraints, site configurations and height restrictions. To minimise visual impact, architectural design or arrangements including building separation and landscaping measures are proposed to achieve better visual permeability (Annexes VIIIa and VIIIb).</p> <p>Moreover, compensatory planting and greening will help alleviate the inevitable vegetation loss due to the housing platform construction and integrate the proposed developments into the Ma On Shan Country Park and the surrounding “GB” zone. The visual assessments have indicated that the overall visual impacts of the proposed developments are considered as “moderately adverse” when viewed from some of the viewing points (VPs). CTP/UD&L of PlanD considered that the assessments have been reasonably conducted according to the TPB PG-No. 41. Albeit of the visual impact, the proposed developments are in line with the housing policy which optimise the land use and increase housing land supply for both public and private housing developments.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (2):</p> <p>The VPs under the visual assessments were selected taking into account criteria such as visual sensitivity, local significance and accessibility, as well as other local and district planning considerations etc. CTP/UD&L of PlanD considered that the selection of VPs is generally in line with the requirements</p>

	<p>as set out in the TPB PG-No. 41.</p> <p>According to paragraph 4.5 of TPB PG-No. 41, in the highly developed context of Hong Kong, it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations. In the interest of the public, it is far more important to protect public views, particularly those easily accessible and popular to the public or tourists. Visual assessments should primarily assess the impact on sensitive public viewers from the most affected VPs.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (3):</p> <p>In view of the acute housing demand, a balance between different considerations including development intensity and visual impact has to be struck. As stated in the visual assessment, a varied BH profile is adopted for the proposed developments at Sites A and B1 to avoid fragmentation of the existing transitional landscape from the highly urbanized Ma On Shan township (such as Lake Silver with BH of 185mPD) to the rural village type area (such as Symphony Bay with BH ranging from about 38mPD to 59mPD and Cheung Muk Tau Village), and to alleviate the potential visual impacts.</p> <p>According to visual assessment for Sites A and B1, VPs of Sensitive Public Viewers include VP from hikers at Ma On Shan, visitors at Nai Chung Beach and Ma On Shan Bypass sitting out area, road users of Sai Sha Road and travellers at Nai Chung Bus Stop. The residual impacts from these VPs are “slightly or moderately” adverse (Annex IXa) with the adoption of mitigation measures such as careful design of BH of the development to avoid blockage of Ma On Shan ridgeline, minimisation of building mass and provision of visual corridors between the building blocks, use of appropriate building materials and colours in built structures to reduce visual impact as well as provision of building separation of 15m wide, the visual impact could be minimised. (Annex VIIIa).</p> <p>Regarding the impact on the ridgeline of Ma On Shan mountain range, as stated in Response J1, given the height of the Ma On Shan ridgeline ranging from 400mPD to 600mPD and the height of the proposed residential development of about 165mPD to 250mPD, the overall integrity of Ma On Shan Ridgeline would not be significantly affected. As demonstrated by the photomontages of the visual assessment conducted for Sites A and B1, the current view to the Ma On Shan mountain range would be blocked partially as viewed from the key public VP at VP4 (road users of Sai Sha Road) as demonstrated in the photomontages under the visual assessment (Annex IXa). To a certain extent, the anticipated obstruction would be alleviated by limiting the number of building blocks and providing building separations.</p> <p>Though natural lighting assessment is not required under the visual assessment, as confirmed by HD, sun-shadowing analysis and solar radiation analysis for the new public housing development will be carried out during detailed design stage to minimise the adverse impacts on natural lighting to</p>

	the surroundings.
(d)	<p>In response to (4):</p> <p>The development concept of Ma On Shan New Town has adopted a stepped height approach with BH generally increasing progressively from the waterfront to inland area/ hillside and decreasing progressively from the town centre and the eastern gateway node of MTR Wu Kai Sha Station towards the peripheries.</p> <p>The BH restriction for Site D situated at inland area/ hillside is 225mPD. To the immediate north and east across Ma On Shan Bypass, the BHR decreases progressively towards the waterfront from 150mPD at Kam Ying Court, 130mPD at Saddle Ridge Garden to 110mPD at Villa Athena. CTP/UD&L of PlanD considered that the proposed development at Site D is generally in line with the stepped height concept of Ma On Shan New Town by keeping taller buildings on the hillside and lower buildings towards the waterfront. When viewed together with the high mountain backdrop of Ma On Shan ridgeline ranging from 550 to 600m in height, the proposed housing developments at 225mPD will not affect the continuation of the ridgeline (Annex IXb) as illustrated in the photomontages for the key public VPs of VP4 (road users at Hang Hong Street Roundabout) and VP8 (recreational users of Pak Shek Kok Promenade).</p> <p>Better visual permeability can be achieved through the design of the building blocks allowing greater flexibility in architectural and landscape design (Annex VIIIb). Moreover, compensatory planting, greening and sensitive design in relation to the local context will help integrate the proposed developments into the surrounding “GB” zone.</p>
(e)	<p>In response to (5):</p> <p>According to the visual assessment for Site G, among the 8 key public VPs, six of them will experience mostly “slight/slight to moderate” visual impact, only two of them (i.e. VP1 (Hikers from the southeast) and VP8 (Hikers at MOST Road) will experience a “moderate to significant” visual impact in view of the close viewing distance and the medium to high sensitivity of these two groups of viewers.</p> <p>During the preliminary design stage of Site G, suitable mitigation measures including avoidance of blockage of the Ma On Shan ridgeline, minimization of landscape fragmentation by locating the future development as close to existing major infrastructure, provision of visual corridors and use of appropriate building materials and colours in built structures are recommended under the visual assessment to minimise the visual impact to the identified key public VPs.</p>

	<p>During the construction and operation stage of Site G, mitigation measures including the provision of amenity planting of housing site, modified slopes and retaining structures, could also be adopted by private developers.</p> <p>Visual assessment has been carried out for the private development at Amendment Item G. Although it has concluded that the overall visual impacts on the key public VPs are considered to be within the range of “moderately” adverse (Annex IXc), the proposed development with a maximum BH of 250mPD would allow about 60% height buffer to preserve the ridgeline of Ma On Shan given that the ridgeline in the vicinity of Site G ranges from about 550mPD to 600mPD. The 60% buffer is not intended to serve as a benchmark but a general comparison between the heights of Ma On Shan ridgeline and the proposed maximum height of the development in Site G. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has revealed and considered the findings of the visual assessment acceptable.</p>
(f)	<p>In response to (6) and (7):</p> <p>According to the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) under the EFS, the proposed developments would not incur adverse air ventilation impacts on the surrounding environment in consideration of the location of the existing built-up areas and the provision of good design features. Mitigation measures such as building separation of 15m wide aligning with appropriate direction and building setback from site boundary along Ma On Shan Bypass will help promote wind penetration for local area and minimise potential air ventilation impact.</p>

5.2.9 *Heritage Aspect on Former Ma On Shan Iron Mine (Related to Amendment Items C to G only)*

Major Grounds	
(1)	The Ma On Shan Iron Mine has historical importance related to the modern international, Chinese and local history, and has led to the establishment of the mining settlements. The proposed developments will result in fragmentation of the heritage of former Ma On Shan Iron Mine. A multi-dimensional “point-line-plane” approach should be adopted to conserve in-situ all the interrelated heritage resources scattering over the hillslope to maintain their integrity, authenticity and group value.
(2)	The Government has not taken proactive conservation measures since the grading of these historic buildings, and tends to tone down their historical importance and the proximity of Sites D and E to the historic buildings.
(3)	Construction works such as piling, site formation and road works may affect the structural stability of the graded historic buildings, especially the 110ML Portal and Shun Yee Sun Tsuen.
(4)	It is unacceptable that comprehensive HIA would only be conducted in the subsequent investigation and implementation stage.

(5)	<p>Site G is the only settlement of Chiu Chow miners in Hong Kong which possesses unique culture and character of a mining settlement and is of intangible historical value. While the settlers subsequently switched to farming, they played an important role in serving other mining settlements. The clearance of the old mining settlements will lead to destruction of the community and is a great loss of human history. Impacts on intangible heritage should also be assessed.</p> <p>The structures in Shun Yee San Tsuen are Grade 3 historic structures but the settlement at Site G is not graded. The Government should explain the rationale for the differential treatment.</p>
(6)	<p>The proposed improvement of MOST Road would result in direct impact on a pier (支柱) of the Mineral Preparation Plant, which is a Grade 3 historic building (Plan H-5). It is important to conserve the historic structure in-situ to maintain its authenticity and group value, and solution to conserve the pier should be explored.</p> <p>Besides, two additional ungraded piers very near to the Mineral Preparation Plant are spotted by R49 (Plan H-6). They would be encroached by the road widening work, but no assessment has been conducted.</p>
(7)	<p>The proposed developments will undermine the local revitalization effort of Grace Youth Camp. The heritage sites of Ma On Shan Mine has the potential and should be considered for local cultural / green tourism development. The Government should reconsider incorporating Ma On Shan Mine into the UNESCO Geo Park.</p>
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1), (2), (3) and (4):</p> <p>According to the EFS, all the graded historic buildings in relation to Ma On Shan Iron Mine including Site Structures at Mining Settlement (Grade 3) in Shun Yee San Tsuen, Exterior walls of 110ML (Grade 2) and the Mineral Preparation Plant (Grade 3) will be preserved <i>in-situ</i>. The proposed developments and their associated infrastructure and facilities will not encroach onto any graded historic buildings/structures except a pier of the mineral preparation plant (Plan H-5). A HIA will be required at the detailed design stage when design is available to further develop the mitigation measures in consultation with AMO. The HIA report has to be submitted to the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) for deliberation and endorsement. Besides, as advised by CEDD, buffer zone will be set up between the construction activities and the historic structures as far as practicable and appropriate monitoring on vibration and settlement will also be carried out during construction stage.</p> <p>AMO has taken a holistic approach in the grading assessment exercise (viz. the adoption of six assessment criteria including historical interest, architectural merit, group value, social value and local interest, authenticity, and rarity). Regarding the “point-line-plane” approach, AMO has advised</p>

	<p>that the grading system for historic buildings is administrative in nature which does not affect the ownership, usage, management and development rights of the buildings/ structures graded. From the heritage conservation viewpoint, AMO is open to initiatives/ proposals from the owner /management party/ user bureau(x)/department(s) or future allocate(s) to reuse the graded historic buildings/ structures properly. AMO will offer technical advice and comment from the heritage conservation perspective on any works proposals arising from the renovation/ revitalization as well as repair and maintenance of the graded historic buildings/ structures.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (5):</p> <p>As advised by AMO, the assessment of heritage value of historic buildings/structures are based on six criteria, namely (i) historical interest; (ii) architectural merit; (iii) group value; (iv) social value and local interest; (v) authenticity; and (vi) rarity. Based on these criteria, three historic buildings associated with the former Ma On Shan Iron Mine were accorded with grading by the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) in April 2016. They include (i) Exterior walls of 240 ML and 110 ML (Grade 2) (ii) Site Structures at Mining Settlement (Grade 3) in Shun Yee San Tsuen; and (iii) Mineral Preparation Plant (Grade 3) of Ma On Shan Iron Mine. According to AMO, Site Structures at Mining Settlement in Shun Yee San Tsuen refer to a group of miners' home units built in the 1960s as a result of the Lutheran missionaries' aid to rehouse some miners' families who had been made homeless by heavy rainstorms. As confirmed by AMO, no graded historic building or new item pending grading assessment by the AAB is situated within Site G. The Intangible Cultural Heritage Office of Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) also advised that no intangible cultural heritage (ICH) item on the current ICH inventory of Hong Kong is related to Site G.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (6):</p> <p>According to the preliminary design in the EFS of the proposed developments, a graded pier of the Mineral Preparation Plant will be affected by the proposed alignment of the upgraded MOST Road (Plan H-5). CEDD has advised that potential adverse impact on the graded pier will be further assessed and corresponding mitigation measures to conserve the pier will be formulated in the HIA to be conducted in the detailed design stage for the endorsement of the AAB. As for the two additional piers mentioned by the R49 (Plan H-6), they are not graded historic buildings or items pending grading assessment by AAB according to AMO. As advised by CEDD, they would not be in direct conflict with the proposed alignment due to level difference. The proposed road alignment will also be further reviewed upon HIA to minimize the potential heritage impact.</p>
(d)	<p>In response to (7):</p> <p>According to the EFS, the proposed developments and their associated infrastructure and facilities will not encroach onto any graded historic</p>

	<p>buildings/structures (except a pier of the Mineral Preparation Plant). The Lutheran Yan Kwong Church (i.e. Grace Youth Camp) (Grade 3 historic building) which is located at the upper part of Ma On Shan Tsuen, is at a distance away from the works limit and will not be affected.</p> <p>From the heritage conservation viewpoint, AMO is open to initiatives/proposals from the owner /management party/ user bureau(x)/department(s) or future allocate(s) to reuse the graded historic buildings/ structures properly and will offer technical advice and comment from the heritage conservation perspective.</p> <p>As advised by AFCD, according to the UNESCO Global Geoparks Criteria, the geological heritage within a UNESCO Global Geopark should be verified with international geological significance. The former Ma On Shan Iron Mine does not seem to meet this criterion.</p>
--	--

5.2.10 *Compensation and Rehousing Arrangement*

Major Grounds	
(1)	<p>The proposed development would result in extensive clearance of land but the extent has not yet been announced. The impact on villagers was not evaluated as their way of living would be affected. The Government should proactively liaise and communicate with the affected residents on the rehousing arrangement to their satisfaction, such that they can receive reasonable compensation and have an improved living environment.</p>
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>Compensation and rehousing arrangements, land clearance and related land matters are outside the scope of the OZP, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the amendment sites. The concerns of the affected stakeholders would be dealt with separately by the Government in firming up the implementation arrangements.</p> <p>As advised by LandsD, in general, ex-gratia allowance (EGAs) and/or rehousing arrangement would be offered to eligible residents, business operators and genuine farmers affected by clearance in accordance with the prevailing policies. Upon finalization of land requirement boundaries, the Government shall carry out the pre-clearance survey to register the affected residents and business operators within the project boundaries.</p>

5.2.11 *Provision of Government, Institution and Community Facilities, Recreational Facilities/Open Space and Other Supporting Facilities*

Major Grounds	
(1)	With the decreasing birth rate and inadequate admission of students, the need for the proposed primary school at Site E is doubtful apart from serving the proposed development at Site D.
(2)	The need for the pumping station at Site C and the service reservoirs at Site F is doubtful apart from serving the proposed housing developments at Sites D and G, as Ma On Shan Service Reservoirs already have adequate capacity to serve the Ma On Shan area.
(3)	There is inadequate provision of GIC facilities and recreational facilities/open space in Ma On Shan, including hospital, community hall, elderly services and child care services. Committed G/IC facilities and recreational facilities/open space including clinic and sports centres should also be implemented first.
(4)	The proposed housing sites are all located away from the Ma On Shan Town Centre and not well served by shopping centre, market, community, recreational and entertainment facilities.
Proposals	
(5)	R52 suggested Site E and its surrounding heritage structures (including Exterior Walls of 110ML and its associated structures, and the Mineral Preparation Plant and its related relics) to be rezoned as “OU (School cum Conservation Areas)”. The planning intention is to integrate the heritage structures into the design of the school site, enriching the learning environments of the students and allowing the heritage structures to perpetuate the values of the Ma On Shan Iron Mine landscape as a common inheritance of Hong Kong.
(6)	R54, R67, R69, R70, R1762, R2142 and R2693 suggested that the amendment site(s) shall be used for RCHE, CCC, clinic, hospital and provision of infirmary services instead.
Responses	
(a)	In response to (1): As advised by Education Bureau (EDB), the Government under the established mechanism will reserve sites for school development when preparing town plans and planning large-scale residential developments having regard to the planned population intake and on the basis of the needs for community services with reference to the HKPSG. The subject school site was reserved in accordance with this mechanism. The proposed school also has the merit of minimising the travelling time of students residing there.

(b)	<p>In response to (2):</p> <p>The EFS has concluded that there is no insurmountable technical problem for the proposed housing developments and their associated infrastructure and facilities. Sites D and G will provide a total of 2,700 public housing units and 1,040 private housing units to help address housing need to the short-to-medium term. As advised by CEDD, the proposed service reservoirs at Sites F is to meet the requirement of the minimum residual head to serve the housing developments, whereas the proposed pumping station at Site C is to provide sufficient feed to the proposed service reservoirs at Site F.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (3):</p> <p>The existing and planned provision of GIC facilities and open space are generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population in Ma On Shan in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG (Annex XII).</p> <p>As advised by Food and Health Bureau (FHB) and Hospital Authority (HA), the provision of hospital beds is assessed on a wider district basis and the deficit can be addressed by the provision in Sha Tin. Regarding the implementation of the planned clinic in Ma On Shan, HA will continue to monitor the service utilization of the general outpatient clinics in Sha Tin district, and plan for the clinic development in due course.</p> <p>In view of the population-based planning standards for elderly and child care services, child care centres (CCC), residential care homes for the elderly (RCHE) and community care services facilities (CCS) have been incorporated into the proposed public and/or private housing developments. The recently-incorporated HKPSG requirements for CCC, RCHE and CCS are a long-term goal. The actual provision would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department (SWD) and relevant departments concerned in the planning and development process as appropriate. PlanD and SWD will work closely together to ensure that additional GIC facilities will be included in new and redevelopment proposals from both public and private sectors.</p> <p>As for the implementation of the planned recreational facilities/open space, LCS D advised that it has all along been following the priority set by the STDC to implement the projects of leisure and recreational facilities in Sha Tin District. LCS D has recently completed the Hang Ming Street Sitting-out Area in Area 90 of Ma On Shan, and is actively planning for the implementation of the Amenity Complex in Area 103 of Ma On Shan to meet the needs of the local residents.</p>
(d)	<p>In response to (4):</p> <p>As confirmed by HD, retail facilities as well as a variety of social welfare facilities have been proposed in Sites A and B1 in Cheung Muk Tau and Site D at MOST Road to serve the needs of the future residents as well as the Ma</p>

	<p>On Shan New Town. Subject to detailed design, HD proposes to provide goods and daily necessities store and food stores in the public housing development to serve the daily needs of the locals. Major shopping centres and entertainment facilities (such as MOSTown and Double Cove Place), markets (such as markets at Heng On Estate and Wu Kai Sha) and recreational facilities (such as Ma On Shan Sports Centre and Ma On Shan Swimming Pool) are also easily accessible at the Ma On Shan Town Centre.</p>
(e)	<p>In response to (5):</p> <p>Site E, currently zoned “G/IC”, is reserved for the development of a primary school to support the new population nearby. According to the EFS, Site E will not encroach onto any graded historic buildings/structures. As regard the integrity of the heritage cluster of former Ma On Shan Iron Mine, response to para. 5.2.9(a) above are relevant.</p> <p>According to EDB, as a general practice, the school design will be drawn up in consultation with the School Sponsoring Body (SSB) in future design stage to suit the school's operation needs as far as practicable. However, whether the heritage concept will be adopted in the school design to echo the surrounding heritage structures is subject to the acceptance of the SSB, environmental consideration and the overall design of the school. Besides, the heritage structures would not be integrated as part of the school site. Since a school building and a heritage structure have very different operational and design requirements, there would be adverse time and cost implications to the school building project as well as concerns from the SSB on school operation and management if the heritage structures were within the school site.</p> <p>Therefore, an “OU (School cum Conservation Areas)” zoning for Site E and its surrounding heritage structures is not supported.</p>
(f)	<p>In response to (6):</p> <p>A variety of welfare facilities including RCHE and CCC have been incorporated in the indicative scheme of the housing sites under the EFS. The provision of welfare facilities may be adjusted subject to the advice from the SWD and other relevant departments concerned at the detailed design stage. SWD has also advised that the proposed RCHEs will be subsidised Contract Homes.</p> <p>For the provision of hospital/ clinic/ infirmary services, second para. of response to 5.2.11(c) above is relevant.</p>

5.2.12 *Public Consultation*

Major Grounds	
(1)	Local consultation before gazettal of the draft OZP was inadequate. After the gazettal of the draft OZP, notification of the amendment of OZP was inadequate, and there are only a short period of 2 months for submission of representation and an exchange session of 1 hour.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>The established public consultation procedures for OZP amendments had been followed. As detailed in paras. 3.1 and 3.2 above, prior to the consideration of the proposed amendments to the approved OZP by the RNTPC, PlanD and CEDD jointly consulted SKNRC, DHC of STDC and PHWC of TPDC on the proposed amendments to the OZP. A meeting with the representatives of Ma On Shan Tsuen was also held at the request of a STDC member. The views and comments received have been duly relayed to RNTPC upon submission of the proposed amendments to the OZP.</p> <p>The draft OZP incorporating the proposed amendments were published for two months under the Ordinance. Members of the public could submit representations in respect of the proposed amendments to the Board. Upon the exhibition of the representations received under the Ordinance, Members of the public could submit comments on the representations within three-week time. All valid representers and commenters have been invited to the Board to present their views.</p> <p>To address the concerns on the proposed developments, subsequent to the gazettal of the draft OZP, PlanD, CEDD, HD and LandsD attended an exchange session co-organised by STDO and MOSSAC on 10.11.2020, which was also attended by villagers of Ma On Shan Tsuen and STDC members. Comments received at the exchange session are attached in Annex VII for Members' reference.</p>

5.2.13 *Others*

Major Grounds	
(1)	The proposed developments at Sites C to G will affect the implementation of the approved planning application no. A/MOS/65, and it is suspicious that the undertaking of improvement of MOST Road by the government is a transfer of benefit to the respective private developer.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1) :</p> <p>According to the PTTIA under the EFS, the upgrading of MOST Road by the Government is required to cater for the traffic demand arising from the proposed developments at Sites C to G. There is no collusion between the</p>

	Government and the applicant of Application No. A/MOS/65. As advised by LandsD, both the land exchange application and the road works in relation to the approved planning application no. A/MOS/65 had not been approved.
--	--

Representations in respect of Item B2 – Rezoning of a strip of land abutting Ma On Shan Bypass from “GB” to an area shown as ‘Road’ to reflect the existing as-built condition

5.2.14 Of the 5,699 valid representations received, 1,415 representations are also related to Item B2. The 2 supporting representations (**R1** and **R2**) and 1,406 adverse representations did not provide grounds specific to Item B2, whilst the specific grounds provided by the remaining 7 adverse representations (**R1767, R1778, R2765, R2766, R2789, R2799** and **R2800**) are summarised as follows:

Grounds	
(1)	The subject road is ancillary to the proposed housing developments, and thus its rezoning should not be agreed before the housing development is widely agreed by the society. The footpath and roadside facilities cannot accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed housing developments, and would lead to illegal parking and adverse impact on the environment.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>Site B2 is located on Government land with roadside amenities and a footpath along Ma On Shan Bypass. It falls within the gazetted road works of “Sha Tin New Town, Stage 2 - Trunk Road T7” authorised in Gazette Notice 2236 dated 7.4.2000. The rezoning of the Site B2 from “GB” to an area shown as ‘Road’ is to reflect the existing as-built condition.</p> <p>The footpath and the roadside amenity areas adjacent to Site B2 are not accessible by vehicles. No illegal parking and no adverse environmental impact are anticipated. Besides, the subway across Ma On Shan Bypass near The Entrance rather than the footpath in Site B2 will serve as the main pedestrian linkage between the proposed housing developments at Sites A and B1.</p>

Representations in respect of Item H – Rezoning of a site near Chevalier Garden from “GB” to “OU(STW)” to rationalize the boundary of STCSTW

5.2.15 Of the 5,699 valid representations received, 1,324 representations are also related to Item H.

Supportive Representations (4)

5.2.16 One representer (**R42**) supports Item H on the following ground, while the other 3 supporting representations (**R1, R2** and **R39**) did not provide grounds

specific to Item H.

Grounds	
(1)	A city has to keep on developing and improving.
Responses	
(a)	The supportive view (1) is noted.

Adverse Representations (1,320)

5.2.17 Amongst the 1,320 opposing representations, only six of them (**R1767, R2585, R2593, R2765, R2781** and **R3126**) provided grounds specific to Amendment Item H as summarised below:

Grounds	
(1)	Doubt on the need for the STCSTW.
(2)	The proposed development at Site H would result in adverse landscape impact and irreversible impact on the “GB” zone, and worsening of the odour impact.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>DSD has advised that with the relocation of the existing STSTW into rock cavern, the STCSTW will bring multi-fold benefits to the communities of Sha Tin and Ma On Shan, including environmental improvement. An EP was granted by the DEP for the construction and operation of the STCSTW Project in 2017. The rezoning procedure for the 98% of the STCSTW site falling on area covered by the Sha Tin OZP had been completed in 2018 (Plan H-2d). Opportunity is now taken to rezone the remaining 2% of the STCSTW site (Site H) falling within the Ma On Shan OZP from “GB” to “OU(STW)” to rationalize the whole development boundary of the STCSTW.</p> <p>Site H is part of the secondary portal of the future STCSTW. The necessity of providing two portal areas, each connecting the main caverns complex via an access tunnel, is due to the need to cater for emergency situations. In case one of the portal areas or access tunnels is obstructed by accidents, the other portal area / access tunnel can serve as a safe passage for evacuating the personnel in the caverns. Firefighters can also make use of this alternative access to conduct rescue operation. Thus, the secondary portal area at Site H at Mui Tsz Lam Road is considered necessary. Besides, Site H have to accommodate some facilities such as electrical substations and ventilation buildings that are not suitable to be placed inside the caverns because of fire safety concerns.</p>

(b)	<p>In response to (2):</p> <p>Regarding the concerns on potential landscape impact, DSD has advised that a tree survey was carried out as part of the EIA approved in November 2016 and further tree survey in the area was conducted in June 2020. To minimise the landscape impacts, compensatory planting of native species within or adjacent to the site for the STCSTW for the loss of about 135 existing trees, which are of common species and generally in fair to poor condition, form and amenity value, will be carried out. The façade of the ancillary buildings at the cavern portal area will be designed with landscape treatment to blend into the greenery of the surroundings. These mitigation measures have been approved as part of the EIA.</p> <p>As for the concern on the potential odour impact, cavern is in fact an effective natural barrier to enclose the sewage treatment facilities with odour emission. Odour emitted from these facilities would be treated by deodourizing units before venting to the ambient via the ventilation shaft at a remote area on Nui Po Shan. In addition, negative pressure would be applied inside caverns preventing odour from leaking through the access tunnels. With these measures in place, the odour impact would be alleviated compared with the existing STSTW.</p>
-----	---

6. COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS

- 6.1 Among the 1,587 valid comments received, one comment submitted by an individual (C1) supports the rezoning. One comment submitted by an individual (C2) supports Items B2, C and E, provides views on Item H and objects to the remaining items. One comment submitted by an individual (C1587) has no clear indication of the views. The remaining 1,584 comments opposing to the rezoning are submitted by 4 STDC members (C7 to C10), a Sai Kung District Council member (C11), 6 green groups or individuals (C3 to C6, C15 and C16), 3 concern groups (C12 to C14) and individuals (1,570). Amongst the 1,587 commenters, about 123 of them are also representers. The commenters opposing to the rezoning are mainly concerning the proposed housing developments and the supporting facilities.
- 6.2 A detailed summary of the major grounds and proposals of the comments on representations and Government departments' responses is at **Annex Vb**. The major concerns raised in the comments are similar to the grounds of objections detailed in para. 5.2 above.
- 6.3 Additional major supporting comments that have not been mentioned by the representations are summarized below:

Other Major Comments Supporting the Rezoning	
(1)	Brownfield development, as an alternative, is a lengthy process involving land resumption.

Responses	
(a)	Noted.

6.4 Additional major objecting comments that have not been mentioned by the representations are summarized below:

Other Major Comments Opposing to the Rezoning	
(1)	During 1996 to 2000, a total of 8,800 historical buildings were assessed by the AMO, 1,444 of which have been announced as graded historical buildings. There is a lack of mechanism to protect the buildings with historical values but yet to be graded, including a number of sites in Ma On Shan Iron Mine.
(2)	According to C13 , some other structures related to the Ma On Shan Iron Mine are also found and may be affected by the proposed developments, including another ungraded pier of the Mineral Preparation Plant, toilet, tram repairing area, water tank, electricity supply facility and retaining wall along the slope near to the 110ML Portal and the Mineral Preparation Plan, and a section of the catchwater (Plan H-6). The Government should suspend the rezoning, and review and assess the relevant historical buildings and structures comprehensively, and to commence the next-stage study on the “Conservation of Industrial Heritage of Ma On Shan Iron Mine” as soon as possible.
Responses	
(a)	In response to (1): As advised by AMO, apart from the three graded historic buildings/structures associated with the former Ma On Shan Iron Mine as mentioned in para. 5.2.9 (b), there are no more buildings in Ma On Shan Tsuen in the list of New Items pending grading assessment.
(b)	In response to (2): As advised by AMO, all the mentioned structures (Plan H-6) are not graded historic buildings or items pending grading assessment by AAB. Based on the information provided by C13 , CEDD has advised that the alignment of the catchwater mostly falls outside the works limit while the other structures fall within the works limit. The proposed road alignment will be further reviewed upon HIA to minimize the potential heritage impact.

7. DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTATION

7.1 The following government bureaux/departments have been consulted and their comments have been incorporated in the above paragraphs, where appropriate:

- (a) Secretary for Development (Antiquities and Monuments Office);
- (b) Secretary for Transport and Housing;
- (c) Secretary for Education;
- (d) Secretary for Food and Health;
- (e) Director of Housing
- (f) Head of Civil Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- (g) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- (h) Project Manager/North, Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- (i) Commissioner for Transport;
- (j) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department;
- (k) Principle Project Coordinator/Special Duties, Highways Department;
- (l) Principle Government Engineer/Railway Development, Railway Development Office, Highways Department;
- (m) District Lands Officer/Shan Tin, Lands Department ;
- (n) District Lands Officer/Tai Po, Lands Department ;
- (o) Director of Environment Protection;
- (p) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation;
- (q) Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department;
- (r) Chief Building Surveyor/ New Territories East (2) and Rail Section, Buildings Department;
- (s) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (t) Chief Engineer/Cavern Projects, Drainage Services Department;
- (u) Director Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (v) Director-General of Civil Aviation;
- (w) Commissioner of Police;
- (x) Director of Fire Services;
- (y) Director of Social Welfare;
- (z) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services; and
- (aa) Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department

7.2 The following government bureaux/departments have no major comment on the representations/comments:

- (a) Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department;
- (b) Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department;
- (c) Director of Health;
- (d) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene;
- (e) District Officer (Shan Tin), Home Affairs Department; and
- (f) District Officer (Tai Po), Home Affairs Department.

8. PLANNING DEPARTMENT'S VIEWS

8.1 The supportive views of **R1 to R38, R39 (part) to R42 (part), R2674, R2675, R2686 to R2688, R2742, R2775** and **R2787** and views provided in **R90** and **R5697 to R5699** are noted.

- 8.2 Based on the assessments in para. 5.2 above, PlanD does not support R39 (part) to R42 (part), R43 to R89, R91 to R2673, R2676 to R2685, R2689 to R2741, R2743 to R2774, R2776 to R2786 and R2788 to R5696 and considers that the OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

Items A, B1, C to G

Development Options for Increasing Housing Supply

- (a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase housing land supply to meet the acute demand on housing. In order to build up land reserve to meet housing and other development needs, land use review on sites under “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone has been carrying out since 2012 in two stages. Under the “GB” sites review, seven “GB” sites at the fringe of Ma On Shan New Town have been identified as suitable for housing developments and their associated supporting government, institution or community (GIC) facilities. Engineering Feasibility Study with technical assessments on the potential traffic, infrastructural, environmental, landscape, heritage, geotechnical, drainage, sewerage, visual and air ventilation impacts etc. has been conducted and confirmed that there is no insurmountable technical problem in developing the representations sites for housing developments and their associated supporting GIC facilities;
- (b) while the Government will expedite public housing supply, it is equally important to continue to increase land for private housing to maintain the healthy and stable development of the private residential property market;
- (c) the proposed zonings, development intensities and building heights for the proposed housing developments and GIC facilities are considered appropriate and technically feasible. It is considered appropriate to rezone these sites for residential use and the associated GIC use to meet the pressing housing demand;

Traffic and Transport Considerations

- (d) traffic impact assessment concludes that road network in the area will be able to cope with the future traffic demand from the proposed developments. With the proposed road improvement works on critical junctions, no insurmountable problem to the nearby road network is envisaged;
- (e) regarding the public transport services, TD will closely monitor the construction progress and introduce bus routes and other public transport services in a timely manner so as to meet the commuting demand from the new population intake. As regards rail services, traffic impact assessment has confirmed that the proposed housing developments will not result in significant increase in patronage on the East Rail Line and Tuen Ma Line;
- (f) parking provision of the proposed housing developments will be provided according to the prevailing HKPSG and agreed with the relevant departments. On the parking provision in Ma On Shan, the Government will continue to optimize the use of land resources to provide public car-parking spaces in suitable

GIC facilities and public open space projects;

Environmental, Ecological and Landscape Aspects

- (g) environmental assessments conducted on the aspects of air quality, noise, water quality, ecology, waste management and land contamination for the proposed developments at both the construction and operation stages have concluded that with the adoption of the proposed mitigation measures, no insurmountable environmental impacts are envisaged;
- (h) the proposed housing developments and their associated infrastructure and facilities fall outside Ma On Shan Country Park and there is no direct impact on the Ma On Shan Country Park. The ecological impact assessment conducted has confirmed that the overall ecological impact, including both direct and indirect impact on habitats and species of conservation interest, will be acceptable after implementation of the mitigation measures. Further environmental review, will be conducted in the detailed investigation stage to confirm the ecological impact and propose necessary mitigation measures;
- (i) preliminary tree survey has been conducted and there is no Old and Valuable Trees identified within the representation sites. The submission and implementation of tree preservation and removal proposal would be carried out for the public housing sites. Tree Treatment will be in accordance with relevant government Technical Circulars;
- (j) landscape assessment conducted has confirmed that the overall residual landscape impacts of the proposed housing development are acceptable with mitigations during the construction and operation phases. Amenity planting, greening and sensitive design in relation to the local context will help integrate the proposed developments into the surrounding “GB” zone and no significant impact on Ma On Shan Country Park is envisaged;

Geotechnical and Construction Aspects and Risk Assessment

- (k) preliminary geotechnical appraisal conducted has confirmed that the proposed site formation and infrastructure works for the development sites are geotechnically feasible, and no insurmountable issue is anticipated from the geotechnical aspect. Detailed site investigation and natural terrain hazard study will be conducted to formulate the detailed design for the site formation works and the necessary natural terrain hazard mitigation works for the proposed developments;
- (l) the risk assessment on the Ma On Shan Water Treatment Works conducted has confirmed that the proposed developments at Site A and B1 will not lead to unacceptable overall risk.
- (m) the risk assessment associated with the operation of high pressure town gas pipeline conducted has confirmed that the proposed developments at Sites B1 and D would not result in unacceptable risks;

Visual and Air Ventilation Aspects

- (n) according to the Visual Impact Assessment and the Air Ventilation Assessment, the proposed housing developments with mitigation measures would not impose significant adverse visual and air ventilation impacts. Further mitigation measures will be considered at the detailed design stage to minimise the impacts;

Heritage Aspect on Former Ma On Shan Iron Mine

- (o) the proposed developments and their associated infrastructure and facilities will not encroach onto any graded historic buildings/structures associated with the former Ma On Shan Iron Mine (except a pier of the Mineral Preparation Plant). There is no graded historic building or new item pending grading assessment by the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) within Site G. Comprehensive heritage impact assessment will be conducted at the detailed design and investigation stage. Mitigation measures to alleviate any adverse heritage impact including the impact on the graded pier will be proposed;

Compensation and Rehousing Arrangement

- (p) Compensation and rehousing arrangements, land clearance and related land matters are outside the scope of the OZP, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the amendment sites. The Government will follow the established procedures for processing ex-gratia allowance and/or rehousing arrangements to the eligible residents, business operators and genuine farmers affected by clearance in accordance with the prevailing policies;

Provision of GIC Facilities, Recreational Facilities/Open Space and Other Supporting Facilities

- (q) the district and local open space and a range of GIC facilities are generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in Ma On Shan in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). The provision of hospital beds/clinics/ child care centre/ residential care home for the elderly/ community care services facility will be monitored by the relevant Government bureaux/ departments;

Public Consultation

- (r) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the zoning amendments have been duly followed. The views received are duly considered and responded to by the concerned Government bureaux/ departments in the process. The exhibition of the Outline Zoning Plan for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance. Relevant information on the technical feasibility of the representation sites has been made available in the public consultation;

Proposals for Alternative Sites

- (s) the alternative sites for the proposed housing developments and government, institution and community facilities are not supported as technical feasibility of these proposals are yet to be ascertained;

Item B2

- (t) the amendment of Item B2 is technical in nature to reflect the as-built land use; and

Item H

- (u) the amendment of Item H is technical in nature to rationalise the zoning boundary for the Sha Tin Cavern Sewage Treatment Works (STCSTW). An Environmental Permit (EP) was granted by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) for the construction and operation of the STCSTW Project in 2017, and the concerned landscape and environmental impacts have been duly addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment.

9. DECISION SOUGHT

- 9.1 The Board is invited to give consideration to the representations and the related comments and consider whether to propose/not to propose any amendments to the OZP to meet/partially meet the representations.
- 9.2 Should the Board decide that no amendment should be made to the draft OZP to meet the representations, Members are also invited to agree that the draft OZP, together with their respective Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

10. ATTACHMENTS

Annex I	Draft Ma On Shan OZP No. S/MOS/23 (reduced size)
Annex II	Schedule of Amendments to the Approved Ma On Shan OZP No. S/MOS/22
Annex III	List of Representers in respect of the Draft Ma On Shan OZP No. S/MOS/23
Annex IV	List of Commenters in respect of the Draft Ma On Shan OZP No. S/MOS/23
Annex Va	Summary of Representations and Government Departments' Responses

Annex Vb	Summary of Comments on Representations and Government Departments' Responses
Annexes VIa and VIb	Extract of the Minutes of Meeting of Rural and New Town Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board held on 21.8.2020 and 18.9.2020
Annex VII	Summary of Views Received at the Exchange Session on 10.11.2020 co-organised by Sha Tin District Office and Ma On Shan South Area Committee
Annexes VIIIa and VIIIb	Conceptual Layout Plans for Amendment Items A, B1, D and G
Annexes IXa to IXc	Viewpoints and Photomontages of the Proposed Housing Sites and Proposed GIC Sites
Annexes Xa to Xe	Proposed Traffic Improvement Works
Annexes XIa to XIe	Proposed Locations for Compensatory Planting
Annex XII	Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Ma On Shan
Plan H-1a to H-1c	Location plans of the representation sites
Plans H-2a to H-2d	Site plans of the representation sites
Plans H-3a to H-3d	Aerial photos
Plans H-4a to H-4e	Site photos
Plan H-5	Graded Historic Buildings
Plan H-6	Ungraded Structures Related to the Former Ma On Shan Iron Mine as Indicated by Representer and Commenter
Plan H-7	Alternative Sites for Housing Development and "Government, Institution or Community Facilities" Proposed by Representatives and Commenters