



圖例 NOTATION

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

土地用途及面積一覽表 SCHEDULE OF USES AND AREAS

USES	大約面積及百分比 APPROXIMATE AREA & %		用途
	公頃 HECTARES	% 百分比	
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	3.32	0.51	綜合發展區
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	22.69	3.51	住宅(甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	61.93	9.57	住宅(乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	12.78	1.97	住宅(丙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP D)	48.19	7.45	住宅(丁類)
VILLAGE TYPE DEVELOPMENT	59.86	9.25	鄉村式發展
INDUSTRIAL	14.80	2.29	工業
INDUSTRIAL (GROUP D)	10.51	1.62	工業(丁類)
OPEN STORAGE	4.75	0.73	露天貯物
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	14.35	2.22	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	0.99	0.15	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	0.44	0.07	其他指定用途
UNDETERMINED	101.04	15.61	未決定用途
GREEN BELT	129.22	19.97	綠化地帶
CONSERVATION AREA	129.11	19.95	自然保育區
DRAINAGE CHANNEL	2.43	0.38	排水渠
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	30.70	4.75	主要道路等
TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	647.11	100.00	規劃範圍總面積

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

**核准圖編號 S/YL-TYST/10 的修訂
AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/YL-TYST/10**

AMENDMENTS EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE 按照城市規劃條例第5條展示的修訂

AMENDMENT ITEM A1		修訂項目 A 1 項
AMENDMENT ITEM A2		修訂項目 A 2 項
AMENDMENT ITEM B		修訂項目 B 項
AMENDMENT ITEM C		修訂項目 C 項
AMENDMENT ITEM D		修訂項目 D 項

(參看附表)
(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

2017年9月29日 按照城市規劃條例第5條展示的
核准圖編號 S/YL-TYST/10 的修訂
AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/YL-TYST/10 EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON 29 SEPTEMBER 2017

Ms Jacinta K. C. Woo 胡潔貞女士
SECRETARY 城市規劃委員會秘書

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



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

圖則編號
PLAN No. S/YL-TYST/11

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO THE
APPROVED TONG YAN SAN TSUEN
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/YL-TYST/10
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

- Item A1 – Rezoning of a piece of land to the west of Long Tin Road and to the north of the Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange from “Open Space” (“O”), “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A)1” (“R(A)1”).
- Item A2 – Rezoning of a strip of land at the eastern boundary of Villa Sunshine from “O” to “R(B)1”.
- Item B – Rezoning of a piece of land to the south of Tan Kwai Tsuen South Fresh Water Service Reservoir from “Green Belt” (“GB”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “R(A)2”.
- Item C – Rezoning of a piece of land at Sha Tseng Road from “G/IC” to “R(B)1”.
- Item D – Rezoning of two pieces of land to the south of Park Villa from “G/IC” to “R(B)1”.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Revision to Remarks (a) of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone to specify the development restrictions are for land designated “R(A)”.
- (b) Revisions to the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone to incorporate the development restrictions for the “R(A)1” and “R(A)2” sub-zones and a new clause on calculating the relevant site area of the “R(A)1” and “R(A)2” sub-zones.
- (c) Revision to the exemption clause for gross floor area/plot ratio/site coverage calculation in the Remarks of the Notes for “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”), “R(A)”, “R(B)”, “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) and “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) zones.
- (d) Revision to Remarks (a)(ix) of the Notes for the “CDA” zone to replace the submission of a traffic impact assessment by a traffic and transport impact assessment.
- (e) Revision to the Chinese translation of the user term ‘Flat’ from ‘分層樓宇’ to ‘分層住宅’ in the Notes for the “CDA”, “R(A)”, “R(B)”, “R(C)”, “R(D)”, “Village Type Development”, “G/IC” and “GB” zones, in

accordance with the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.

- (f) Revision to the Chinese translation of the term ‘maximum plot ratio and site coverage’ from ‘最高地積比率和上蓋面積’ to ‘最高地積比率和最大上蓋面積’ in the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)”, “R(B)” and “I(D)” zones.
- (g) Revision to the Chinese translation of Remarks (b) of the Notes for the “R(D)” zone in accordance with the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.

Town Planning Board

29 September 2017

**Lists of Representers and Commenters in respect of
the Draft Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-TYST/11
《唐人新村分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/YL-TYST/11》
申述人和提意見人名單**

Representers 申述人

Representation No. 申述個案編號	Name of 'Representer' 申述人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R1	Johnson Cheung
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R2	Amy Liao
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R3	Lily Wong
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R4	Leung Kwong Choi
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R5	MTR Corporation Limited 香港鐵路有限公司
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R6	Lau Siu Mei
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R7	Lam Pui Tak
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R8	Tse Kwok Wai
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R9	Cheung Wai Sze
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R10	Lam Mei Ka Shirley
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R11	Chak Wai Ting
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R12	Johnson Koon Wan Cheung
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R13	Kwan Kin Kei
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R14	Lily Lai Lai Wong
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R15	Mak King Fai
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R16	Lau Yin Yi
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R17	Wong Tak Chun
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R18	Yuen Wing Yee Candy
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R19	Wong Tak Kin
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R20	Lee Andrea
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R21	Wong Kwai Ying
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R22	Wong Tak Yan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R23	謝思明
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R24	Wong Kit Yung
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R25	Ho Chi Ho
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R26	Li Yanjie
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R27	Malla Robin Kumar
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R28	Wong Sze Man

Representation No. 申述個案編號	Name of 'Representer' 申述人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R29	王天也
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R30	鍾佩玲
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R31	梁志光
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R32	梁志強
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R33	梁國韜
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R34	梁佩晴
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R35	梁志明
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R36	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R37	黃瑞鵬
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R38	David Phu
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R39	劉潤林
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R40	Fong Cham Kwan Eric
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R41	Leung Mui Mui
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R42	李穎然
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R43	Poon Kwok Ling
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R44	潘九
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R45	Luk Po Chun
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R46	梁家泰
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R47	梁瑞宏
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R48	周宇婷
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R49	方美玲
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R50	張沛燊
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R51	何美琼
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R52	廖小紅
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R53	劉燕雲
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R54	Lai Po Chu
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R55	朱俊超
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R56	Chang Yu Wen
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R57	韓桂妹
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R58	黃官文
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R59	黃斯豪
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R60	蕭鳳英
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R61	Lai Mei Mei
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R62	Lau Ka Keung
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R63	Lai Shuk Ching

Representation No. 申述個案編號	Name of 'Representer' 申述人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R64	Tse Sheung Wan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R65	Cheng Lai Wan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R66	Lam Cheong Yim
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R67	Lam Yu Ting
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R68	Ku Shu Yat Susanna
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R69	Frankie Wong
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R70	傅連帶
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R71	傅琮帶
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R72	蔡煥政
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R73	張利國
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R74	賴升輝
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R75	Kwan Ka Ho Mike
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R76	姚子裕
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R77	Lau Ka Wai
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R78	So Po Yu Elsie
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R79	Wu Kin Sun Alex
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R80	Ma Chung Wai
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R81	Ho Hang Fung
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R82	吳錫祈
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R83	庾偉釗
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R84	周嘉兒
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R85	陳美好
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R86	Tang Ho Yin
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R87	Wong Lai Yin
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R88	Tse Hoi Yan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R89	Wong Ka Ho
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R90	Lee Chi Wah
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R91	Wong Hoi Ki
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R92	Hui Ka Kit
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R93	吳永昌
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R94	Leung Tsz Yan Keiko
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R95	譚婉寧
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R96	Eric Yeung
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R97	Choi Kam Chi
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R98	Wong Hok Hin

Representation No. 申述個案編號	Name of 'Representer' 申述人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R99	杜日輝
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R100	朱美儀
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R101	Leung Lap Man
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R102	何錫洋
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R103	Chui Siu Tong
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R104	程怡信
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R105	Leung Ka Wai
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R106	Wong Cheuk Yin
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R107	Cheung Ko Chi
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R108	吳嘉桂
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R109	Lai Ching Mei
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R110	盧嘉媚
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R111	Fung Nga Kwan Sandra
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R112	陳智忠
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R113	洪咏彤
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R114	Fan Man Yuen
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R115	Yeung Ka Yan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R116	余麗美
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R117	Wong Chun Kwok
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R118	Chau Kai Lun
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R119	Chan Hon Tim
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R120	湯子良
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R121	陳明燊
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R122	吳小明
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R123	趙少雲
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R124	陳啟宇
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R125	Heung Yee Kuk New Territories 新界鄉議局
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R126	Yuen Long District Council 元朗區議會
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R127	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R128	The Conservancy Association 長春社
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R129	丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R130	Wright Fu

Representation No. 申述個案編號	Name of 'Representer' 申述人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R131	林秀紅
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R132	馮滔
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R133	林儀仔
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R134	李惠嫦
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R135	李日明
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R136	李敏賢
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R137	張玲儀
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R138	王利洪
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R139	石燕基
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R140	黃杰強
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R141	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R142	蘇志標
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R143	王靜怡
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R144	林彩群
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R145	方宇文
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R146	王成會
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R147	曾健華
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R148	伍艷嫦
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R149	李晶
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R150	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R151	Yuen Siu Mee
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R152	劉映娣
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R153	黃志強
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R154	李冠南
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R155	麥美儀
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R156	何麗芬
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R157	易明慧
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R158	李杏英
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R159	龐則潔
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R160	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R161	陳寶娟
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R162	蘇伯煊
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R163	葉麗儀
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R164	李建清
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R165	曾國卿

Representation No. 申述個案編號	Name of 'Representer' 申述人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R166	Nigel Lai Chong Lam
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R167	Mary Meng Di Lam
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R168	周勝
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R169	周興仔
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R170	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R171	許啟龍
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R172	梁少恒
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R173	蔡燕媚
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R174	張珍儀
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R175	許艷珍
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R176	鄭娟梅
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R177	Kung Hing Wan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R178	李朝亨
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R179	馬海善
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R180	陳金娣
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R181	蔡燕青
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R182	蔡仕文
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R183	鍾潤財
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R184	鍾乃聰
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R185	鍾天棟
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R186	簡立
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R187	Li Ah Wu、洪玉佩
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R188	洪玉佩
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R189	Li Ah Wu
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R190	彭國良
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R191	丘德安
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R192	黃小燕
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R193	羅崇傑
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R194	方家聲
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R195	顏憲坤
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R196	李強
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R197	Chan Wai Sum
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R198	秦詩韻
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R199	黃小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R200	李文怡

Representation No. 申述個案編號	Name of 'Representer' 申述人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R201	李先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R202	劉女士
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-R203	The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited 香港中華煤氣有限公司

Commenters 提意見人

Comments on Representation No. 意見編號	Name of 'Committer' 提意見人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C1	Miss Li
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C2	王女士
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C3	Mr. Yao
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C4	Mrs. Wang
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C5	李小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C6	Miss Mude
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C7	黃先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C8	呂夢竹
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C9	呂小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C10	丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C11	余小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C12	呂小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C13	魏小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C14	于小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C15	李小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C16	Tara Wei
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C17	黃先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C18	Wenny Li
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C19	莫富棋
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C20	李燁棋
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C21	Thomas
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C22	方宇文
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C23	伍艷嫦
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C24	張宗勇
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C25	易良紅
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C26	方英龍
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C27	江炎堯
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C28	譚偉明
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C29	朱鳳英
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C30	郭先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C31	于美德
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C32	張錦文
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C33	黃麗君

Comments on Representation No. 意見編號	Name of 'Committer' 提意見人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C34	彭淑婷
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C35	劉禮容
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C36	林雲
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C37	林煒
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C38	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C39	林博
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C40	王時思
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C41	李麗芳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C42	黃創達
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C43	李奕昌
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C44	李健清
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C45	李忻琪
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C46	陳月珍
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C47	彭清梅
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C48	梁世傑
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C49	何桂珍
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C50	李先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C51	鄒小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C52	張小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C53	王小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C54	羅女士
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C55	沈小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C56	陳先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C57	沈小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C58	伍's
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C59	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C60	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C61	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C62	鍾先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C63	方太
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C64	張國群
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C65	梁業清
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C66	吳超芬
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C67	關阿好
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C68	何珊娟

Comments on Representation No. 意見編號	Name of ‘Committer’ 提意見人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C69	劉玉枝
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C70	Hilary
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C71	周興仔
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C72	蘇銜香
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C73	周子皓
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C74	鍾汶樂
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C75	湯彥珩
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C76	沒有提供姓名 No Name Provided
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C77	沒有提供姓名 No Name Provided
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C78	沒有提供姓名 No Name Provided
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C79	沒有提供姓名 No Name Provided
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C80	沒有提供姓名 No Name Provided
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C81	沒有提供姓名 No Name Provided
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C82	沒有提供姓名 No Name Provided
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C83	沒有提供姓名 No Name Provided
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C84	鄧震奎
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C85	鄭穎芯
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C86	楊金蘭
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C87	楊金蓮
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C88	姚偉強
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C89	姚安琪
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C90	章女士
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C91	Ralph
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C92	賀女士
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C93	Jenny
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C94	洪小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C95	黃瑞
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C96	陳鋒
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C97	李 sir
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C98	吳標
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C99	林存金
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C100	林文依
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C101	黃麗珍
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C102	陳友寧
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C103	李惠霞

Comments on Representation No. 意見編號	Name of ‘Committer’ 提意見人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C104	鄭爾新
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C105	Eric
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C106	王女士
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C107	Peter
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C108	李光旭
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C109	余帆
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C110	偉
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C111	基
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C112	翁
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C113	梁群歡
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C114	文
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C115	郭女士
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C116	宜
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C117	方小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C118	梁
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C119	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C120	孫女士
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C121	Marone
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C122	朱女
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C123	阿樟
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C124	Prey Chan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C125	丘留娣
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C126	陳利英
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C127	張莉芳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C128	張利紅
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C129	張莉霞
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C130	溫鳳友
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C131	陳紅
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C132	張新明
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C133	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C134	江運平
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C135	丘駿友
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C136	丘駿豪
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C137	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C138	丘小梅

Comments on Representation No. 意見編號	Name of 'Committer' 提意見人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C139	丘如昌
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C140	梁小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C141	蔡先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C142	楊先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C143	王麗京
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C144	羅先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C145	王先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C146	胡先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C147	胡小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C148	王子庭
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C149	許秀琴
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C150	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C151	Name Illegible 姓名不詳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C152	蔡先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C153	羅偉忠
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C154	蔡龍華
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C155	吳玉珍
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C156	郭麗珍
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C157	吳翠杰
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C158	方紅麗
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C159	陳虹
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C160	李雲
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C161	王曼浪
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C162	李太
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C163	阿順
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C164	阿康
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C165	阿文
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C166	桃女士
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C167	英姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C168	謝先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C169	黃小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C170	羅旺好
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C171	詩敏
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C172	鳳女士
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C173	黃先生

Comments on Representation No. 意見編號	Name of 'Committer' 提意見人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C174	芷妍
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C175	陳漢文
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C176	劉小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C177	Leung Ka Wai
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C178	強
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C179	黃小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C180	王兵
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C181	陳濟富
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C182	畢新龍
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C183	陳聖釧
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C184	梁子金
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C185	王飛
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C186	林道銘
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C187	張添明
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C188	江金德
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C189	吳作棟
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C190	游漢文
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C191	鄭富窮
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C192	廖文迪
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C193	楊自雲
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C194	薛風華
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C195	葉金星
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C196	劉連芝
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C197	俊宇
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C198	毛迪華
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C199	朱家恆
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C200	彭淑梅
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C201	Wong Kam Yuen
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C202	Lai Chun
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C203	彭國良
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C204	鄭昭明
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C205	鄭榮鎬
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C206	楊秀珍
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C207	陳穎彤
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C208	李朗風

Comments on Representation No. 意見編號	Name of ‘Committer’ 提意見人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C209	Chelsea Cheung
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C210	張善怡
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C211	To Hiu Nam
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C212	Leung Chi Kong
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C213	吳偉彬
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C214	何先生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C215	楊繕而
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C216	Lee Man Ho
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C217	張錦江
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C218	蕭朗宜
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C219	Sue Yeung
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C220	Kelvin Wu
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C221	Au Yeung Wing Yi
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C222	Tsoi Hing
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C223	劉子賢
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C224	May Yip
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C225	黃穎嫻
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C226	Li Lok Yan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C227	陳君行
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C228	陳綺茵
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C229	歐陽芷琳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C230	方履慧
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C231	Fong Lok Man
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C232	杜倩怡
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C233	Franko Lam
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C234	Chan Nga Hin Jessie
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C235	Yip Wing Shan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C236	陳楚天
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C237	梁維倩
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C238	Ingrid Jim
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C239	Wu Kwan Ho
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C240	李詠生
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C241	Miss Nie
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C242	Mario Chan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C243	莫榮鍾

Comments on Representation No. 意見編號	Name of 'Committer' 提意見人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C244	溫悅華
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C245	洪菲雅
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C246	Leanne Lo
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C247	Tsui Ka Man
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C248	徐霖
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C249	羅子鏗
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C250	Ip Tin Wai Jacqueline
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C251	Leung Shu Ting
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C252	Li Elim
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C253	一群關心丹桂村和綠化地帶的香港人
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C254	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C255	The Conservancy Association 長春社
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C256	土地正義聯盟
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C257	Simon
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C258	Mr. Cheng
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C259	s. Cheng
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C260	黃小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C261	黃小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C262	譚小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C263	胡小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C264	鄧小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C265	張小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C266	鄧小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C267	何小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C268	李小姐
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C269	Lam Wing-hong
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C270	Jerry Chan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C271	Mr. Chan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C272	沒有提供姓名 No Name Provided
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C273	Chun Sze Wan
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C274	沒有提供姓名 No Name Provided
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C275	Nancy Chun
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C276	沒有提供姓名 No Name Provided
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C277	Hannah Chu

Comments on Representation No. 意見編號	Name of 'Committer' 提意見人名稱
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C278	吳巧程
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C279	Enoch Cheng
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C280	馮世權
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C281	Michelle Sher
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C282	高顯寧
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C283	林國棟
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C284	李瑞謙
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C285	何凱琳
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C286	梁雪華
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C287	Chantelle Suen
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C288	Gloria Chaung
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C289	廖嘉儀
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C290	Jane A Che
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C291	苗士
TPB/R/S/YL-TYST/11-C292	許文壕

**Summary of Representations and Comments to Representations and the Planning Department's Responses
in respect of the Draft Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY-TYST/11**

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
R1 to R3 and R11 to R28	R1 Johnson Cheung R2 Amy Liao R3 Lily Wong R11 Chak Wai Ting R12 Johnson Koon Wan Cheung R13 Kwan Kin Kei R14 Lily Lai Lai Wong R15 Mak King Fai R16 Lau Yin Yi R17 Wong Tak Chun R18 Yuen Wing Yee Candy	Support Items A1, A2 and B but Oppose the Use of the Rezoning Sites for Public Housing Development Only. <u>Major Grounds of Representations</u> <i>Housing Mix</i> (a) Efficient use of land resources through rezoning for higher development density. The increase in development density can be supported by enhanced infrastructures. (b) The sites should not be used exclusively for public housing purpose. Due consideration should be given to the existing private land ownership and the owners' legitimate expectation. It will be unfair if private ownerships are given up to facilitate public housing development. There is a community need for land for private residential development. The Government should strike a balance between public housing and private housing and to establish a reasonable diversity in housing types.	(a) Noted. (b) Whether the residential development is implemented by public or private initiatives is a matter of implementation and not related to the land use proposals on OZP. Notwithstanding the above, as advised by the Housing Department (HD), the public housing demand is acute. As at end-March 2018, there were about 153 300 general applications for public rental housing, and about 119,000 non-elderly one-person applications under the Quota and Points System. The average waiting time for general applicant is 5.1 years. Based on the latest projection under the Long Term Housing Strategy (LTHS) Annual Progress Report 2017, the Government's public housing target is 280,000 units for the ten-year period from

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
	<p>R19 Wong Tak Kin</p> <p>R20 Lee Andrea</p> <p>R21 Wong Kwai Ying</p> <p>R22 Wong Tak Yan</p> <p>R23 謝思明</p> <p>R24 Wong Kit Yung</p> <p>R25 Ho Chi Ho</p> <p>R26 Li Yanjie</p> <p>R27 Malla Robin Kumar</p> <p>R28 Wong Sze Man</p>	<p>(c) It is considered that private developments can be implemented in a shorter period of time, which will benefit more users in a shorter time. Community facilities such as residential care home for the elderly, children's day care centres, kindergarten and schools, home starters units and neighbourhood amenities can also be provided by private sector in a shorter period of</p>	<p>2018-19 to 2027-28, and the split between public rental housing and subsidized sale flat is 200,000 and 80,000 units respectively. As of December 2017, assuming that all sites identified (including the Item A1 site to the west of Long Tin Road (LB site) and the Item B site to the south of Tan Kwai Tsuen South Fresh Water Service Reservoir (TKT site)) can be smoothly delivered on time for housing development, they would produce about 237,000 public housing units for the ten-year period from 2018-19 to 2027-28, which still lags behind the ten-year supply target of 280,000 units. For this reason, HD is still in dire need of sufficient land for public housing development to meet the LTHS's public housing target and there is a genuine need to use both the LB and TKS sites for public housing purpose. The representers' proposals to use part or whole of these two sites for private housing development will affect the public housing production and exacerbate the shortfall.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to the responses to ground (b) under sub-heading "Housing Mix" of R1 to R3 and R11 to R28 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>time than by public initiatives.</p> <p>(d) It is considered that the planning intention for allowing public housing development only is unfair and incomprehensive; and it is inappropriate to specify such important intention in the non-statutory and inconspicuous Explanatory Statement (ES) only (R3 only).</p>	<p>(d) Whilst the ES does not constitute part of the statutory plan, it is a document published by the Town Planning Board (the Board) to assist an understanding of the land use proposals on the OZP and reflects the planning intention and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings. It is considered appropriate to specify the intention for using the sites for public housing purpose in the ES.</p>
R4	R4 Leung Kwong Choi	<p>Support Item A1 and B but Oppose the Use of the Rezoning Sites for Public Housing Development Only.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p><i>Housing Mix</i></p> <p>(a) It is suggested let private land owners to participate in housing development in the “Residential (Group A)” zone and keeping the public housing development to around 40%</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (b) under sub-heading “Housing Mix” of R1 to R3 and R11 to R28 above.</p> <p>(b) With the public housing development on the LB and TKT sites, the ratio of public to private housing units in TYST OZP will be about 70% to 30%. In the TYST area, there will also be Yuen Long South (YLS) development to be rezoned. If YLS is taken into account, the ratio will then become 65% to 35% (public to private). The overall proposed housing mix in the area is considered reasonable.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
R5	<p>R5 香港鐵路有限公司 MTR Corporation Limited</p>	<p>Representations providing Views on Item A1.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p><i>Light Rail Noise</i></p> <p>(a) Noise from Light Rail operations may affect the future occupants of the LB site. The Hong Kong Housing Authority should conduct detailed noise review regarding the potential noise impact from the Light Rail to the satisfaction of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), and implement adequate noise mitigation measures at their own cost and to the satisfaction of EPD. The Board should impose related development requirements through Planning Briefs, statutory plans and/or land administration documents.</p>	<p>(a) The Preliminary Environmental Review (PER) of Site Formation and Infrastructural Works for the Development at Long Bin, Yuen Long-Feasibility Study (LB Study) reveals that on a preliminary basis, the future residential development at LB site will not be subject to insurmountable environmental impacts including rail noise with suitable mitigation measures in place, such as noise barriers, acoustic windows/balconies and acoustic fins. An Environmental Assessment Study, including the assessment of rail noise, will be carried out by HD at the subsequent detailed design stage to determine the appropriate mitigation measures based on the latest development proposals for EPD's agreement. Noise mitigation measures such as noise barrier, acoustic windows/balconies, acoustic fin and air conditioning system for non-domestic buildings will be incorporated in the proposed public housing development where necessary to ensure compliance with relevant criteria at all Noise Sensitive Receivers.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
			<p>(b) While the PER in the LB Study and Site Formation and Infrastructural Works for the Development near Tan Kwai Tsuen, Yuen Long-Feasibility Study (TKT Study) has ascertained that the proposed housing developments would not be subject to adverse environmental impacts, a further environmental review, including the assessment of traffic and rail noise, will be carried out at the subsequent Investigation, Design and Construction (IDC) stage to determine detailed mitigation measures based on the latest development proposals for the EPD's agreement.</p>
<p>R6 to R10</p>	<p>R6 Lau Siu Mei R7 Lam Pui Tak R8 Tse Kwok Wai R9 Cheung Wai Sze R10 Lam Mei Ka Shirley</p>	<p>Representations providing Views on Items A1, A2 and B.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p><i>Housing Mix</i></p> <p>(a) There is a community need for land for private residential developments. A steady supply for private housing land is favorable to the sustainable and healthy development of the property market</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to grounds (b) and (d) under sub-heading "Housing Mix" of R1 to R3 and R11 to R28 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/RSYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
R29 to R124	96 Individuals (Names of Representers are shown at Annex III)	Oppose Items A1, A2 and B and the use of the Rezoning Sites for Public Housing Only. <u>Major Grounds of Representations</u> <i>Housing Mix</i> (a) Please refer to grounds (a), (b) and (c) under sub-heading “Housing Mix” of R1 to R3 and R11 to R28 above. (b) Please refer to ground (a) under sub-heading “Housing Mix” of R6 to R10 above.	(a) Please refer to the responses to grounds (a), (b), (c) under sub-heading “Housing Mix” of R1 to R3 and R11 to R28 above. (b) Please refer to the responses to grounds (b) and (d) under sub-heading “Housing Mix” of R1 to R3 and R11 to R28 above.
R125	R125 新界鄉議局 Heung Yee Kuk New Territories	Oppose Items A1 and B. <u>Major Grounds of Representations</u> <i>Transport and Traffic</i> (a) The traffic flow at the Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange, which is the major route of the Yuen Long South area, is already very heavy. Vehicles from other districts also need to pass through Tong Yan San Tsuen to other parts of Yuen Long. New developments would aggravate the problem. The Government should properly solve the problem.	(a) Preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessments (TTIAs) have been conducted as part of the LB Study and TKT Study. The findings, as agreed by Transport Department, conclude that even taking into account other major planned development proposals including Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area (HSKNDA) and Yuen Long South (YLS) development, the major road network in the area, including Castle Peak Road, Yuen Long Highway, Shun Tat Street, Tin Shui Wai West Interchange and Tong Yan San Tsuen

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
			<p>Interchange as mentioned by the representers, could still be able to accommodate the traffic flow generated by the new developments. With the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, there is no insurmountable technical problem arising from the proposed public housing developments.</p> <p>(b) In addition, the Government has plans to embark on the following traffic studies to meet the longer term development needs in North West New Territories (NWNT):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• in view of the long-term development in NWNT, the Government has started a feasibility study in May 2018, for completion in 2020, on a new strategic route (Route 11) to cope with the increase in traffic demand brought by the future population growth in the NWNT;• the Government will take forward the “Strategic Studies on Railways and Major Roads beyond 2030” in light of the “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” Study to carry out studies on whether it is necessary to construct a new heavy rail to directly connect North West New Territories to urban areas to meet the rail service demand; and

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p><i>Government, institution and community (GIC) Facilities and Open Space</i></p> <p>(b) The Planning Department (PlanD) proposes a lot of public housing developments in the Ping Shan Heung area, including the LB and TKT sites. The estimated population of the two proposed public housing developments will exceed 50,000. It will substantially increase the population of the Yuen Long District, however, the Government has not planned for enough supporting facilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Government will strive to seek resources to commence a feasibility study in 2018 on design improvements for busy junctions to alleviate the need for Light Rail to share road with other road users. After completing the feasibility study, the Government will look for measures to improve the mode of operation of Light Rail along Yuen Long Main Road in the long-run. <p>(c) On the local level, the preliminary TTIA's have proposed road improvement works to cope with the traffic arising from the public housing developments (Plan H-5a).</p> <p>(d) In finalizing the public housing proposals, the Social Welfare Department (SWD)'s view will be sought on the provision of the social welfare facilities to meet the local needs. According to HD's preliminary proposal, GIC facilities including a kindergarten, a primary school and social welfare facilities such as residential care home for the elderly, care centres for child or elderly, youth services centre, occupational rehabilitation centre, hostels, etc. could be provided in each of the LB and TKT sites and a community hall could be provided in the TKT site. In the detailed</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
			<p>design stage, HD would further liaise with SWD and the Education Bureau on exact provisions and locations of such facilities.</p> <p>(e) The provision of GIC facilities within the planning scheme area of the OZP have been assessed. Based on the HKPSG (Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines) requirements and a planned population of about 72,000 persons (including the estimated population from the proposed public housing developments at LB and TKT sites), the GIC facilities and open space provision are generally sufficient except secondary school (-29.59 classrooms), hospital beds (-396.27 beds), sports centre (-1.1), leisure centre (-1.43), as well as district open space (-7.13ha) (Annex IX).</p> <p>(f) According to HKPSG, site reservation for secondary schools should be made on district basis. In this regard, there is a surplus in secondary school provision in Yuen Long New Town (+167.84 classrooms), which falls within the same district as TYST and could help to meet the demand in TYST. Whilst EDB does not request for reservation of new secondary school site in TYST, it will keep reviewing the latest projections and monitoring closely the supply and demand of school places in the district.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
			<p>(g) On hospital bed provision, the Hospital Authority (HA) plans its services on a cluster basis. The New Territories West (NTW) cluster covers the service requirement from residents in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long Districts, including TYST area. In service planning, HA takes into account a number of factors in planning its services, including the increase of service demand as a result of population growth and demographic changes, advancement of medical technology, manpower availability as well as organisation of services of the clusters and hospitals. HA monitors the service utilisation and updates the service demand projection regularly according to the latest population projection parameters and development plan of the Government.</p> <p>(h) As stated in the Clinical Services Plan for NTW Cluster published in 2017, Tin Shui Wai Hospital (TSWH) has commenced operation in the first quarter of 2017 by phases. It will provide 300 hospital beds when it comes into full operation. In the long run, the HA would consider making use of the adjoining site of TSWH for future expansion of the hospital to further increase service capacity. The construction of an extension to the Operating Theatre Block of Tuen Mun Hospital, which is the major acute hospital in the</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
			<p>cluster, is underway. At the same time, in the light of an increasing demand for healthcare services, the Government has invited HA to start planning the second 10-year hospital development plan. The Government has also reserved a site at HSKNDA for the construction of a new hospital to meet the growing healthcare demand of the population in NTW.</p> <p>(i) For sports centre and leisure centre, the shortfall could be served by the surplus provision in Yuen Long New Town in the proximity (+2.09 upon full development) (Plan H-6).</p> <p>(j) The surplus of District Open Space provision in Yuen Long New Town (+9.57 ha upon full development) could also help meet the shortfall in Tong Yan San Tsuen (TYST) area. In this regard, it should be noted that unlike local open space to provide recreation for local residents close to home, district open space is to serve a wider catchment. In fact, the Yuen Long Park is accessible by various public transports (Plan H-6). Local open space will also be planned in the public housing developments in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG to serve the local residents.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
R126	<p>R126 元朗區議會 Yuen Long District Council</p>	<p>Oppose All Items.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p><i>Transport and Traffic</i></p> <p>(a) The increased population will worsen the current traffic condition in Yuen Long District, which is already saturated and increasingly congested. Traffic congestion will be aggravated by large-scale planned developments in the Hung Shui Kiu and the Yuen Long South. It is not reasonable to start another project while HSKNDA is still developing. It is impossible to allow hundreds of thousands people to live in this area.</p> <p>(b) There are only 2 train compartments for the Light Rail (LRT) and the capacity of West Rail Line (WRL) is already saturated. Thus, the capacity of the WRL/LRT cannot cope with the development of TKT site.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (a) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R125 above.</p> <p>(b) On the adequacy of the public transport service, starting from 2016, trains of the WRL have been progressively changing from 7-car to 8-car, representing an increase in at least 14% capacity comparing with the capacity in 2015. After mid-2019, subject to the actual patronage, the fleet size of the WRL can be further increased until reaching its ultimate capacity by operating with 8-car trains with an hourly frequency of 28 at each direction. On this basis, the carrying capacity of the WRL will increase by 60% comparing with the capacity in 2015. Taking into account all the major planned developments in the NWNT including the two proposed public housing sites</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
			<p>at LB and TKT, it is estimated that the patronage of WRL would be about 59,000 passengers per hour per direction during morning peak hour in 2031. Based on an assumption of 4 or 6 ppsm, and hourly frequency of 28 at each direction, the carry capacity of WRL will be about 53,000/hr or 75,000/hr respectively. With the latest change in plot ratio, there will be an additional loading to the WRL in the peak hour of around 450 pax/hr in 2031 from the LB and TKT sites, i.e. an increase of about 0.7% on top of the aforementioned total estimated patronage of 59,000/hr in 2031 which is considered negligible.</p> <p>(c) On the bus services, according to the TTIA's, a PTI will be provided under both public housing developments and that there will be bus and feeder bus services for the future residents to commute to and from main urban areas, Town Centre and Industrial Estate in Yuen Long New Town, HSKNDA and Tuen Mun, either direct or through interchange with other bus or rail services. The Government will monitor the demand arising from new developments and timely plan for enhancing the services to meet any such demand. Overall speaking, the impact of the two proposed housing sites on the existing public transport system is considered manageable with the proposed additional services.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>(c) For the LB site, vehicles have to pass through Tong Yan San Tsuen Road and San Hi Tsuen Street to the Yuen Long Town Centre. These roads are already saturated, especially in the morning peak hours. The other proposed route is from LB site via Long Tin Road through the bridge to the highways then to Yuen Long and Kowloon. Yet, this route is indirect and cannot be acceptable.</p> <p>(d) For the TKT site, even though there will be a proposed vehicular access to Castle Peak Road, vehicles will also have to pass through Tong Yan San Tsuen Road, which will cause traffic congestion. Also, the proposed road layout of the development in TKT site cannot ease the traffic load of the existing Tan Kwai Tsuen Road.</p>	<p>(d) For LB site, road improvement works include modification of existing U-turn lane at Long Tin Road, proposed slip roads connecting from Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange to Ma Fung Ling Road and from Ma Fung Ling Road to Long Tin Road (Plan H-5b). The proposed ingress/egress point for LB Phase 1 development at the westbound of Castle Peak Road – Ping Shan (Plan H-5b) is similar to the existing arrangement of the Long Bin Interim Housing, while the access point to LB Phase 2 will be at northbound of Long Tin Road. Improvement works at the U-turn lane at Long Tin Road (Plan H-5b) are proposed to alleviate the potential traffic impact due to the proposed public housing development.</p> <p>(e) For TKT site, a new single 2-lane public road running alongside the eastern side of Yuen Long Highway is proposed to connect the proposed public housing development to the existing road networks. This proposed road will connect to the existing Shun Tat Street at its southern end near the existing North West New Territories Refuse Transfer Station (NWNT RTS) and extend northwards to connect with the existing slip roads at Tin Shui Wai West Interchange (Plans H-5a and H-5c).</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>(e) Slip roads or flyovers should be constructed to connect the proposed public housing developments with major trunk routes, such as Yuen Long Highway direct to ease the traffic congestion.</p>	<p>(f) On the concern on the traffic impact on the existing Tan Kwai Tsuen Road and Tong Yan San Tsuen Road, the proposed vehicular access routes for TKT site will provide a more direct and convenient route for road users to reach Castle Peak Road (Plans H-5a and H-5d). In comparison, the existing Tan Kwai Tsuen Road and Tong Yan San Tsuen Road should be less preferable routes to vehicles going to Castle Peak Road from TKT site and vice versa. According to the preliminary TTIA, the anticipated additional traffic flow on Tan Kwai Tsuen Road due to the proposed public housing development at TKT site is negligible.</p> <p>(g) It should be noted that the LB site already enjoys direct access to Castle Peak Road and Long Tin Road with slip roads connecting to Yuen Long Highway. The TKT study had explored the option for connecting the site to Yuen Long Highway but found that substantial modification to Yuen Long Highway and extensive land resumption would be required. Whereas, the currently proposed access arrangement for TKT site is technically feasible with less disruption to the surrounding. Both LB and TKT would not create unacceptable traffic impact on the road network.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p><i>GIC Facilities and Open Space</i></p> <p>(f) The overall plot ratio of the LB site has been increased from 6 to 6.5 and the proposed flat numbers are increased by two or three thousands. With the increase in flat and population, Item A1 (i.e. LB site) will turn the developments in the area from medium to high density. However, other amendments like Items B, C and D involve rezoning of "G/IC" sites for residential use.</p> <p>(g) The Government should increase the provision of open space, recreational and community facilities, as well as better utilise land zoned "G/IC" and "O" to improve the living quality.</p> <p><i>Rezoning of "GB" for Residential Development</i></p> <p>(h) In the past, "GB" zone could not be used as residential development. However, the Government seems no longer to uphold the principle now.</p>	<p>(h) Please refer to the responses to ground (b) under sub-heading "GIC Facilities and Open Space" of R125 above.</p> <p>(i) Please refer to the responses to ground (b) under sub-heading "GIC Facilities and Open Space" of R125 above.</p> <p>(j) As committed in the Policy Address announced in October 2017, to increase land supply is a must, be it about people's home ownership problems or improving their living conditions. Over the years, the Government has proposed many strategies for increasing land supply including reclamation outside the Victoria Harbour, and is actively pursuing New Development Area projects which cover brownfield sites such as HSKNDA.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
			<p>(k) Whilst a total of 460,000 housing units are required in the coming ten years according to the Long Term Housing Strategy, land for only about 417,000 units has been identified so far. As explained in the responses to ground (b) of under sub-heading “Housing Mix” of R1 to R3 and R11 to R28 above, taking into account the site identified and assuming a timely delivery, there will still be a shortfall of at least 43,000 public housing units up to 2027-28. As such, there is a need to continue the effort to increase land supply through a multi-pronged approach in the meanwhile. In this regard, the most immediate and effective way to augment housing land supply in the short to medium term is to make more optimal use of the developed areas in the existing urban areas and new towns, as well as nearby land in the vicinity of existing infrastructure.</p> <p>(l) Therefore, the Government has been carrying out various land use reviews, including review on “GB” sites, with a view to identifying suitable sites for residential use. The TKT site is located at the fringe of “GB” in close proximity to developed area of Tan Kwai Tsuen area and adjacent to the Yuen Long Highway; and will also be close to the future YLS development. The site is considered suitable and having potential for housing development. The TKT Study has ascertained that the TKT site is technically feasible for public housing development.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>(i) The Government should retain the “GB” zones along Yuen Long Highway and should not rezone them for residential use. The Government should consider developing other “GB” zones in other districts. It is unfair to the residents of Yuen Long as all the housing developments are proposed in Yuen Long District.</p> <p>(j) The ex-Long Bin Interim Housing site should be developed first as it does not involve any land resumption issue and not controversial; and the development of the other part of LB site and the TKT site should be withhold.</p>	<p>(m) On the proposal to retain the “GB” along Yuen Long Highway and the concern on loss of “GB” zone, it should be noted that the TKT site with an area of about 10.6 ha only accounts for about 6.9% of the “GB” zones in TYST OZP. Rezoning of the TKT site will not affect the overall integrity of the “GB” zone or jeopardize its function to contain urban sprawl.</p> <p>(n) Regarding the allegation that it is unfair to concentrate the housing development in Yuen Long, it should be noted that the Government’s land use review, including the “GB” review, covers other districts in Hong Kong but not limited to the Yuen Long District. In fact, amongst the total 210 sites identified for rezoning in the short to medium term, about 24 sites are in Yuen Long District while the remaining distribute amongst the other 17 districts in Hong Kong.</p> <p>(o) The ex-Long Bin Interim Housing has been included in Phase 1 of the LB site. The target completion date is 2024/25.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>(k) The Administration should explore alternatives, including brownfield, temporary or military sites or golf course or reclamation at Deep Bay, Lau Fau Shan, Sheung Pak Nai and Ha Pak Nai area (Plan H-8), instead of developing greenfield/“GB” sites. There are also alternative sites nearby for residential development including the already devegetated, deserted or formed sites adjacent to TKT site.</p> <p><i>Ecological and Environmental Impact</i></p> <p>(l) The future residents of LB site are expected to be subject to traffic noise impact. Vehicles from the Hong Kong-Shenzhen Western Corridor will pass through Long Tin Road. At present, the noise levels at the residential estates near the road are over 80dBA. Although the Administration has promised to install noise barriers, it is not yet implemented. Furthermore, the proposed slip road connecting Long Tin Road at LB site would worsen the traffic noise problem.</p>	<p>(p) For the proposed alternative sites, developing brownfield sites is one of the approaches of land supply. In fact, the second phase of LB site is mainly occupied by brownfield operations. Deep Bay, Lau Fau Shan and Sheung Pak Nai and Ha Pak Nai mainly comprise natural and unspoiled coastline (Plan H-8) and reclamation or intensive developments at these locations are not appropriate.</p> <p>(q) The Highways Department has employed consultants to carry out an IDC assignment for the provision of noise barrier along Long Tin Road. The Yuen Long District Council (YLDC) was consulted on the proposed work on 19.3.2018. Members supported the proposed works and urged for early implementation to relieve the residents of traffic noise impact. For the proposed slip roads connecting from Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange to Ma Fung Ling Road and from Ma Fung Ling Road to Long Tin Road, noise barrier would be provided.</p> <p>(r) While the PER in the LB Study and TKT Study has ascertained that the proposed housing developments would not be subject to adverse environmental impacts, a further environmental review, including the assessment of traffic and rail noise, will be carried out</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p><i>Consultation and Availability of Information</i></p> <p>(m) At its two meetings on 21.2.2017 and 27.6.2017, YLDC had provided their views and reflected the local concerns on traffic, supporting facilities, land resumption and rehousing issues and raised objection against rezoning “GB” sites. However, the Government did not revise the scheme to address the concerns of YLDC but rather, submit the OZP amendments to the Board for consideration. The Board also approved the plan for public inspection without paying much attention to the advisory role of the district council.</p> <p><i>Compensation and Rehousing</i></p> <p>(n) The Government should fully consult the affected villagers and stakeholders in respect of compensation and rehousing. The Government should meet the affected villagers in TKT directly and to understand their requests for “No removal and no clearance”, rehousing in the same district, etc.</p>	<p>at the subsequent IDC stage to determine suitable mitigation measures based on the latest development proposals for the EPD’s agreement.</p> <p>(s) The views and objections by YLDC, together with the draft meeting minutes, were entirely conveyed to the Rural and New Town Planning Committee of the Board (RNTPC) for consideration in submitting the proposed OZP amendments. Responses to the concerns raised by YLDC (as well as Ping Shan Rural Committee (PSRC) and the villagers) were included in the RNTPC paper. The RNTPC fully noted the local views and objections and requested concerned departments to further respond to the concerns, particularly on traffic issue, at the meeting (Annex IX). After considering the concerns and responses, the RNTPC agreed to exhibit the proposed OZP amendments under the Town Planning Ordinance for statutory public consultation.</p> <p>(t) The TKT site is entirely on government land. It is estimated under the TKT Study that about 30 structures can be found in the south-western part of the site (exact number affected subject to detailed survey) (Plan H-2b). Given the location, avoiding such structures or acceding to the request of “No removal and no</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p><i>Others</i></p> <p>(o) It is undesirable to rezone a small area of 310m² in Item A2 to “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) zone for high density building.</p>	<p>clearance” will substantially affect the public housing production. If clearance of existing structures is unavoidable, the Government will offer compensation, Ex-gratia Allowances and/or rehousing arrangements to the eligible affected parties in accordance with prevailing policies.</p> <p>(u) The arrangements for affected households are outside the scope of the subject OZP, which is to show the broad land use framework and planning intention for the area, and should be dealt with separately by the Government. That said, the Government announced on 10 May 2018 proposed enhancements to the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for eligible domestic occupants in squatters and business undertakings affected by Government's development clearance exercises. The enhanced arrangements are formulated to pragmatically address the needs of different groups of people, while balancing the use of public money and public housing resources, principles of fairness, and expectations of affected clearerees as well as the wider community.</p> <p>(v) Item A2 is to reflect the lot boundary of the existing residential development located in the adjoining “R(B)1” zone (i.e. the Villa Sunshine) and to rationalize the zoning boundary.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/RSYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
R127	R127 Mary Mulvihill	<p>Oppose All Items.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p><i>GIC Facilities and Open Space</i></p> <p>(a) The planning for the proposed developments is based on current standard on GIC provision. The provision of GIC facilities data demonstrates that this would be another Tin Shui Wai, a community lacking in many essential facilities. However, the 2030+ Study indicates that provision for both GIC facilities and open space should be increased.</p> <p>(b) The LB site was originally an “O” site, yet, there is no implementation programme. PlanD claims that whilst there will be deficit in district open space provision in TYST area after the OZP amendments, the district open space provision in Yuen Long New Town nearby is in surplus and could help meet the shortfall in TYST.</p>	<p>(a) The ‘Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030’ (Hong Kong 2030+) is an on-going study to review the territorial development strategy for Hong Kong. The proposed strategic directions and actions under Hong Kong 2030+ are visionary in nature, and may be subject to refinement prior to its final promulgation and subsequent incorporation into relevant standards and guidelines. The actual implementation of the proposed strategic directions and actions must also be balanced against other material considerations, and in commensurate with local circumstances.</p> <p>(b) Please also refer to the responses to ground (b) under sub-heading “GIC Facilities and Open Space” of R125 above.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to the response (j) to ground (b) under sub-heading “GIC Facilities and Open Space” of R125 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>However, the Yuen Long Park is not near to the Tong Yan San Tusen area and is not within walking distance. Yuen Long Park should not be taken as a convenient alternative. The proposal should be revised for a reduction in density and an increase in “OS”, recreational and community facilities.</p> <p><i>Visual Impact and Air Ventilation</i></p> <p>(c) The proposed housing blocks are too high and will breach the ridgeline. The green view of Tai Lam and the manifold health benefits from the green panorama enjoyed by the existing residents will be deprived of. Visual impact is anticipated from the proposed redevelopment of the brownfield sites at LB site, which will create an urban concrete jungle.</p>	<p>(d) A preliminary LVIA has been conducted each at the LB and TKT studies. In gist, the overall visual impact of the two proposed public housing development is considered acceptable with mitigation measures in place. The proposed mitigation measures include aesthetic design of the proposed development, amenity/compensatory planting, screen and buffer planting, building separation/visual corridors, building set back and stepped height profile. In particular, for TKT site, the proposed building heights have minimized blocking of the mountain backdrop. Extract of the photomontages from the public viewpoints are extracted at Plans H-9 and H-10.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
R128	<p>R128 長春社 The Conservancy Association</p>	<p>Oppose Item B.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p><i>Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development</i></p> <p>(a) The TKT site includes lower hill slopes, woodland, traditional burial ground and vegetated land at the urban fringe. Such “GB” zone can still serve its function to contain urban sprawl. The Government should not damage the greenfield site/natural environment. Approving the development at TKT site would set an undesirable precedent for similar amendments in the future.</p> <p>(b) The administration has not taken efforts in exploring alternatives to avoid and minimize both ecological and social impacts on “GB” as far as possible. The Government should prioritize the sites adjacent to TKT site, which are already devegetated, deserted or formed, for residential development.</p> <p><i>Ecological and Environmental Impact</i></p> <p>(c) The estimation that approximately 1,135 out of 1,450 trees in TKT site would be removed does not include some young trees or vegetation with less than 95mm in diameter at breast height. Apart from exotic species such as <i>Pinus massoniana</i> (馬尾松), <i>Acacia confusa</i> (臺灣相思), <i>Lophostemon confertus</i> (紅膠木), etc.,</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (h) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to the responses to grounds (h), (j) and (k) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above.</p> <p>(c) Whilst about 1,135 out of the 1,450 trees are proposed to be felled as estimated by the broad brush tree survey conducted in the TKT Study, the Government will do its utmost to ensure no unnecessary tree felling and that trees are properly protected during the works. According to DEVB TC(W) No. 7/2015, a plant is</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>shrubs such as <i>Litsea rotundifolia</i> (豺皮樟), <i>Psychotria asiatica</i> (九節), <i>Adinandra millettii</i> (黃瑞木) can be found in the TKT site. These native species are important for natural regeneration. Even there is a mechanism for tree compensation and transplantation, it would only preserve individual trees but not the habitat as a whole.</p>	<p>considered as a "tree" if its trunk diameter measures 95mm or more at a height of 1.3 m above the ground level. In estimating the numbers of trees within the TKT site, the captioned technical circular has been fully complied with. Should tree felling be considered unavoidable, tree removal application and compensatory planting proposal will be submitted in accordance with DEVB TC(W) No. 7/2015. A compensatory planting proposal with implementation of compensatory tree planting in a ratio not less than 1:1 in terms of quantity and quality will be carried out as far as practicable.</p> <p>(d) With the implementation of the ecological mitigation measures, the ecological impact would be minor or insubstantial, except habitat loss of about 5.5 ha mixed woodland and plantation woodland with residual impact of moderate level. Offsite compensation for woodland loss would be further investigated in the subsequent Investigation, Design and Construction stage to mitigate the residual impact. Subject to planting native species in the compensation woodland, the loss of the exotic tree species as mentioned by the representers would be compensated by native tree species.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p data-bbox="667 948 1196 976"><i>Consultation and Availability of Information</i></p> <p data-bbox="667 995 1404 1458">(d) The TKT Study together with various technical assessment reports have not been published or attached in the Town Planning Board paper. As members of the Board cannot get sufficient information prior to the Board's meeting, they cannot make proper decision thus leading to irreversible ecological and social impacts. Such arrangement is also unfair to public and concerned parties during the consultation. All information related to development in TKT site should be open for public access before the Board's discussion.</p>	<p data-bbox="1426 225 2163 879">(e) The Preliminary Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) in the TKT Study reveals that about 1.96 ha of the existing shrubland are in direct conflict with the proposed works and that the presence of graves indicated certain extent of human disturbance. According to the TKT Study, about 1.44 ha of the formed slope areas are initially proposed for planting of shrubs and climbers. For the three native species of shrubs mentioned by the representers, they are commonly found within Hong Kong. DAFC also advises that they are not protected species or species with conservation interest. Furthermore, native shrub species would be considered and proposed to be planted in the subsequent stages.</p> <p data-bbox="1426 995 2163 1506">(f) Whilst the write-up of the study reports of the TKT Study was still being finalized at the time of consultations with the PSRC, YLDC and the villagers in May 2017, February/June 2017, and June 2017 respectively, all other respective technical assessments had been completed which confirmed the feasibility of developing public housing at the TKT site, and the relevant information were made available to answer members' and villagers' queries at these meetings. To facilitate the RNTPC's consideration of the proposed OZP amendments, the Executive Summaries of the LB</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p><i>Others</i></p> <p>(e) There is no justification to propose a primary school at the location of the existing village area at TKT site.</p>	<p>and TKT studies were attached to the relevant RNTPC Paper (RNTPC Paper No. 7/2017) and the relevant technical assessment reports were deposited at the RNTPC's meeting on 8.9.2017 available for Members' inspection.</p> <p>(g) The proposed primary school is intended to serve the additional demand with the increase in population according to the advice of the Education Bureau.</p>
<p>R129</p>	<p>R129 丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組</p>	<p>Oppose Item B.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p><i>Transport and Traffic</i></p> <p>(a) Please refer to ground (a) under sub-heading "Transport and Traffic" of R126 above.</p> <p>(b) Some 210,000 people will be living in the Hung Shui Kiu area after implementation of HSKNDA. The two existing roads - the Yuen Long Highway and the Castle Peak Road are already saturated, especially at the rush hours. Congested junctions/sections include Shap Pat Heung Interchange, Pok Oi Interchange and Hung Tin Road. It is considered that these roads cannot accommodate the additional traffic as suggested in the TKT Study. The various developments in the future will aggravate traffic congestion in the area.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (a) under sub-heading "Transport and Traffic" of R125 above.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to the responses to ground (a) under sub-heading "Transport and Traffic" of R125 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>(c) Please refer to ground (b) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R126 above. The LRT and WR are now operating over their capacity. The proposed increase in WRL capacity (from 7 compartments to 8 compartments) cannot solve the problem. It is indicated in a TV programme that the carrying capacity of the LRT and WRL already reached 104%. The opening of Hung Shui Kiu Station of the WRL could not help to solve the problem.</p> <p>(d) The proposed road related to TKT site passing through the North West New Territories Refuse Transfer Station to Shun Tat Street and then to the Castle Peak Road is not feasible. At present, refuse collection vehicles are already queuing up for entering the station. Together with the vehicles from the nearby residential developments, Shun Tat Street is already very congested. It is impossible to widen Shun Tat Street given the existing village houses alongside. It is questionable whether the proposed road scheme can divert the flow.</p>	<p>(c) Please refer to the responses to ground (b) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R126 above.</p> <p>(d) The preliminary TTIA has confirmed the feasibility of the proposed access road running along the north-western boundary of the existing NWNT RTS. According to the result of the preliminary TTIA, which has been agreed by Transport Department, with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, no adverse traffic impact would be anticipated at Shun Tat Street, even taking into account the operation of NWNT RTS. For Shun Tat Street, it should be noted that only re-arrangement of traffic lanes and junction improvement works, rather than road widening, will be required according to the recommendations in the preliminary TTIA.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p><i>Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development</i></p> <p>(e) The TKT site is the only “GB” site in the area. The “GB” land and country parks are public assets which should not be used for housing development. There are also alternative sites nearby for residential development including the 3 pieces of formed brownfield sites adjacent to TKT site (Plan H-6).</p> <p>(f) It is not environmentally friendly and not logical to waste money to build flats on the unformed hilly land.</p>	<p>(e) Please refer to the responses to ground (h) and (i) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above. Amongst the 3 brownfield sites mentioned (Plan H-7), two of them in the vicinity of the TKT site are currently under a separate land use study for Lam Tei Quarry and the adjoining areas by the Government. The other site across the Yuen Long Highway is currently used by government department for works area; and its size (about 3,309m²) is not comparable to the TKT site.</p> <p>(f) In the current situation of tight land supply, the Government has been carrying out various land use reviews, including review on “GB” sites, with a view to identifying suitable sites for residential use. As the TKT site is located at the fringe of “GB” in close proximity to developed area of Tan Kwai Tsuen area and adjacent to the Yuen Long Highway; and will also be close to the future YLS development, it is considered suitable and having potential for housing development. The construction cost of the project is related to the scope of the project, which will depend on the constraints of individual projects, including the topography, geotechnical conditions and proposed formation level, and technical difficulties. Therefore, the construction cost varies from project to project.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p><i>Ecological and Environmental Impact</i></p> <p>(g) The TKT site has ecological value and the flora and fauna there have established over one hundred years with rare species.</p>	<p>Also, a final and more accurate estimation of construction cost could only be established until completion of the detailed design of the project. Based on the above considerations, it is not appropriate to compare the construction cost of a project with the number of public housing units that can be provided. In response to the pressing demand for public housing, and with planning, infrastructure and environmental factors permitting, the Government have put in place the principle of "make the best use of our land" and give full play to the development potential of the land to increase the supply of public housing, taking into account the needs of existing and future residents.</p> <p>(g) The PER of the TKT Study has also assessed the ecological impacts. The TKT site comprises substantial portion of mixed woodland, plantation woodland and shrubland of medium-low ecological value, while two small semi-natural streams, village area, agricultural land and wasteland of low ecological value are found within the site too.</p> <p>(h) Only four plant species of conservation interest are identified at/in the vicinity of the site, including <i>Nepenthes mirabilis</i> (豬籠草), <i>Rhododendron simsii</i> (紅杜鵑), <i>Aquilaria sinensis</i> (土沉香) and <i>Gnetum</i></p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
			<p><i>luofuenses</i> (羅浮買麻藤). No Registered Old and Valuable Trees were identified. While the impacts on <i>Nepenthes mirabilis</i> (豬籠草) and <i>Rhododendron simsii</i> (紅杜鵑) will be avoided by excluding them from the project site, three individuals of <i>Aquilaria sinensis</i> (土沉香) would be in direct conflict with the proposed development. Two of them are proposed to be preserved by transplanting. The remaining one which is found to be in poor health condition is proposed to be felled, and its removal is considered to be a minor impact. <i>Gnetum luofuenses</i> (羅浮買麻藤) has widespread distribution throughout the territory. No adverse impact on the species due to the unavoidable conflict is anticipated and no adverse comment has been received from Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD).</p> <p>(i) Two fauna species of conservation interest, namely <i>Crested Goshawk</i> (鳳頭鷹) and <i>Somanniathelphusa zanklon</i> (鐮刀束腰蟹) are found within the site. The impact on <i>Crested Goshawk</i> (鳳頭鷹) will be negligible due to the high mobility of this kind of birds. The freshwater crabs <i>Somanniathelphusa zanklon</i> (鐮刀束腰蟹) will be affected due to loss of a stream section. This crab species is recommended to be preserved by translocation to a nearby stream close to the south-western boundary of the site, which has been</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p data-bbox="667 608 1196 639"><i>Consultation and Availability of Information</i></p> <p data-bbox="667 655 1404 879">(h) The Government has not submitted the Final Report of the TKT Study when consulting the villagers, the PSRC and the YLDC. Without enough information, the villagers and the members were not properly consulted.</p> <p data-bbox="667 943 1404 1166">(i) CEDD is not willing to disclose the information to the public and the report could only be copied upon payment. The authenticity of the TKT Study and feasibility of the proposed development is also questionable.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1326 1039 1358"><i>No Removal and No Clearance</i></p> <p data-bbox="667 1374 1404 1501">(j) The villagers had expressed their request for “No removal and no clearance” and keep this only “GB” site in Hung Shui Kiu.</p>	<p data-bbox="1496 225 2168 544">found to be an existing breeding ground of <i>Somanniathelphusa zanklon</i> (鎌刀束腰蟹) and will not be affected by the proposed public housing development. No adverse comment has been received from the AFCD and EPD regarding the proposal of preserving the freshwater crabs <i>Somanniathelphusa zanklon</i> (鎌刀束腰蟹) by translocation.</p> <p data-bbox="1424 655 2168 783">(j) Please refer to the responses to ground (d) under sub-heading “Consultation and Availability of Information” of R128 above.</p> <p data-bbox="1424 943 2168 1070">(k) Please refer to the responses to ground (d) under sub-heading “Consultation and Availability of Information” of R128 above.</p> <p data-bbox="1424 1134 2168 1262">(l) On the need for payment, the administrative procedure and payment for copying documents are prevailing practice of the Government.</p> <p data-bbox="1424 1374 2168 1501">(m) Please refer to the responses to ground (n) under sub-heading “Compensation and Rehousing” of R126 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p><i>Others</i></p> <p>(k) It is not believed that the Government would use the resumed land of TKT site for public housing purpose given the past cases of disposing resumed land in TKT area for private residential development, i.e. Domus (尚築).</p>	<p>(n) As explained in the responses to ground (b) of under sub-heading “Housing Mix” of R1 to R3 and R11 to R28 above, there is a dire need for using the TKT site for public housing development. The intention of public housing development at this site is also clearly indicated in the relevant public documents including YLDC paper, RNTPC paper and the ES to the OZP.</p>
<p>R130 to R202</p>	<p>73 Individuals (Names of Representers are shown at Annex III)</p>	<p>Oppose Item B.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p><i>Transport and Traffic</i></p> <p>(a) Please refer to ground (a) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R126 above (R130, R134, R135, R150, R169, R171, R174, R179, R183, R186, R187, R189, R194, R195, R198 and R199 only).</p> <p>(b) Please refer to ground (b) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R129 above (R197 and R202 only). The TKT Study already indicates that the traffic and transport proposal is only a better option but not a perfect solution for the traffic problem (R198 only). No job opportunity is created in the district and the residents have to travel to other district for work (R202 only).</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (a) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R125 above.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to the responses to ground (a) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R125 above.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>(c) Only one proposed public transport interchange (PTI) in the TKT site is not enough for some additional thirty thousand people (R202 only).</p> <p>(d) Please refer to ground (b) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R126 above (R181 and R202 only).</p> <p><i>Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development</i></p> <p>(e) Please refer to ground (e) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R129 above (R133, R134, R138, R139, R144, R145, R147, R151 to R154, R157 to R169, R172, R175, R180, R185, R187 to R189, R191 to R200 only).</p> <p>(f) To develop the only “GB” zone in the area is a backward step in urban design (R188 only). The TKT site is considered not suitable for large-scale public housing development as it is far away from the major transport and community facilities (R130 only).</p> <p>(g) The Government should retain the “GB” zones along Yuen Long Highway and should not rezone them for</p>	<p>(c) It should be noted that the preliminary TTIAs have assessed the public transport demand generated by the two public housing developments. It is recommended to provide a PTI with bus bays and public light bus/taxi bay each at LB site and TKT site to cater for the demand in public transport services of the future residents.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to the responses to ground (b) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R126 above.</p> <p>(e) Please refer to the responses to ground (e) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R129 above.</p> <p>(f) Please refer to the responses to ground (h) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above and the responses to ground (f) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R129 above.</p> <p>(g) Please refer to the response (m) to ground (i) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>residential use. The Government should consider developing other “GB” zones in other districts (R135, R138, R139, R141 to R146, R149, R152, R153, R158, R159, R161, R162, R165, R166, R168, R169, R173, R179, R180, R185, R191, R192, R199 and R200 only).</p> <p><i>Ecological and Environmental Impact</i></p> <p>(h) Please refer to ground (g) under sub-heading “Ecological and Environmental Impact” of R129 above (R156, R159, R197, R199 and R200 only).</p> <p>(i) Please refer to ground (l) under sub-heading “Ecological and Environmental Impact” of R126 above (R202 only).</p> <p><i>Visual Impact and Air Ventilation</i></p> <p>(j) The proposed 40-stoerys public housing in TKT site would block the air ventilation to the village houses at Ping Shan and Hung Shui Kiu in the surroundings.</p>	<p>Development” of R126 above.</p> <p>(h) Please refer to the responses to ground (g) under sub-heading “Ecological and Environmental Impact” of R129 above.</p> <p>(i) Please refer to the responses to ground (l) under sub-heading “Ecological and Environmental Impact” of R126 above.</p> <p>(j) An Air Ventilation Assessment Expert Evaluation (AVA EE) has been conducted under the TKT Study. According to the findings, design features such as set back from Yuen Long Highway and building separations have been proposed for alleviating the potential air ventilation impact caused by the proposed public housing development. Regarding the village houses at Ping Shan and Hung Shui Kiu area mentioned by the representer (R186), they are more than 1km away from the TKT site (Plan H-11).</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>(k) Please refer to ground (c) under sub-heading “Visual Impact and Air Ventilation” of R127 above (R202 only).</p> <p><i>Consultation and Availability of Information</i></p> <p>(l) There is inadequate public consultation with the TKT villagers and relevant stakeholders in the area. The TKT site is near to Lam Tei of Tuen Mun. However, no consultation has been made to the Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) (R130, R179, R193 and R201 only).</p>	<p>Considering the distance as well as the relatively open nature around the site, prevailing wind could pass over the proposed development at TKT site and reattach at the pedestrian level before it even reaches Castle Peak Road. The village houses of Ping Shan are also very far away and do not fall within the wind wake region of the proposed development. It is not anticipated that the proposed development at TKT site would have any air ventilation impact on these villages.</p> <p>(k) Please refer to the responses to ground (c) under sub-heading “Visual Impact and Air Ventilation” of R127 above.</p> <p>(l) The established public consultation procedures for OZP amendment had been followed for the present case. The local stakeholders, i.e. PSRC and YLDC, were consulted before RNTPC’s consideration of the proposed OZP amendments. On the consultation with the villagers, PlanD, CEDD and HD had, upon invitation, attended two meetings with the 丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組 and some villagers from the vicinity areas of Tan Kwai Tsuen, before RNTPC’s consideration of the proposed OZP amendments and during the OZP exhibition period respectively. The views of the PSRC, YLDC and the villagers were also conveyed to</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>(m) Please refer to ground (m) under sub-heading “Consultation and Availability of Information” of R126 above (R179, R187 and R188 only).</p> <p><i>Compensation and Rehousing</i></p> <p>(n) The Government should solve the rehousing problem first. Public rental housing flats should be allocated to those villagers affected by the development in TKT site. Otherwise, after the demolition of the squatters in TKT, more people have to apply for public rental housing (R146, R148 and R154 only).</p> <p>(o) There are graves and urns of Tuen Mun/Yuen Long indigenous villagers within or near to the TKT site. However, there is no mention on the relocation or compensation arrangement in the document submitted by PlanD. In the case of HSKNDA, the Government guaranteed that graves and urns are legally protected and if being affected by the NDA development, will be relocated to the surroundings and reasonable compensation will be given. (R201 only).</p>	<p>the RNTPC in the submission of the proposed OZP amendments. As the proposed TKT public housing development site and the relevant OZP fall within YL District, the DC consultation was made with YLDC rather than TMDC.</p> <p>(m) Please refer to the responses to ground (m) under sub-heading “Consultation and Availability of Information” of R126 above.</p> <p>(n) Please refer to the responses to ground (n) under sub-heading “Compensation and Rehousing” of R126 above.</p> <p>(o) Some existing graves and urns within or near the TKT site would be affected. However, it is anticipated that the exact extent and boundary of the site formation and infrastructure works and thus the exact impact on the graves and urns due to the site formation and infrastructure works would only be identified in the detailed design stage of the project. The Government will also consult those affected stakeholders and offer compensation, Ex-gratia Allowances and/or relocation</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
		<p>(p) The villagers have lived in TKT site for a long period of time and do not want any change. The neighborhood is good. The proposed development at TKT site would affect the existing villagers (R131, R133, R135 to 137, R140, R149, R159, R163, R167, R169, R174, R176, R180, R182, R184 and R190 only).</p> <p>(q) To demand “No removal and no clearance of TKT” (R137, R155, R156, R173, R174, R176, R178, R181 and R182 only).</p> <p><i>Others</i></p> <p>(r) The TKT site should be developed as public rental housing instead of “Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme” to solve the housing problem of the grassroots (R146, R150, R155, R156 and R163).</p> <p>(s) It is not believed that the Government would use the resumed land of TKT site for public housing purpose (R136, R150, R155, R163, R170, R176, R177, R194 and R200).</p> <p>(t) The Government may also resume other parts of TKT and Wo Ping San Tsuen for the reason of development of public facilities (R194).</p>	<p>arrangements to the eligible affected parties in accordance with prevailing policies in due course.</p> <p>(p) Please refer to the responses to ground (n) under sub-heading “Compensation and Rehousing” of R126 above.</p> <p>(q) Please refer to the responses to ground (n) under sub-heading “Compensation and Rehousing” of R126 above.</p> <p>(r) The type of public housing at the LB and TKT sites will be considered at the detailed design stage and subject to further study by HD.</p> <p>(s) Please refer to the responses to ground (k) under sub-heading “Others” of R129 above.</p> <p>(t) There is currently no plan for the Government to resume other parts of TKT and Wo Ping San Tsuen for the reason of development of public facilities.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representations
R203	<p>R203 香港中華煤氣有限公司 The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited</p>	<p>Oppose Item B and provide views on Item A1.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p><i>Others</i></p> <p>(a) It is suggested to modify the development boundary to avoid the conflict with an existing high pressure gas pipeline near TKT. It is considered that LB site is in close vicinity of the existing high pressure gas pipeline at Fui Sha Wai South Road and Yuen Long Highway. A risk assessment is required to evaluate the potential risk and determine the necessary mitigation measures for both sites. The project proponent should consult Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited in design stage and closely coordinate with them during construction stage and provide protective measures.</p>	<p>(a) It is noted that there are existing high pressure gas pipelines running along Fui Sha Wai South Road and Yuen Long Highway. Preliminary quantitative risk assessments covering the proposed public housing developments were conducted and the results revealed that both the individual and societal risk levels posed by the high pressure gas pipelines meet the criteria set in the Hong Kong Risk Guidelines. The project proponent/works contactor will liaise with the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited in respect of the exact locations of existing or planned gas pipes/gas installations within or in vicinity of the developments during the design and construction stages.</p>

Comments On Representations (Comments)

Comment No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Commenter	Gist of Comment	Response to Comments
<p>C1 to C9</p>	<p>9 Individuals (Names of Commenters are shown at Annex III)</p>	<p>Oppose R1 to R124.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(a) Object to rezone “GB” zones for building of private housing.</p> <p>Support R126 (YLDC) and R129 (丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組, also C10) to R165.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(b) Avoiding clearance of TKT.</p> <p>(c) Consideration of alternative sites/priority of developing vacant or brownfield sites.</p> <p>(d) Retaining “GB” zones.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (k) under sub-heading “Others” of R129 above.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to the responses to ground (n) under sub-heading “Compensation and Rehousing” of R126 above.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to the responses to ground (k) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to the responses to grounds (h) and (i) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above.</p>
<p>C10</p>	<p>C10 丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組 (also R129)</p>	<p>Oppose R1 to R4 and R6 to R124.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(a) There are already many private residential</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (k) under</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Commenter	Gist of Comment	Response to Comments
		<p>developments in Tin Shui Wai, Yuen Long, Tuen Mun and Hung Shui Kiu area.</p> <p>(b) There are still many brownfield sites available for development</p> <p>(c) Private residential development will cause adverse traffic impact</p> <p>Support R126 (YLDC) and R129 (丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組, also C10) to R202.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(d) Lack of public consultation.</p> <p>(e) Priority of developing brownfield sites.</p> <p>(f) Adverse traffic impact.</p>	<p>sub-heading “Others” of R129 above.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to the responses to ground (k) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to the responses to ground (k) under sub-heading “Others” of R129 above.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to the responses to ground (l) under sub-heading “Consultation and Availability of Information” of R130 to R202 above.</p> <p>(e) Please refer to the responses to ground (k) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above.</p> <p>(f) Please refer to the responses to ground (a) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R125, the responses under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R126, R129 and R130 to R202.</p>

Comment No. (TPB/RSYL-TYST/11-)	Commenter	Gist of Comment	Response to Comments
<p>C11 to C253 and C277 to C292</p>	<p>259 Individuals (Names of Commenters are shown at Annex III)</p>	<p><u>C11 to C253</u> Support R129 (丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組, also C10).</p> <p><u>C277 to C292</u> Support R126 (YLDC), R128 (the Conservancy Association, also C255) and R129 (丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組, also C10).</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(a) Insufficient public consultation (C11, C12, C14 to C16, C19, C21, C26, C29 to C32, C40, C42, C48, C50, C51, C54 to C58, C60, C68, C71 to C75, C84 to C90, C95, C97, C109, C115, C117, C120, C121, C123, C124, C160, C175, C197, C204 to C207, C211, C213, C215, C217, C218, C220, C224 to C228, C230, C232, C236, C237, C241 to C243, C245 to C248, C250, C252, C278 to C280, C283 to C288 and C290 to C292).</p> <p>(b) Adverse landscape, ecological, environmental and traffic impacts (C23, C25, C33, C36, C38, C44, C46, C49, C52, C59, C63, C71, C74 to C90, C92, C94, C96, C98 to C105, C107, C109 to C114, C116, C118, C121, C123, C128 to C130, C132, C147, C148, C151 to C154, C159, C161, C165, C170, C175 to C177, C180 to C200, C204 to C209, C212, C213, C215, C217, C219, C221, C224 to C231, C233, C235 to C237, C245, C250, C253, C277, C279 to C282, C284,</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (l) under sub-heading “Consultation and Availability of Information” of R130 to R202 above.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to the responses to the grounds under sub-heading “Ecological and Environmental Impact” of R129 above.</p> <p>(c) Please also refer to the responses to ground (a) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R125, the responses to ground (b) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R126, Please refer to the responses to the grounds under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic”</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Commenter	Gist of Comment	Response to Comments
		<p>C285, C287, C288 and C290 to C292).</p> <p>(c) Consideration of alternative sites/priority of developing vacant or brownfield sites (C14, C17, C18, C34, C61, C62, C67, C70, C84 to C89, C106, C111, C166 to C169, C171 to C175, C177, C178, C201, C203 to C207, C210, C211 to C218, C220, C221, C223 to C225, C229, C235, C237, C239, C240, C242, C245, C249, C252, C279, C280, C283, C284 and C288).</p> <p>(d) Abandoning the clearance of TKT (C11, C17, C21, C27, C28, C39, C50, C65 to C67, C70, C75, C91, C94, C124, C125, C127, C130 to C135, C137, C139 to C142, C146, C149 to C152, C155 to C164, C169, C171, C173, C174, C179, C201, C210, C211, C213, C217, C219, C220, C223, C224, C225, C228, C234, C237 to C239, C241, C243, C245, C247, C250, C252, C253, C280, C283 and C288).</p> <p>(e) Resumption of land and/or clearance of existing structures and graves (C84 to C89, C128, C155, C175, C204 to C207, C209, C220, C224, C226, C237, C240, C242, C245, C280, C290 and C292).</p> <p>(f) Villagers were not properly consulted as the TKT was not completed during the consultation. (C26, C45, C215 and C216).</p>	<p>of R129 above.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to the responses to grounds (h), (i) and (k) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above.</p> <p>(e) Please refer to the responses to ground (n) under sub-heading “Compensation and Rehousing” of R126 above.</p> <p>(f) Please refer to the responses to ground (o) under sub-heading “Compensation and Rehousing” of R130 to R202 above.</p> <p>(g) Please refer to the responses to ground (d) under sub-heading “Consultation and Availability of Information” of R128 above.</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Commenter	Gist of Comment	Response to Comments
		<p>(g) Please refer to ground (s) under sub-heading “Others” of R130 to R202 above. (C47, C51, C64, C84 to C90, C108, C117, C119, C120, C124, C156 to C158, C175, C204 to C207, C209, C212, C213, C216, C218, C220, C223, C224, C226, C228, C236, C242, C245, C250, C251, C280 and C288).</p> <p>(h) Please refer to ground (n) under sub-heading “Compensation and Rehousing” of R126 (C90, C92, C108, C109, C119 and C284).</p> <p>(i) Please refer to ground (p) under sub-heading “Compensation and Rehousing” of R130 to R202 (C91, C93, C94, C108, C117, C128, C212, C216, C217, C236, C237, C281, C282, C284, C290 and C292).</p> <p>(j) Please refer to ground (f) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R129 (C94 and C203).</p> <p>(k) The geotechnical condition of TKT site could not support high-rise developments (C53, C84 to C89, C113, C115, C128, C175, C204 to C206, C224, C226, C236, C245, C250, C280 and C288).</p>	<p>(h) Please refer to the responses to ground (k) under sub-heading “Others” of R129 above.</p> <p>(i) Please refer to the responses to ground (n) under sub-heading “Compensation and Rehousing” of R126 above.</p> <p>(j) Please refer to the responses to ground (n) under sub-heading “Compensation and Rehousing” of R126 above.</p> <p>(k) Please refer to the responses to ground (f) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R129.</p> <p>(l) According to the results of the preliminary Geotechnical Assessment (GA) (including the assessment of the existing ground investigation works, geological condition, and geotechnical constraints) in the TKT Study, it is considered that the proposed</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Commenter	Gist of Comment	Response to Comments
			<p>geotechnical works for the site formation and infrastructure construction are technically feasible. A detailed GA will be carried out at the later investigation / detailed design stages of the project to define the scope and programme of the required geotechnical works. The design of the proposed works will incorporate appropriate construction methods and measures to prevent disturbance to the existing waterworks installation in the vicinity. The design and construction of the building blocks including the foundation of the proposed public housing development will be carried out by HD.</p>
<p>C254</p>	<p>C254 Mary Mulvihill (also R127)</p>	<p>Has not indicated the related representations.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(a) Insufficient social welfare services and recreational and community facilities.</p> <p>(b) Priority of freeing up brownfield sites for redevelopment.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (b) under sub-heading “GIC Facilities and Open Space” of R125 above.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to the responses to ground (k) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above.</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Commenter	Gist of Comment	Response to Comments
C255	<p>C255 長春社 The Conservancy Association (also R128)</p>	<p>Oppose R1 to R4 and R6 to R124.</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(a) R1 to R4 fail to take account of the fact that even though private housing is required to meet so-called public demand, alternative sites can be further explored. For example, brownfield sites are available adjacent to the TKT site, existing facility can be relocated to cavern and the site be released for residential development.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (k) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above.</p>
C256	<p>C256 土地正義聯盟 Land Justice League</p>	<p>Oppose R6 and Support R129 (丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組, also C10).</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(a) objects to building of luxurious private housing in TKT.</p> <p>(b) agree with the views of R129.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (k) under sub-heading “Others” of R129 above.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to the responses to R129 above.</p>
C257 to C276	<p>20 Individuals (Names of Commenters are shown at Annex III)</p>	<p>Support R126 (YLDC).</p> <p><u>Major Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(a) Traffic and environmental grounds.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to the responses to ground (a) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R125 and the responses to the grounds under sub-heading “Transport</p>

Comment No. (TPB/R/SYL-TYST/11-)	Commenter	Gist of Comment	Response to Comments
		<p>(b) The Government has already planned the ratio of public and private housing in the HSKNDA.</p> <p>(c) It is unreasonable to rezone the TKT site as public housing.</p> <p>(d) The traffic facilities in Yuen Long, Tuen Mun and Tin Shui Wan cannot deal with the increased population in the coming future.</p> <p>(e) The rezoning also caused adverse impact to the natural environment.</p>	<p>and Traffic” of R126 above. Please also refer to the responses to the grounds under sub-heading “Ecological and Environmental Impact” of R126 above.</p> <p>(b) Please refer to the responses to ground (b) under sub-heading “Housing Mix” of R4 above.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to the responses to ground (h) under sub-heading “Rezoning of “GB” for Residential Development” of R126 above.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to the responses to ground (a) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R125 and the responses to ground (b) under sub-heading “Transport and Traffic” of R126 above.</p> <p>(e) Please also refer to the responses to the grounds under sub-heading “Ecological and Environmental Impact” of R126 above.</p>

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 29

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved

Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-TYST/10

(RNTPC Paper No. 7/17)

86. The Secretary reported that two of the proposed amendment items to the Approved Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) were to facilitate two proposed public housing developments by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---|--|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
(Chairman)
<i>as the Director of Planning</i> | - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee (BC) of HKHA |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan,
<i>as the Chief Engineer
(Works) of the Home
Affairs Department</i> | - being an alternate member of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai |]] having current business dealings with HKHA |
| Dr C.H. Hau |]] |
| Mr H.F. Leung | - being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his firm having current business dealings with MVA |

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu]
] having past business dealings with HKHA
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu]

87. The Committee noted that Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu and Alex T.H. Lai and Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

88. The Secretary reported that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed public housing development was the subject of amendments to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of the Chairman and Members mentioned above on the item only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Session

89. The following representatives from PlanD, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and the consultants were invited to the meeting:

Mr David C.M. Lam - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW), PlanD
Mr Alan Y.L. Au - Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW), PlanD
Mr Edward C.W. Chan - Chief Engineer (CE)/Housing Projects 2, CEDD
Mr Clarence K.L. Chan]
] Senior Engineer (SE), CEDD
Mr Vincent S.H. Chow]
Mr Ray S.W. Tang]
] Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup)
Miss Winnie Lee]

- Mr Lee Pui Hung - MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA)
- Mr Tony C.M. Cheng - Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ)
- Mr Edwin C.H. Lo - Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited

90. Mr David C.M. Lam, DPO/TMYLW, drew Members' attention that a replacement page of the Paper and the extract of minutes for meeting with Yuen Long District Council (YLDC) on 27.6.2017 were tabled at the meeting for Members' information. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lam then presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Background of the Proposed Amendments

- (a) the Government had continued reviewing various land uses and rezoning appropriate sites, where the original intended use was no longer required, for housing development. A site to the west of Long Tin Road and to the north of the Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange (Long Bin Site) and another site to the south of Tan Kwai Tsuen South Fresh Water Service Reservoir (Tan Kwai Tsuen Site) had been identified for public housing developments;

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

- (b) Amendment Item A1 – to rezone the Long Bin Site (about 10 ha) from mainly “Open Space” (“O”) and “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) to “R(A)1” to facilitate a proposed public housing development with a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 6.5 and a maximum building height (BH) of 155 mPD. The proposed public housing development could provide about 11,700 residential units for an estimated population of about 32,900. Phases 1 and 2 would be completed in 2024/25 and 2028/29 respectively;
- (c) Amendment Item A2 – to rezone a small area of about 310 sq.m from “O” to “R(B)1” for minor boundary adjustment to reflect the existing residential development (Villa Sunshine);

- (d) Amendment Item B – to rezone Tan Kwai Tsuen Site (about 10.6 ha) from “Green Belt” (“GB”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “R(A)2” to facilitate a proposed public housing development with a maximum PR of 6.5 and a maximum BH of 205mPD. The proposed public housing development could provide about 7,400 residential units for an estimated population of about 20,600. It would be completed in 2028/29;
- (e) Amendment Items C and D – opportunities were taken to rezone two sites, which were the subject of two s.12A planning applications (No. Y/YL-TYST/5 and Y/YL-TYST/6) previously agreed by the Committee (i.e. one site at Sha Tseng Road and one site comprising two portions to the south of Park Villa) from “G/IC” to “R(B)1”;

Technical Assessments

- (f) CEDD had undertaken two feasibility studies to ascertain the technical feasibility, namely Site Formation and Infrastructural Works for the Development at Long Bin, Yuen Long-Feasibility Study (LB Study) and Site Formation and Infrastructural Works for the Development near Tan Kwai Tsuen, Yuen Long-Feasibility Study (TKT Study). The proposed public housing developments, with suitable improvement and mitigation measures, would not have insurmountable traffic, environmental, infrastructural, geotechnical, landscape and visual, and air ventilation impacts on the surrounding areas;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (g) the Notes of the “R(A)” zone was amended to include remarks for sub-zones “R(A)1” and “R(A)2”, to reflect the PR restriction of 6.5 and BH restrictions of 155mPD and 205mPD respectively for the proposed public housing developments respectively;

- (h) the Remarks of the Notes of the “Comprehensive Development Area”, “R(A)”, “R(B)”, “R(C)” and “R(D)” zones were amended for the exemption clause for PR or site coverage calculation in relation to caretaker’s quarters to tally with the Master Schedule of Notes;

Departmental Consultation

- (i) relevant bureaux and departments consulted had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed amendments;

Public Consultation

- (j) the Ping Shan Rural Committee (PSRC) was consulted on the proposed amendments on 24.5.2017. PSRC members generally objected to the proposed public housing developments from the traffic and transport point of view. The affected villagers of Tan Kwai Tsuen requested to exclude the existing village dwellings located at the northwestern part of the Tan Kwai Tsuen Site from the proposed public housing development;
- (k) YLDC was consulted on 21.2.2017 and 27.6.2017 regarding the proposed amendments. YLDC members generally objected to the proposed public housing developments of Long Bin Site and Tan Kwai Tsuen Site mainly on the grounds that the increase in population would aggravate the existing traffic congestion problem, “GB” zone was not suitable for housing development, and no rehousing/compensation package was provided for discussion; and
- (l) PlanD, CEDD, HD and the Lands Department (LandsD) participated in a consultation meeting with villagers of Tan Kawi Tsuen on 23.6.2017. The villagers had no objection to increase the supply of public housing to relieve the housing shortage in Hong Kong on condition that it would not affect the grassroots and there would be “no removal no clearance”. The affected villagers requested to exclude the existing village dwellings located at the northwestern part of the Tan Kwai Tsuen Site from the proposed housing

development.

[Mr H.F. Leung left the meeting at this point.]

91. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Edward C.W. Chan, CE/CEDD and Mr Clarence K.L. Chan, SE/CEDD, made the following main points on the traffic aspect:

Long Bin Site

- (a) to cater for the public housing development, a number of improvement works to the existing infrastructure were proposed, including two new slip roads, i.e. one from Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange to Ma Fung Ling Road and the other one from Ma Fung Ling Road to Long Tin Road; conversion from give-way line to merging lane for U-turning under the flyover of Long Tin Road; and a Public Transport Interchange (PTI) with a capacity for parking of eight taxi and nine buses;
- (b) ingress and egress routes for heading to Yuen Long Town Centre, Tuen Mun, Kowloon through Long Tin Road, Castle Peak Road, Yuen Long Highway (Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange and Pok Oi Interchange) for Phases 1 and 2 of the Long Bin public housing development were introduced;

Tan Kwai Tsuen Site

- (c) to cater for the public housing development, a new PTI at the Tan Kwai Tsuen Site was proposed;
- (d) a new vehicular access running along the south side of Yuen Long Highway was proposed to connect the public housing development to the existing road network at Shun Tat Street to the west and Tin Shui Wai West Interchange to the east and pedestrian accesses would be provided between the public housing development and the surrounding areas; and

- (e) improvement works at the junction of Shun Tat Street and Castle Peak Road – Hung Shui Kiu Section were proposed, in which a right turning movement would be allowed for the vehicles from Shun Tat Street (northbound) to Castle Peak Road;

Both Public Housing Development Sites

- (f) volume to capacity ratio (v/c ratio) for major roads on the road network in future with both public housing developments were shown to indicate that the full capacity of most of these major roads had not been reached;
- (g) walking time and travelling time by feeder bus from the proposed public housing developments to the Light Rail and West Rail stations were summarized to demonstrate the accessibility to the railway station.

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

- (a) existing conditions of the sites, existing uses around the sites and the compatibility of the proposed public housing developments with the surrounding developments;
- (b) planning considerations/implications of the proposed public housing developments, in particular the environmental, noise and visual impacts on the surrounding areas;
- (c) whether there would be provision of market facilities in the proposed public housing developments;
- (d) whether the cumulative traffic impacts of other planned and committed developments in Yuen Long South had been taken into account in the Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (TTIA) conducted by the consultant; and
- (e) the proposed traffic arrangement including improvement to the existing road network and enhancement of the public transport services and capacity to

meet the additional demand generated by the new population of the proposed public housing developments.

93. Mr David C.M. Lam, DPO/TMYLW made the following responses:

- (a) Phase 1 of the proposed Long Bin public housing development was situated on the site currently occupied by the Long Bin Interim Housing while Phase 2 was largely situated on a brownfield site currently occupied by temporary structures mainly for workshop purposes with scattered residential dwellings. As regards the scattered dwellings found within the site, LandsD advised that there was no record of a recognised village in the site;
- (b) it was stated in the 2014 Policy Address that the maximum domestic PR currently permitted for the residential developments could be increased by around 20% as appropriate to meet the pressing housing demand and the maximum domestic PR in density zone 1 of new towns could be up to 6. As the site was located adjacent to the new town and it was important to make efficient use of the limited land resources, the proposed domestic PR of 6 for the proposed public housing developments were considered appropriate;
- (c) the existing developments in the “R(B)” zone near Yuen Long town centre was mainly occupied by residential buildings subject to BH restriction of 25 storeys while the area to the immediate west of the Long Bin Site was zoned “R(B)1” occupied by low-density residential developments of four to five storeys. The proposed BHs of the public housing development at the Long Bin Site which ranged from 40 to 49 storeys were higher than those in the surrounding areas. Nevertheless, by adopting suitable mitigation measures, visual impact of the proposed Long Bin public housing development was slightly adverse but considered acceptable;
- (d) as for the proposed public housing development at Tan Kwai Tsuen Site, there was a high mountain acting as a natural backdrop for the proposed development. Although the proposed BH was higher than the surrounding

developments, photomontages viewing from various public vantage points demonstrated that the visual impact of the proposed Tan Kwai Tsuen public housing development was slightly adverse but considered acceptable with mitigation measures;

- (e) the technical assessments were conducted based on the indicative layouts for the proposed public housing developments prepared by HD. According to the Preliminary Environmental Review, there would be no insurmountable environmental impact with suitable mitigation measures. Regarding the noise impact, HD would carry out the Environmental Assessment Study (EAS) for planning of building layout and adopt appropriate building design to ensure compliance with relevant requirements of the Environmental Protection Department; and
- (f) shopping facilities including markets would be provided in the proposed public housing developments as appropriate and the level of provision would be subject to the detailed design by HD. Besides, there were existing markets in other nearby areas, e.g. Hung Fuk Estate and Yuen Long New Town, that served the local residents.

94. Mr Edward C.W. Chan, CE/CEDD, Mr Vincent S.H. Chow and Mr Clarence K.L. Chan, SEs/CEDD, also made the following responses:

- (a) regarding the existing conditions of the sites, based on site survey, there were about 100 structures within the Long Bin Site and most of them were temporary in nature with existing uses characterised by industrial operations. On the other hand, the Tan Kwai Tsuen Site fell entirely within the government land and was partially occupied by some structures for residential uses of the existing Tan Kwai Tsuen. There were about 20 dwellings as claimed by the villagers of Tan Kwai Tsuen at the PSRC meeting on 24.5.2017;
- (b) an Air Ventilation Assessment (Expert Evaluation) was conducted, air ventilation mitigation measures including setback from Yuen Long Highway,

as a major wind corridor, for the Tan Kwai Tsuen Site and appropriate building separations were recommended to be incorporated into the detailed design of the proposed public housing developments;

- (c) the TTIA had already taken into consideration all the planned and committed public developments as well as the committed private developments in the district;
- (d) the carrying capacity of the West Rail would be gradually increased by 60% by increasing the number of train compartments from seven to eight, upgrading the railway signal system, increasing the frequency of trains from 21 to 28 per hour during peaking hours, and better crowd control and management. It was estimated that the additional demand generated by the new population of the two public housing developments only accounted for 3% of the increased carrying capacity of the West Rail. Therefore, the West Rail would have sufficient capacity to meet the future demand generated from the proposed public housing developments and other planned/committed developments in the North West New Territories. As for the Light Rail, the Transport and Housing Bureau had been liaising with relevant departments to consider the proposal for diverting one bound of the existing light rail tracks in Yuen Long town centre with a view to free up more space for road-based traffic; and
- (e) people living in the New Territories generally preferred point-to-point road-based transport. Upon completion of the proposed Tuen Mun West Bypass and Route 11 tentatively in 2026 and 2031 respectively, it was expected that more bus services to the urban areas would be provided for the Yuen Long South area. Besides, the Transport Department would continue to liaise with the public transport operators in order to enhance the future public transport services.

Long Bin Site

95. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the pedestrian and vehicular connectivity between the site and the Yuen Long town centre;
- (b) whether the proposed PTI and Phase 2 of the proposed development would share the same ingress and egress, making the PTI more congested; and
- (c) whether there would be grade separation for the proposed cycle track and road traffic.

96. Mr Clarence K.L. Chan, SE/CEDD, made the following responses:

- (a) to enhance vehicular connectivity between the site and the Yuen Long town centre, separated ingress and egress points were proposed for Phases 1 and 2 of the proposed public housing development in Long Bin. The ingress and egress of Phase 1 would be located at Castle Peak Road – Ping Shan Section, linking up with Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long Section to the Yuen Long town centre. On the other hand, vehicles from Phase 2 could use the ingress and egress at Long Tin Road to reach Yuen Long town centre via Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long Section; and
- (b) as for pedestrian connectivity, two elevated footbridges, i.e. across Castle Peak Road – Ping Shan Section and across Long Tin Road, and an at-grade footbridge from Long Tin Road to Shan Ha Road (across Yuen Long West Nullah) were proposed. A continuous cycle track network would also be provided.

97. Mr Ray S.W. Tang, Arup, also made the following responses:

- (a) despite the fact that the proposed ingress and egress points of the PTI and Phase 2 would be co-located at Long Tin Road, separated lanes would be provided for the PTI and the proposed public housing development; and

- (b) the proposed cycle track would not be grade-separated and cyclists would be required to get off their bikes when crossing the ingress and egress of the PTI.

Tan Kwai Tsuen Site

98. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the level differences between the various platforms of the proposed public housing development and whether escalators/lifts would be provided;
- (b) construction cost of the vehicular access roads; and
- (c) whether the site formation and construction costs would be much higher than those of other public housing projects given the site was situated on slope and extensive site formation work would be required.

99. Mr Edward C.W. Chan, CE/CEDD made the following responses:

- (a) the proposed development would have three platforms at different levels which ranged from about 40mPD to 80mPD. Provision of escalators/lifts within the housing development would be considered in the detailed design stage by HD;
- (b) the new vehicular access would mainly be an at-grade road with only a small portion to be built on elevated structures. The construction cost for the vehicular access roads would be similar to that of other public works projects. While it would be connected with Shun Tat Street at its western end, it would also be connected to the Tin Shui Wai West Interchange at its eastern end such that the traffic from/to the public housing development would not be interrupted in cases of any blockage of the vehicular access; and
- (c) the site formation cost comprised mainly the slope cutting and was considered essential given the specific site condition. It was estimated that

the construction cost for each residential unit would be similar to that of other public housing projects.

[Dr F.C. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

100. The Chairman drew Members' attention that YLDC had raised objection to the proposed amendments due to concerns on the traffic congestion problem arising from the proposed public housing developments. Similar concerns on the traffic impacts generated by the proposed public housing developments were raised by some Members during the discussion, Members' concerns on the compatibility of the developments, planning implications as well as the various impacts on environmental, traffic and visual aspects had been addressed.

101. In view of YLDC's objection, some Members further made the following responses/suggestions:

- (a) meeting the pressing housing demand was of utmost importance while the traffic concerns could be addressed through better transport planning and various mitigation measures;
- (b) new ideals/technologies should be explored to help resolving the traffic problem; and
- (c) non-franchised buses (邨巴) and public transport services should be enhanced to better serve the future residents.

102. The Chairman said that Members' suggestions above should be referred to PlanD and CEDD for further consideration.

Other Amendment Items

103. In response to the Chairman's queries, Mr David C.M. Lam, said that Amendment Item C was to rezone a site at Sha Tseng Road, which was the subject of a s.12A application No. Y/YL-TYST/5 approved by the Committee in 2015, from "G/IC" to "R(B)1" to facilitate a residential development; while Amendment Item D was to rezone a site

comprising two portions to the south of Park Villa, which was the subject of a s.12A application No. Y/YL-TYST/6 approved by the Committee in 2016, from “G/IC” to “R(B)1”. Members generally had no particular comment on the two proposed amendment items.

104. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-TYST/10 and that the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen OZP No. S/YL-TYST/10A (to be renumbered as S/YL/TYST/11) and its Notes are suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen OZP No. S/YL-TYST/10A (to be renumbered as S/YL/TYST/11) as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Town Planning Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the draft OZP.”

~~[The meeting adjourned for a 5-minute break.]~~

[Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr Edwin W.K. Chan left the meeting and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

[Ms Stella Y. Ng, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW),
~~was invited to the meeting at this point.]~~

屏山鄉鄉事委員會

第二十屆執行委員會

第二十四次會議記錄

日期：二零一七年十月十三日(星期五)
時間：下午二時三十分
地點：本會會議廳
會議主持：曾樹和
記錄：鄧淑貞
出席者
執行委員：曾樹和主席 莫永堅副主席
黃永生 鄧胤楚 蔡建新 盛曉鋒
鄧子光 黃連成 梁卓榮 吳燦輝
林權 文流芳 鄧鈞銘 楊大有
陳錫儔 梁金祥 麥炳祥
顧問：張木林 鄧慶業 楊桂消 黃桂棠
列席：黃偉明 鄧森福 鄭森祺 林如棟

政府部門代表

<u>姓名</u>	<u>所屬部門</u>	<u>職位</u>
余翠碧警長	天水圍分區警署	尖鼻咀鄉村巡邏隊
黃瑞豐警員	元朗分區警署	元朗鄉村巡邏隊
陳漢鈞先生	元朗民政事務處	高級聯絡主任
謝慧慧女士	元朗民政事務處	聯絡主任 (鄉郊二)
區裕倫先生	規劃署	高級城市規劃師
李倩儀女士	房屋署	高級規劃師
陳國樑先生	土木工程拓展署	高級工程師
周少康先生	土木工程拓展署	高級工程師

請假：

執行委員：鄧達善副主席 鄧建國 黃志孝 陳文輝
梁寶 鄧則鳴 鄧志強
顧問：楊家安 李軍樑 沈豪傑 吳永麒

會議內容：

一.主席致歡迎詞及介紹與會嘉賓

嘉賓如下：

天水圍分區警署尖鼻咀鄉村巡邏隊余翠碧警長

元朗分區警署元朗鄉村巡邏隊黃瑞豐警員

元朗民政事務處高級聯絡主任陳漢鈞先生

元朗民政事務處聯絡主任（鄉郊二）謝慧慧女士

二.通過本會第二十屆執行委員會第二十三次會議記錄(文件已於早前寄出)，秘書處無收到修訂，與會者同意通過上次會議記錄。

提議：黃永生

和議：吳燦輝

決議：一致通過

討論事項 1 - 《唐人新村分區計劃大綱草圖》所載的修訂：

曾主席歡迎規劃署高級城市規劃師區裕倫先生；房屋署高級規劃師李倩儀女士；土木工程拓展署高級工程師陳國樑先生及高級工程師周少康先生。

規劃署高級城市規劃師區裕倫先生表示，規劃署曾於 2017 年 5 月 24 日徵詢屏山鄉鄉事委員會對擬議修訂《唐人新村分區計劃大綱核准圖》的意見，並於 2017 年 9 月 8 日得到城市規劃委員會同意該修訂項目建議。該修訂項目於 9 月 29 日刊憲，公開展示給公眾發表意見。區先生介紹擬議修訂，主要涉及四組修訂項目，包括朗邊用地、丹桂村用地及兩項根據《城市規劃條例》第 12A 條已獲批准的改劃：

(1) 朗邊用地及相關改劃

1.1 修訂項目 A1

- 由「休憩用地」及「住宅（乙類）1」地帶改劃為「住宅（甲類）1」
- 總地積比率調高為 6.5
- 預計座數共約 11 座
- 建築物高度為最高 155 米(主水平基準以上)
- 預計單位數目共約 11,700 個單位
- 預計人口共約 32,900 人
- 將提供相關政府、機構或社區設施
- 用地及其周邊的現時用途
 - 第一期為朗邊中轉房屋
 - 第二期主要為用作露天貯物/貯物用途的構 築物/臨時構 築物、分散的住宅構築物和一個農場
- 展示相關圖片

1.2 初步交通及公共運輸影響評估

- 擬議發展對附近道路、路口及交通設施－構成可應付增長的交通影響
- 建議於朗天路增設用以掉頭的支路及於孖峰嶺路增設通道，以改善車輛的可達性及舒緩潛在的交通影響
- 提供足夠的泊車位及公共交通交匯處
- 已規劃的行人天橋及單車徑，以提升連接性

1.3 初步景觀及視覺影響評估

- 擬議發展用地內共有約 858 棵樹，主要是常見的物種
- 沒有發現罕見、受保護或瀕危樹種、康樂及文化事務署冠軍樹、或記錄在冊的古樹名木
- 建議保留 172 棵樹(包括 5 棵重要樹木)，移植 80 棵樹，砍伐 606 棵樹
- 及不少於 1:1(質量及數目)的補償性植樹建議
- 建議緩解措施－包括：
 - 美化設計
 - 綠化/補償性植樹
 - 屏障植物
 - 建築物距離/觀景廊
 - 建築物後移
 - 階梯式建築物高度
- 配合緩解措施，整體的視覺影響是輕微負面但可以接受
- 展示相關視覺合成圖

1.4 初步空氣流通評估

- 為了盡量減少對周邊地區的通風影響，擬議發展項目採用下列設計方案：
 - i) 寬度為 15 米的通風走廊
 - ii) 所有的房屋建築將會遠離朗天路 20 米以上及遠離山丘 10 米以上
- 為改善行人通道風環境，進一步的緩解措施包括：
 - i) 於住用樓宇地下採用不少於一層樓高的挑空設計
 - ii) 於沿著通風走廊的非住用建築，設計不少於一層樓高的架空平台，此等設計可同時用作緊急車輛通道或行人通道

1.5 初步環境評估

- 初步環境評估顯示擬議發展對環境包括空氣質素、噪音、水質、廢物管理、生態及文化遺產沒有負面/重大的影響

1.6 初步生態評估

- 預期擬議發展對犬面果蝠的潛在影響為低

1.7 初步土力評估

- 擬議發展的地盤平整及基礎建設的土力工程為技術上可行

1.8 基礎建設方面

- 根據初步排水影響評估、初步排污影響評估及初步供水影響評估，現有/已

規劃的排水、排污及水務設施足以應付擬議的公營房屋發展

1.9 修訂項目 A2

- 由「休憩用地」改劃為「住宅（乙類）1」地帶
- 輕微改變邊界以反映現有的住宅發展（朗逸豪園）

(2) 丹桂村用地

2.1 修訂項目

- 由「綠化地帶」及「政府、機構或社區」地帶改劃為「住宅（甲類）2」地帶作公營房屋發展
- 總地積比率最大為 6.5
- 建築物高度為最高 205 米(主水平基準以上)
- 預計座數共 7 座
- 預計層數約 41 層
- 預計單位數目約 7,400 個單位
- 預計人口約 20,600 人
- 將提供相關政府、機構或社區設施

2.2 初步交通及公共運輸影響評估

- 初步交通及公共運輸影響評估顯示擬議發展不會有未能克服的交通影響
- 建議沿元朗公路的雙線不分隔道路，接駁天水圍交匯處
- 建議改善順達街與青山公路-洪水橋段道路交匯處
- 提供足夠的泊車位及公共交通交匯處

2.3 初步景觀及視覺影響評估

- 擬議發展用地內共有約 1,450 棵樹木，主要是常見的物種
- 沒有發現古樹名木冊內的樹木
- 建議保留 215 棵樹，移植 100 棵樹，砍伐 1,135 棵樹木
- 及不少於 1:1(質量及數目) 的補償性植樹
- 建議緩解措施，包括
 - i) 控制建築物高度提供緩衝區以保留關鍵視覺資源之一的山脊線
 - ii) 於建築物之間提供視覺走廊
 - iii) 適當設計以確保建築物與周圍環境的視覺兼容性
 - iv) 補償種植和緩衝種植

- 配合緩解措施，整體的視覺影響是輕微負面但可以接受
- 展示相關視覺合成圖

2.4 初步空氣流通評估

- 為了盡量減少對周邊地區的通風影響，擬議發展項目採用下列設計方案：
 - i) 建築物將會遠離元朗公路 21 米以上
 - ii) 寬度為 15 米的建築物分隔帶
 - iii) 最低和中間平台的樓宇採用最少 30 米寬度的建築物分隔帶
 - iv) 非住用建築物採用不同寬度的建築物分隔距離

2.5 初步環境評估

- 初步環境評估顯示擬議發展對環境包括空氣質素、噪音、水質、廢物管理、生態及文化遺產沒有負面/重大的影響

2.6 初步生態評估

- 擬議發展附近有四種受保護具有保育價值的植物物種，包括土沉香、羅浮買麻藤、豬籠草和杜鵑花
- 豬籠草和杜鵑花位於該發展用地之外不會受發展影響
- 三棵土沉香其中兩棵通過移植保存，其餘一棵因健康狀況不佳，建議砍伐
- 羅浮買麻藤是一種非常普遍的物種，不可避免而要移除
- 兩動物物種具有保育價值：鳳頭蒼鷹和鐮刀束腰蟹
- 鳥類具高流動性，預計對鳳頭蒼鷹的影響可以忽略
- 由於損失部分丹桂村溪流，鐮刀束腰蟹（淡水蟹）將遷移保育

2.7 初步土力評估

- 擬議發展的地盤平整及基礎建設的土力工程為技術上可行

2.8 基礎建設方面

- 根據初步排水影響評估、初步排污影響評估及初步供水影響評估，現有/已規劃的排水、排污及水務設施足以應付擬議的公營房屋發展

(3) 小型項目修訂 - 沙井路用地

- 由「政府、機構或社區」地帶改劃為「住宅（乙類）1」地帶

(4) 小型項目修訂 - 柏巒以南的用地(金蘭觀附近)

- 由「政府、機構或社區」地帶改劃為「住宅（乙類）1」地帶

《唐人新村分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/YL-TYST/11》的諮詢期由 2017 年 9 月 29 日至 2017 年 11 月 29 日，任何人可就任何有關修訂向委員會作出申述。申述須以書面作出，並須不遲於 2017 年 11 月 29 日送交香港北角渣華道 333 號北角政

府合署 15 樓城市規劃委員會秘書。

唐人新村村代表林如棟先生表示，身為一個村代表，理應支持政府所推行的政策，尤其是興建公營房屋計劃。然而朗邊中轉房屋發展計劃影響唐人新村交通問題，車輛轉入唐人新村再駛往元朗，未知修訂大綱圖是否改善/減少影響該區的交通。另外，政府改劃唐人新村一幅「政府、機構或社區」地帶用地為住宅用途，鄰近一座樓宇（原先是別墅），這座新建樓宇是否骨灰安置所，未知上述發展計劃是否包括興建陰宅工程。

曾主席認為規劃署著重介紹評估方面對村民輕微影響，未有重點提及民生事項，如丹桂村十多戶受影響的寮屋居民，地政處有否妥善安排居民上樓及其他交通配套措施等問題。希望規劃署清楚講解各項目工程，如唐人新村新建的樓宇是否陰宅等等，讓政府推行之發展計劃得以順利進行。

張木林議員表示，規劃署於早前會議已詳細介紹朗邊中轉發展計劃，林如棟村代亦表示憂慮日後會影響該區交通問題。張議員有以下意見：

- (1) 朗邊村兩期合共總住人口超過五萬人，評估方面未有提及交通配套設施；未有提供實質數據，包括單位/車位比例，洪福邨的比例合理是 33：1。
- (2) 至於交通方面，車輛轉入唐人新村駛往元朗，影響該區交通；馬坑路的設計完全與今個發展計劃脫節；孖峰嶺路轉入朗天路可否改善該區塞車問題等等。
- (3) 另外，丹桂村配水庫受影響的村民對上述發展計劃之安排非常不滿，甚至衝進特首發表施政報告現場表達訴求。根據丹桂村配水庫大綱圖顯示，興建公營房屋約 7,400 個單位，容納二萬多人，未知該計劃有否涉及其他私人發展項目參與。修訂項目附表的第一及第二欄內容設計非常豐富，包括教育機構、圖書館、街市、場外投注站、私人會所等。規劃署只講解公營房屋發展，沒有公布私人發展公司參與其中，有隱瞞之嫌。由於土地用途牽涉利益，村民和鄉事會有知情權，希望規劃署提供真實資料。
- (4) 還有丹桂村交通，該區有兩條道路通往元朗公路—順達路和丹桂村路。至於洪德路轉右駛往元朗，現時早上交通頗為繁忙，要求運輸署闢建道路由丹桂村路轉右往元朗，希望規劃署得悉以上訊息後與運輸署配合，完成基建設施後，才發展興建公屋。

張議員希望政府明白，規劃完善基建配套的必要性和提供實質數據的重要性，方可得到市民的支持，否則地區將會產生災難性矛盾。

鄧慶業議員認為政府部門立場強硬，沒有接受市民所反映的意見而作出規劃修改。又認為發展計劃內容毫無創意，興建一堆私營/公營房屋，周邊輕輕提供一些設施，其他大型設施/入屋配套一切欠奉。顧問公司所規劃的洪水橋發展及元朗南發展離不開以元朗區為核心，真正的新時代城市規劃設計應該考慮將上述兩個發展區自給自足，配合大型交通運輸網絡，從而疏導元朗區交通，才是正確方針。著重依賴現有道路－青山公路、元朗公路、丹桂村路、洪德路，難以改善塞車問題。還有輕鐵搭客擠迫問題，也是元朗區居民非常擔心的事情，懇切希望規劃署重新研究完善基建設施，否則所有元朗居民均不會支持此等發展計劃。

曾主席表示，今次會議是相關政府部門的程序向屏山鄉鄉事委員會諮詢意見，其後再到區議會徵詢意見。現階段各方包括屏山鄉表示反對，因為現時元朗最嚴峻的問題就是交通的問題，熱切希望多個政府相關部門作出協調一併研究解決元朗區交通問題。最後，再次感謝政府部門出席今次會議。

以上討論事項於 3 時 29 分結束。

主 席：

記 錄：

日 期：二零一七年十月十三日

元朗區議會二零一七年度第五次會議記錄

日期：二零一七年十月二十四日(星期二)

時間：上午九時三十分至下午二時五十分

地點：元朗橋樂坊二號元朗政府合署十三樓元朗區議會會議廳

<u>出席者</u>	<u>出席時間</u>	<u>離席時間</u>
主席：沈豪傑議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
副主席：王威信議員, MH	(會議開始)	(下午 02:00)
議員：湛家雄議員, BBS, MH, JP	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
陳美蓮議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
陳思靜議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
張木林議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
程振明議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
趙秀嫻議員, MH	(會議開始)	(下午 02:15)
周永勤議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
郭慶平議員	(會議開始)	(下午 01:15)
郭強議員, MH	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
鄺俊宇議員	(會議開始)	(下午 01:10)
黎偉雄議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
劉桂容議員	(上午 09:40)	(會議結束)
李月民議員, MH	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
梁志祥議員, SBS, MH, JP	(會議開始)	(下午 12:30)
梁福元議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
梁明堅議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
呂堅議員, MH	(下午 12:45)	(會議結束)
陸頌雄議員	(上午 10:45)	(下午 12:25)
馬淑燕議員	(上午 09:55)	(會議結束)
麥業成議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
文光明議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
文炳南議員, MH	(上午 10:10)	(會議結束)
鄧焯謙議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
鄧卓然議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
鄧慶業議員, BBS	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
鄧賀年議員	(會議開始)	(上午 10:50)
鄧家良議員	(會議開始)	(下午 02:25)

鄧勵東議員	(會議開始)	(上午 10:50)
鄧鎔耀議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
杜嘉倫議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
曾樹和議員	(會議開始)	(下午 12:50)
黃卓健議員	(會議開始)	(下午 01:00)
黃煒鈴議員	(上午 10:30)	(會議結束)
黃偉賢議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
姚國威議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
楊家安議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)
袁敏兒議員	(會議開始)	(會議結束)

秘書：江國彪先生
 助理秘書：黃敏婷女士

元朗民政事務處高級行政主任(區議會)
 元朗民政事務處一級行政主任(區議會)

列席者 麥震宇先生, JP

陳漢鈞先生
 林智文先生
 劉永錦先生
 鄺英偉先生
 張培仲先生
 黃健義先生
 李伯豪先生
 詹玉娟女士
 趙莉莉女士
 吳炳棠先生
 黃樹恩先生
 朱詠賢女士
 許家耀先生
 梁加諾先生

元朗民政事務專員
 元朗民政事務處高級聯絡主任(鄉郊)
 規劃署屯門及元朗西規劃專員
 土木工程拓展署總工程師/新界西 1(新界西)
 教育局總學校發展主任(元朗)
 食物環境衛生署元朗區環境衛生總監
 香港警務處署理元朗警區指揮官
 香港警務處元朗警區警民關係主任
 房屋署物業管理總經理(屯門及元朗)
 地政總署地政專員(元朗地政處)
 地政總署行政助理/地政(元朗地政處)
 康樂及文化事務署總康樂事務經理(新界北)
 社會福利署元朗區福利專員
 運輸署總運輸主任(新界西北)
 運輸署高級運輸主任/元朗 2

議程第二項

林智文先生
 區裕倫先生
 李倩儀女士
 陳卓榮先生
 周少康先生

規劃署屯門及元朗西規劃專員
 規劃署高級城市規劃師/元朗西 1
 房屋署高級規劃師(1)
 土木工程拓展署總工程師/房屋工程 2
 土木工程拓展署高級工程師/5

鄧思威先生

奧雅納工程顧問主任(交通)

議程第三項

Mr Raphael Cohen

Gobee.bike (行政總裁)

蔡誠先生

Gobee.bike (公共事務經理)

宋賢邦先生

Hobabike (行政總裁及創辦人)

鄒健宏先生

Ketch' Up Bike (創辦人及行政總裁)

歐陽冠仁先生

Ketch' Up Bike (首席營運總監)

缺席者

蕭浪鳴議員

(因事請假)

鄧瑞民議員

(因事請假)

* * * * *

~~交運輸署。~~

(會後補註：秘書處已於 2017 年 10 月 24 日將議員的意見轉交運輸署考慮。)

8. 議員對議程沒有異議。

第一項：通過元朗區議會二零一七年度第四次會議記錄

~~9. 議員通過二零一七年度第四次會議記錄。~~

第二項：諮詢《唐人新村分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/YL-TYST/11》所載的修訂

(區議會文件 2017/第 63 號)

10. 主席請議員參閱第 63 號文件，內容是規劃署、土木工程拓展署以及房屋署諮詢議員對《唐人新村分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/YL-TYST/11》所載修訂的意見。

11. 主席歡迎以下部門代表出席會議：

規劃署

屯門及元朗西規劃專員	林智文先生
高級城市規劃師/元朗西 1	區裕倫先生

房屋署

高級規劃師(1)	李倩儀女士
----------	-------

土木工程拓展署

房屋工程 2 部 總工程師	陳卓榮先生
房屋工程 2 部 高級工程師/5	周少康先生

奧雅納工程顧問

主任(交通)	鄧思威先生
--------	-------

12. 林智文先生表示，規劃署聯同土木工程拓展署和房屋署就《唐人新村分區計劃大綱核准圖編號 S/YL-TYST/10》的擬議修訂，在 2017 年 6 月 27 日諮詢元朗區議會。其後規劃署將有關分區計劃大綱圖的擬議修訂連同元朗區議會的意見和關注呈交城市規劃委員會(城規會)轄下的鄉郊及新市鎮規劃小組委員會考慮。該委員會在詳細考慮後，同意根據《城市規劃條例》(第 131 章)將有關的分區計劃大綱草圖作公開展示，作為法定公眾諮詢程序。議員或公眾人士如有意見，可以根據條例的規定，在 2017 年 11 月 29 日或之前直接向

城規會提交書面申述；城規會會根據條例處理申述。在這段期間，規劃署聯同相關部門再次向元朗區議會介紹有關的分區計劃大綱圖及其修訂。

13. 區裕倫先生表示，在 2017 年 9 月 29 日城規會公開展示載有修訂項目的《唐人新村分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/YL-TYST/11》後，規劃署聯同相關部門在 2017 年 10 月 13 日諮詢屏山鄉鄉事委員會。他繼而簡介有關分區計劃大綱圖的四組修訂項目和發展參數等。

14. 主席表示，在進入討論前，他先代表元朗區議會歡迎元朗商會小學及樂善堂梁銶琚學校的老師和學生旁聽會議。

15. 黃偉賢議員表示，從程序來看，在 2017 年 6 月 27 日有關部門向元朗區議會提交關於擬議修訂《唐人新村分區計劃大綱核准圖編號 S/YL-TYST/10》的文件，當時議員不贊成有關的公營房屋發展項目，因為當局沒有聽取議員的意見特別是關於增設道路的訴求。另外，以往政府若不獲區議會同意，便不會將分區計劃大綱圖刊憲以啟動法定程序。他質疑有關的分區計劃大綱圖既已不獲區議會同意，然而當局亦繼續將之刊憲，部門再次諮詢區議會的意義何在。他認為當局沒有理會區議會已在 6 月的會議所表達的意見，強行推展有關的公屋發展項目，是不尊重區議會的角色，希望主席作出裁決。

16. 鄧慶業議員, BBS認為今天不應再討論有關文件，以示不助長政府部門以這種態度諮詢區議會。政府部門不理區議會贊成與否，都向城規會呈交有關的分區計劃大綱圖。他相信即使有關的公營房屋發展項目的道路規劃不完善，城規會也會審批該分區計劃大綱圖。他希望主席考慮中止討論。

17. 曾樹和議員表示，早前部門亦向屏山鄉鄉事委員會提交有關的分區計劃大綱圖，在討論後遭到鄉事委員會委員一致反對，認為當局不應不斷建屋，繼續增加人口密度，但由始至終沒有妥善規劃元朗區的交通。

18. 林智文先生回應如下：

- (1) 就程序的處理，一般而言，除非某些分區計劃大綱草圖的修訂有特別的機密性，否則規劃署會在向城規會提交建議修訂前諮詢區議會，目的是讓城規會考慮有關的土地改劃時，可以初步了解區議會的看法；

- (2) 關於本分區計劃大綱圖的修訂，在 6 月諮詢元朗區議會時，確有很多議員表達反對有關房屋發展項目的意見。規劃署已將區議會的反對意見包括區議會的會議記錄一併呈交城規會轄下的鄉郊及新市鎮規劃小組委員會考慮。該委員會在考慮修訂建議時，已就着這些關注特別是交通方面的問題作出詳細討論；有關的會議記錄可在城規會的網頁查閱；
- (3) 城規會已根據《城市規劃條例》公開展示載有修訂項目的《唐人新村分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/YL-TYST/11》，為期兩個月，進入法定諮詢程序。在這期間，議員或公眾人士可以直接將意見以書面申述的形式提交城規會。城規會會安排聆訊聽取申述人士的意見；及
- (4) 部門的代表出席是次會議的原因，是由於有關分區計劃大綱圖已進入公開展示期，希望可以藉此機會向議員講解有關的圖則和解答議員的查詢。

19. 張木林議員表示，屏山鄉鄉事委員會討論丹桂村及朗邊公營房屋發展項目時，鄉事委員會主席和委員以及村代表都對該項目持反對意見。議員和地區人士就交通問題提出很多意見，例如現在唐人新村交匯處的交通非常擠塞，而有關的公屋發展項目亦依靠現有道路如孖峰嶺路、朗天路等。可是，有關部門並沒有因應意見修改交通的規劃，似乎將整個責任推上城規會。他認為繼續提出反對也沒有意義，亦不希望區議會在今天再次討論有關事項。

20. 郭慶平議員表示，他理解某事項若在諮詢鄉事委員會時不獲該會同意，便不應在區議會討論。因為現在鄉事委員會表明不同意有關的唐人新村分區計劃大綱圖，為何有關文件會在區議會討論。他認為區議會和鄉事委員會都不同意該分區計劃大綱圖，但有關部門卻強行將之呈交城規會，大部分議員都會反對部門的建議。

21. 鄧家良議員表示，地區人士包括區議員、鄉事委員會委員和村代表往往十分支持政府發展地區以滿足人口的需要。政府在進行發展前諮詢地區人士，但經常不接受他們的合理意見。無論地區人士的意見是支持或反對，政府亦都照樣將規劃建議提交城規會。他認為城規會的委員由政府委任，必定會批准政府的建議。在這情況下，部門再次諮詢區議會意義何在。若政府不尊重地區人士的意見，例如受影響的居民希望不遷不拆、原區安置的意見，便難以獲得他們對政府的地區發展項目的支持。他認為政府應在諮詢時向地區人士交代是否接受他們的意見，適當地修訂計劃的內容才向城規會提交。

22. 黃偉賢議員表示，規劃署的代表回應說已經將區議會的意見以會議記錄的形式呈交城規會，但會議文件第 2.4 段指出在「2017 年 9 月 8 日，城規會轄下的鄉郊及新市鎮規劃小組委員會同意分別於前朗邊中轉房屋及周邊土地和丹桂村南食水配水庫南面部分土地改劃作擬議公營房屋發展，及反映根據《城市規劃條例》第 12A 條已批准的改劃申請的擬議修訂。」即是說小組委員會看到區議會的意見時，完全不當一回事，然後同意將規劃署建議的有關分區計劃大綱圖的修訂，原原本本地呈交城規會。城規會已經同意有關的修訂，現在規劃署諮詢區議會完全沒有意義。若小組委員會在充分考慮區議會的意見後會修改規劃署的建議，這種審議過程才有意義。他同意鄧家良議員的說法，城規會必定會批准政府的建議。

23. 湛家雄議員, BBS, MH, JP 表示，規劃署聯同相關部門出席 6 月 27 日的元朗區議會會議，就《唐人新村分區計劃大綱核准圖編號 S/YL-TYST/10》的擬議修訂諮詢議員，當天議員已反對有關的修訂。他見到文件中表示規劃署建議將前朗邊中轉房屋及周邊土地的最高總地積比率由 6 倍提高至 6.5 倍，與上次諮詢區議會時的建議不同。地積比率增加 0.5 倍，住宅單位或會增加二三千個，令人口增加幾千，其實是有關分區計劃大綱圖的重要修訂，應先諮詢區議會的意見才向城規會呈交。今天議員面對兩難的處境，若議員決定不繼續討論這項議程，但是因為有關的分區計劃大綱圖經已刊憲，根據法定程序，會有兩個月的公眾諮詢期。即使議員不作討論，有關部門可視作已諮詢區議會，並向城規會匯報。若議員只在議會表達反對意見而不在諮詢期內提交書面意見給城規會，當諮詢期完結後，城規會亦不會考慮個別議員意見的詳細內容。當局處理洪水橋新發展區的規劃大綱圖的做法亦是一樣，洪水橋新發展區工作小組與相關部門的討論仍在進行時，城規會已將有關的規劃大綱圖刊憲。他認為政府上述做法令議員十分氣餒，議員並不反對政府興建公屋，只是希望反映對交通配套不足和人口急速增長的憂慮及討論解決方法。他認為當局在未釋除議員的憂慮前，又建議增加地積比率，同時匆匆地向城規會呈交改劃建議，程序實在很有問題。

24. 李月民議員, MH 表示，剛才不少議員所說的程序問題，正是區議會一向的關注。就地區發展和地區事務，政府應先吸納區議會的意見並獲其支持後，才進行下一步的工作。他支持湛家雄議員所說，議員面對兩難的處境。若今天議員不阻止 6.5 倍的地積比率，該地積比率最終會被呈交予城規會通過。此外，若議員不繼續討論這項議程，他便無法反映丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組的意見，因為他在會前承諾該關注組會代他們反映意見，否則會令他們失望。他亦希望該關注組的意見在城規會得以反映。

25. 鄭俊宇議員表示，政府部門沒有理由繞過區議會，不聽取區

議會的意見。現時部門有時間收集公眾的意見和諮詢區議會，而區議會也很樂意提供意見。但是，政府部門只是形式上諮詢區議會，實際上強行發展地區，帶頭造成社會撕裂。今屆政府的施政理念是「與民共議」，但這次部門諮詢區議會根本不尊重適當的程序。因比，他對部門的諮詢工作有所保留。

26. 主席表示，就着議員關於程序的意見，一向的慣例是部門先諮詢鄉事委員會然後諮詢元朗區議會；但鄉事委員會反對的事項，並不代表不可以在區議會討論。事實上，他將這事項編入議程前，亦有諮詢屏山鄉鄉事委員會的意見。至於議員提議中止討論，議員在今年2月21日的元朗區議會會議討論相關的規劃建議時，議員根據《會議常規》第24(1)條提出中止討論的動議並獲通過。因此，作為主席，他不會違反先例以決定繼續討論這項議程與否。若收到議員提出中止討論的動議，區議會須按常規即場處理。另一方面，正如湛家雄議員所說，部門的文件除了顯示已進入公眾諮詢期之外，亦載有一些新的修訂例如增加地積比率、丹桂村南食水配水庫附近土地的改劃等，與部門在上次區議會會議提交的文件不同，因此不可純以程序的角度處理今天的文件，議員亦要考慮是否需要討論其內容。

27. 麥業成議員表示，由於有關的土地改劃涉及政府土地，所以部門才諮詢區議會。但他擔心若十位發言議員當中有九位反對一位贊成有關的土地改劃建議，部門亦可能將諮詢結果寫成得到區議會支持。所以，既然屏山鄉鄉事委員會已表示反對，他建議不需要在區議會討論部門的建議。議員非常不滿這個公營房屋發展項目和關注交通的問題，議員或可考慮提出否決整個公屋發展項目的動議。若議員一致通過動議，便可向城規會傳達更明確的信息，並記錄在案。

28. 鄧慶業議員, BBS表示，相關部門處理洪水橋新發展區的規劃事宜時，做法與今天一模一樣。洪水橋新發展區工作小組與部門未討論完各項規劃環節時，規劃署已經將規劃刊憲，完全是「霸王硬上弓」。議員也很清楚，規劃建議在城規會審批後如同判決。所以，他希望區議會作出一些有制約性、懲罰性的決議，否則日後元朗區的問題不堪設想。

29. 湛家雄議員, BBS, MH, JP同意鄧慶業議員的意見，並表示議員非常不滿部門處理洪水橋新發展區規劃的程序。洪水橋新發展區工作小組與部門討論各項專題時，城規會已將有關的規劃大綱圖刊憲。他提醒議員，就着今天的議題，當局已啟動唐人新村分區計劃大綱圖的兩個月法定諮詢程序。若今天區議會中止討論但個別議員想表達意見的話，一定要在兩個月內以書面直接向城規會表達意見，否則城規會便會視作沒有意見和不會邀請議員出席聆訊。

30. 李月民議員, MH贊成湛家雄議員的看法，有關的法定程序已展開，若區議會中止討論，規劃署便會視作區議會不予討論，續將有關的規劃建議呈交城規會審批。正如他在剛才的發言中所說，他無法協助丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組反映意見。他相信該關注組都希望向城規會表達意見，包括他們不反對政府興建公屋，但希望有關的公屋發展項目不擾民、可保育「綠化地帶」、要求規劃署與村民直接會面等。他認為若他們沒有機會反映意見，對他們並不公平。

31. 郭強議員, MH贊成湛家雄議員和李月民議員的看法。正如主席所說，部門的文件顯示不少土地改劃的修訂，而部門在未回應區議會和鄉事委員會的要求前已向城規會呈交規劃建議，過程已不能逆轉。他建議區議會繼續討論這項議程，最少可以收集議員的反對意見，並以區議會的名義轉達城規會，似乎較個別議員致函城規會為好。

32. 周永勤議員表示，區議會很不滿政府的處理手法，好像當區議會不是一回事。中止討論固然是區議會強烈表示不滿的方法，但以事論事，議員可以在公開的場合就這個公營房屋發展項目表達不同意見也是必須的。所以，他建議讓議員發表意見後，區議會才作出決定，這種處理會更好。

33. 鄧家良議員表示，他理解議員正在草擬動議，反對這項公營房屋發展項目。他相信旁聽會議的村民希望不遷不拆。若動議獲得通過，議員不需要再討論部門的文件的內容。

34. 程振明議員表示，在上次元朗區議會會議，議員已反對有關唐人新村分區計劃大綱圖的擬議修訂，現在部門再次向區議會提出有關建議，相信大部分議員的立場仍然是一樣。城規會沒有考慮議會的反對意見，將有關的分區計劃大綱圖刊憲，而部分用地的地積比率由6倍增加至6.5倍。若今天議員繼續討論而城規會仍然不考慮議會的意見，相信城規會也會照樣批准部門的建議。他認為應中止討論這項議程。

35. 就不少議員認為規劃署沒有如實反映議會的意見，林智文先生解釋，規劃署在呈交城規會的文件內已寫明區議會的反對意見，城規會亦有討論有關的意見。至於今天的文件中提及增加地積比率的情況，已在上次區議會會議中提及，他希望主席稍後讓他講解。

36. 黃偉賢議員希望林專員解釋，區議會在上一次會議反對規劃署的文件後，規劃署仍然將之呈交城規會。以後政府部門向區議會提交規劃建議的文件，無論區議會贊成與否，部門是否也會向城規會呈

交。

37. 林智文先生回應，正如他在上次區議會會議時提到，公營房屋發展項目有急切性和興建的時間表。一般而言，規劃署將改劃建議呈交城規會考慮前，會先諮詢區議會，以收集區議會的意見，一併呈交城規會作較完整的考慮。規劃署出席上次元朗區議會會議，完成這個步驟。現在進入《城市規劃條例》下的法定公眾諮詢程序，公眾人士可親自向城規會遞交書面申述。城規會會安排聆訊，邀請遞交書面申述的人士出席聆訊，闡釋其關注事項。以上是處理分區計劃大綱圖的修訂時的一貫程序。

38. 梁福元議員表示，部門今次的諮詢明顯「偷步」，繞過區議會和不聽鄉事委員會的意見。所以，若中止討論這項議程，個別議員應向城規會表達意見，始終最大的持份者是當區的議員。部門諮詢鄉事委員會時，鄉事委員會都有提出反對意見。部門沒有如實反映所有反對的意見，實在很有問題。

39. 主席建議休會十分鐘，讓議員有時間擬備動議。

40. 議員對此並無異議。

(休會十分鐘)

41. 主席表示，收到鄧慶業議員、**BBS**及曾樹和議員在席上提出動議，並獲王威信副主席、**MH**、陳美蓮議員、陳思靜議員、張木林議員、程振明議員、周永勤議員、郭慶平議員、黎偉雄議員、劉桂容議員、梁福元議員、梁明堅議員、麥業成議員、文光明議員、文炳南議員、**MH**、鄧焯謙議員、鄧卓然議員、鄧賀年議員、鄧家良議員、鄧勵東議員、鄧鎔耀議員、杜嘉倫議員、姚國威議員、楊家安議員及袁敏兒議員和議。動議的全文如下：

「有關唐人新村分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/YL-TYST/11 諮詢文件，早前已被區議會否決，但規劃署漠視區議會的意見，一意孤行遞上城規會，我們堅決反對，並在維護區議會尊嚴下，拒絕繼續討論有關文件。」

42. 主席表示，在就着動議進行表決前，會按《會議常規》讓議員進行討論。

43. 張木林議員表示，議員非常支持特區政府建屋以解決市民住屋的問題，但見到政府部門就兩項公營房屋發展項目諮詢區議會多次，聽到議員和鄉事委員會的意見特別是有關交通問題的意見後，對計劃沒有任何修改，他感到十分遺憾。在不同的場合包括鄉事委員會的會議，村代表都關注當局在前朗邊中轉房屋的地盤大量建屋，如何解決交通問題。然而他在部門的文件中只看到增加地積比率和建屋量。如提高建屋量是為了滿足基層市民的需要，議員十分贊成。但往往有關部門是為了建屋而建屋，沒有考慮其他問題尤其是交通問題。所以議員提出中止討論的動議，也是迫不得已的。他希望規劃署和土木工程拓展署看到動議的內容後，修訂有關的建屋計劃，以回應區議會、鄉事委員會和居民的訴求。另外，他亦希望部門認真考慮改劃「綠化地帶」的需要。總括而言，他希望當局能夠在社區和諧和令居民安居樂業的基礎上解決房屋問題，並希望規劃署認真研究議員的意見。

44. 周永勤議員表示，他有兩個意見希望記錄在案：首先，政府建議的四項修訂完全是為私人發展商辦事。A 項修訂把「休憩用地」地帶和「住宅（乙類）1」地帶改劃為「住宅（甲類）1」地帶，令樓宇密度由中密度變高密度，明顯為發展商提供用地。B 項修訂把「政府、機構或社區」地帶改劃為「住宅（甲類）2」地帶，只有部分是公屋。C 項和 D 項修訂把「政府、機構或社區」地帶改劃為「住宅（乙類）1」地帶。上述「政府、機構或社區」地帶本來是公眾用地，全部會變成中密度住宅發展，當中少量是公屋，明顯是剝削市民的公共服務的供應，並為發展商開路，實在不可以接受。另外，公屋的興建達四、五十層樓高，涉及過千個單位，即每層有 21 至 26 個單位，相較現在天水圍的和諧式公屋每層有 18 至 20 個單位，環境更為擠迫，公屋「納米化」的趨勢更不可以接受。他希望上述兩個意見記錄在案，公諸於世，而不是默默地反對。為了表示不滿，他決定暫時離席。

45. 麥業成議員強烈反對政府的這項諮詢和城規會的做法，所以會支持動議。他表示這個規劃建議中最重要的改動是將丹桂村南食水配水庫的附近土地的最高總地積比率定為 6.5 倍。該處是「綠化地帶」和山邊，是接近邊緣的部分。若將該處的地積比率定為 6.5 倍，相信其他接近道路的用以發展私人屋苑的土地的地積比率也會被提高。此外，會受發展影響的丹桂村村民一直要求與規劃署商討，但政府完全漠視他們的要求。他希望會後該署與丹桂村村民見面。

46. 姚國威議員表示，他支持政府建屋，但並非盲目支持。他在過去多次會議上都表示政府在建屋時需要解決交通和社區配套設施的問題，但當然遷拆的安排也要處理得當，令建屋計劃能暢順地進行。他表示部門早前向區議會提交類似的文件時，他已表達上述意見，今天部門再次提交有關的文件，其實無甚意義。因此，隸屬工聯會的議員包括他在內，都會支持動議的內容。然而，他擔心議員中止討論後，

會被部門視作沒有意見，曲解動議的意義。所以，他建議除了動議之外，會後或需以元朗區議會的名義向城規會表達意見。

47. 鄧慶業議員, BBS 表示，交通問題實在困擾元朗區多年。元朗是一個舊區，經歷數十年的發展和農業的式微，政府徵收農地以作發展。政府在元朗區展開不少發展計劃，將來區內人口會超過 100 萬，可是基建設施沒有很大的改善，政府對區內的交通問題置若罔聞。就丹桂村及朗邊公營房屋發展項目，政府也沒有提出有效的交通改善方案。而賠償方面的安排亦未落實，種種問題令人難以接受。他認同周永勤議員的說法，政府跟着發展商的腳步，失去應有的專業判斷。政府在元朗區不停覓地建屋，對區內居民的生活質素和保留元朗區的特色沒有好處。在這情況下，議員實在無法遏止忿怒。

48. 陳美蓮議員表示，居民追求安居樂業，希望政府切實解決居民的居住問題。此外，她反對政府改劃丹桂村以南的「綠化地帶」以建屋，現在香港有 700 多萬人口，若再使用「綠化地帶」建屋，會影響環境和空氣流通，對居民的健康沒有益處。另外，上次部門諮詢區議會時，她已強調政府在建屋時必須提供完善的交通配套設施。但部門就有關的公屋發展項目提出的交通改善方案，是建議車輛繞道以進入現有道路，不能長遠解決交通問題。此外，政府建屋的目的是讓市民有安定的居所和讓更多的市民受惠，而不是遷走原有居民以安置新遷入的居民。原有居民都需要政府協助他們解決居住的問題，所以政府要與村民會面，聽取他們的意見。政府必須致力令市民安居樂業，在過程中要尊重和回應議員的意見，但議員在上次會議提出有關改善交通的意見，部門在今天的文件中並沒有提到任何回應。她認為政府既然沒有回應議員的意見，繼續討論只會浪費時間。

49. 黃偉賢議員表示，興建公屋相信不會有議員反對，但問題是政府不應拆卸現有居民的房屋以建屋讓其他人居住，而政府在橫洲興建公屋，也沒有與橫洲的村民商討補償和安置的事宜。其次，他對政府規劃作住宅發展的用地最終是否用於興建公屋存有疑問，例如新元朗中心的現址和元朗第 13 區，本來的構思是興建公屋，相信因為發展商持有的土地較多，所以政府以地下有溶洞為由不興建公屋。他擔憂部門建議興建公屋的用地的地積比率提升後，政府又重施故技。另外，朗邊公營房屋發展可提供約 11 700 個單位，以容納約 32 900 人口。假設 10% 的家庭擁有汽車，車量數目便有 1 000 多部。他沒有信心在不增設道路的情況下可以應付增加的車輛流量，所以政府一定要藉着房屋發展改善區內的道路。關於「綠化地帶」，他在早前區議會討論橫洲公營房屋發展時，堅決要求政府停止改劃「綠化地帶」以興建公屋，所以他強烈反對部門再次建議改劃該類土地。最令他不滿的是規劃署的代表說已將議員的所有意見向城規會反映，現在議員可向城規會直接表達意見。他認為若規劃署不接受議員的意見，難以期望

城規會接納議員的意見。城規會的委員公務繁忙，相信會依足規劃署的建議作出決定。既然當局一意孤行，繼續討論也沒有意義，所以他支持這項動議。

50. 袁敏兒議員表示，她支持興建公屋，但對部門提交的文件感到無奈，因為政府漠視民意。她在上次會議已經表達很多意見，包括朗天路的交通噪音問題擾攘該路附近的民居十多年，但當局還沒有設置隔音屏障。朗邊公營房屋發展項目會帶來三萬多新增人口，居民出入主要也會依靠朗天路，到時交通噪音的問題會更加嚴重。元朗區的交通擠塞問題十分嚴重，居民常因此批評議員辦事不力。若政府不解決元朗區的交通問題，議員難以支持政府的建屋計劃。另外，她希望政府與原有居民商討安置和補償安排，關注民生。

51. 林智文先生回應如下：

- (1) 有關今次《唐人新村分區計劃大綱草圖》所載的修訂，主要涉及改劃土地以發展公營房屋。只有兩個較細面積的地點涉及私人發展項目，而所作的修訂只是反映較早前已獲城規會同意的土地改劃；
- (2) 社會對房屋特別是公營房屋有急切需求，所以當局希望在朗邊及丹桂村南兩個地點可以有較大數量的公營房屋供應，而規劃署為配合有關公營房屋的發展時間表，須適時向城規會呈交建議。當局明白進行地區發展不免帶來影響，所以希望區議會理解和包容，而當局非常尊重區議會的意見；
- (3) 當局進行土地改劃前已進行詳細的評估特別是交通影響。在上次會議未有機會詳細解釋。稍後土木工程拓展署的代表可作講解；
- (4) 至於地積比率方面，規劃署與相關部門在 6 月 27 日諮詢區議會時，提及當局因應房屋的需求增加，檢視輕微增加前朗邊中轉房屋及周邊土地的總地積比率至不超過 6.5 的可行性，所以在今次的文件中建議有關土地的總地積比率由不超過 6 增加至不超過 6.5。其實增加的數字並非全是為了發展房屋，更包括提供非住用的設施如街市、商場等。由此增加的房屋單位約有 600 個，約佔總房屋單位供應量的 5%。部門在上次會議已提及有關的建議修訂，不過當時顧問公司未完成評估，未在文件中交代。顧問公司完成評估後，當局認為有關輕微增加地積比率可以接受，所以納入修訂當中；及

- (5) 當局明白議員對交通和拆遷方面的關注，城規會在審議改劃建議時留意到議員就這兩方面的意見，並有詳細討論。至於當局會否與受影響的居民商討，其實丹桂村坑尾寮屋關注組也有邀請規劃署會面。規劃署和其他相關部門樂意與該關注組會面，討論有關的公屋發展和土地改劃事宜。

52. 陳卓榮先生回應，土木工程拓展署在進行交通及公共運輸影響評估時運用運輸署認可的交通運輸計算模型。署方以未來整體人口的發展類別及其他數據計算交通需求，參數包括學生、家庭主婦和在職人士的數目分佈以及交通費用等資料。顧問公司運用以上的數據及交通計算模型估算未來的交通需求。結果顯示，丹桂村及朗邊公營房屋發展項目對附近交通的影響可以接受。署方會在下一階段，進行詳細設計時，顧問公司會就優化整個計劃提出建議。而在落實工程時，署方亦會再委聘新的顧問公司審視有關的公屋發展項目對交通的影響。

53. 就陳先生的回應，黃偉賢議員表示顧問公司的估算的準確度不可盡信，例如當年運輸署和其顧問公司估算擬建的博愛交匯處的交通流量時，都表示沒有問題。但博愛交匯處由啟用至今經常出現交通擠塞，足以證明有關的估算並不準確。

54. 梁福元議員認為政府繞過鄉事委員會和區議會，強行推出建屋計劃，完全沒有理會地區人士就交通問題的意見。元朗區的交通擠塞情況每天都出現，例如私人屋苑原築和溱柏附近的公庵路路口經常擠塞，然而政府卻沒有設置新的道路以疏導交通。再者，正如袁敏兒議員所說，朗天路交通噪音嚴重，但當局並無在該路設置隔音屏障，反觀其他區甚至有隔音的道路。他續表示橫洲、元朗南、錦田南、洪水橋等不停發展，未來人口會增加數十萬，但政府並無聆聽地區人士的意見以改善交通配套設施。

55. 鄺俊宇議員認為政府部門繞過區議會的程序的做法，成功地令區議會更團結。他認為部門的諮詢工作原本可以做得更好，更有效地聽取議員以及關心有關發展的市民和村民的聲音。現在部門只在形式上諮詢區議會，繼續討論也沒有意義。即使部門將今天的討論視作已獲得區議會的同意，將來向立法會提交計劃時，身兼立法會議員的元朗區議會議員一定會如實反映區議會的意見。

56. 郭慶平議員表示，就剛才陳先生有關交通評估的資料，他認為部門可參考港鐵公司對鐵路乘客量的評估方法。現時元朗市和天水

圍的停車場經常爆滿，若如黃偉賢議員所說車輛數目會增加 1 000 多輛，一定沒有地方停泊。他查詢土木工程拓展署會否興建停車場及其選址以容納預計 1 000 多輛新增汽車。他並反映博愛交匯處每天都塞車，而港深西部通道的車流更較預計暢順。總而言之，顧問公司的評估不可盡信。

57. 程振明議員表示，元朗區的居民深受交通問題之苦，近十數年來整個元朗區沒有新的道路網絡，難怪多位議員強烈要求政府在進行地區發展前必須完善交通的規劃。然而，政府每每個別地推行發展項目，只集中改善個別項目範圍內的交通問題，忽略與周邊地區的交通配合。因此，他希望政府審慎考慮整個元朗區的交通規劃和配套，重新檢視開設新的道路網絡的需要，以疏導整區的交通為目標。現在部門建議的公屋發展項目，再加上橫洲、元朗南、錦田南、八鄉和洪水橋等地點的發展，人口的增長非常可觀。所以，政府在元朗區推行各項發展的前提是完善交通。

58. 杜嘉倫議員表示，他希望部門真正聽到議員的意見，否則議員不會信任政府的任何規劃數據。議員提出動議是由於部門的做法不合區議會的程序。政府應致力建立誠信。

59. 曾樹和議員表示，議員的動議是表達議會拒絕繼續討論有關事項，希望盡快進行表決。

60. 副主席表示，他不支持部門建議的規劃修訂，當然這並非表示他不支持政府發展公屋，而社會上確實有很多需要政府協助的市民。整個丹桂村南及朗邊公營房屋發展有兩個階段，第一個階段涉及前朗邊中轉房屋的用地。他建議政府考慮先發展這個階段，並調低總地積比率至不超過 6.0。他相信這部分的公屋發展的爭議較少，亦可配合政府增加房屋的政策。但是，另一階段即丹桂村南房屋發展涉及交通的問題以及環保的關注，亦會涉及補償和安置的問題，相信政府需要更詳細的諮詢和考慮，亦要改善交通配套設施和就補償和安置作出更大承擔，才可獲得區議會的支持。

61. 李月民議員, MH 表示他支持動議，因為所有繞過和架空區議會的做法都是侮辱民意。動議的信息十分清楚，指出在區議會的反對下，部門照樣向城規會呈交改劃建議，而部門在議會表達反對後仍然一意孤行的情況屢有發生。若居民不知實情，會以為議員辦事不力。因此，區議會一定要表達忿慨和不支持這種做法。他希望主席盡快進行表決。

62. 主席請議員就動議進行表決。

63. 議員以舉手及記名方式就動議進行表決。王威信副主席, MH、陳美蓮議員、張木林議員、程振明議員、周永勤議員、郭慶平議員、鄺俊宇議員、黎偉雄議員、劉桂容議員、李月民議員, MH、梁福元議員、梁明堅議員、麥業成議員、文光明議員、文炳南議員, MH、鄧焯謙議員、鄧卓然議員、鄧慶業議員, BBS、鄧家良議員、鄧鎔耀議員、杜嘉倫議員、曾樹和議員、黃卓健議員、黃偉賢議員、姚國威議員、楊家安議員及袁敏兒議員表示贊成。

64. 主席宣布, 議員以 27 票贊成、0 票反對及 0 票棄權的絕對多數票通過動議。

65. 主席總結, 在今年內政府部門三度向區議會提交丹桂村南及朗邊公營房屋發展項目及有關《唐人新村分區計劃大綱圖》的修訂的諮詢文件, 而一直以來議員非常擔心當一個高密度的公屋發展項目落成後, 是否有充足的交通和社區配套設施的配合。但今次部門提交的文件並沒有作出交代, 反而更進一步增加總地積比率。同時, 議員對部門沒有聽取議會的意見而繼續進行其他法定程序感到憤慨。此外, 亦有議員不滿政府繼續改劃「綠化地帶」以建屋。因此議員通過動議中止討論, 以表達強烈不滿。作為元朗區議會主席, 他希望部門真正聆聽地區的意見, 向當局如實反映議員的意見和不滿。

66. 姚國威議員查詢部門如何跟進區議會的意見。

67. 林智文先生回應, 若議員有意見, 可直接地向城規會作出書面申請, 截止日期是 2017 年 11 月 29 日。同時, 規劃署會向城規會如實反映議員的意見, 並將意見記錄在署方向城規會提交的文件內, 讓城規會了解區議會就有關修訂的看法。

68. 陳美蓮議員表示, 她擔心「下情不能上達」。為確保元朗區議會的意見到達城規會, 她建議以元朗區議會的名義致函城規會, 直接反映議員的意見和今天的動議結果。

69. 主席同意會後由秘書處準備致城規會的信件。

Provision of Open Space and Major Government, institution and community facilities in the Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (as at 23.5.2018)
 在唐人新村分區計劃大綱圖中提供的休憩用地及主要政府、機構或社區設施（截至二零一八年五月二十三日）

Type of Facilities 設施種類	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) 《香港規劃標準與準則》	HKPSG Requirement (based on existing population) 《香港規劃標準 與準則》 (按現有人口)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population) 《香港規劃標準 與準則》 (按規劃人口)	Provision 供應		Surplus/ Shortfall (against existing provision) 過剩/短缺 (與現有供應 比較)	Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision) 過剩/短缺 (與已規劃供應 比較)
				Existing Provision 現有	Planned Provision 已規劃		
District Open Space 地區休憩用地	10 ha per 100,000 persons 每 100 000 人 10 公頃	1.32 ha 公頃	7.13 ha 公頃	0	0	-1.32 ha 公頃	-7.13 ha 公頃
Local Open Space 鄰舍休憩用地	10 ha per 100,000 persons 每 100 000 人 10 公頃	1.32 ha 公頃	7.13 ha 公頃	3.26	11.19	+1.94 ha 公頃	+4.06 ha 公頃
Secondary School 中學	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17 每 40 名 12 至 17 歲青少年 設一個全日制課室	21.74 classrooms 課室	89.59 classrooms 課室	60	60	+38.26 classrooms 課室	-29.59 classrooms 課室
Primary School 小學	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11 每 25.5 名 6 至 11 歲兒童 設一個全日制課室	24.60 classrooms 課室	98.13 classrooms 課室	14	86	-10.60 classrooms 課室	-12.13 classrooms 課室
Kindergarten/ Nursery 幼稚園/幼兒班	26 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to 6 每 1 000 名 3 至 6 歲以下幼童 設 26 個課室	7.53 classrooms 課室	43.74 classrooms 課室	11	61	+3.47 classrooms 課室	+17.26 classrooms 課室
District Police Station 警區警署	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons 每 200 000 至 500 000 人設一間	0.03	0.14	0	0	-0.03	-0.14
Divisional Police Station 分區警署	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons 每 100 000 至 200 000 人設一間	0.07	0.36	0	0	-0.07	-0.36
Hospital 醫院	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons 每 1 000 人設 5.5 張病床	72.6 beds 病床	396.27 beds 病床	0	0	-72.6 beds 病床*	-396.27 beds 病床*

* Hospital bed and magistracy provision are determined on a regional basis. 醫院病床及裁判法院數目是按區域計算。
 The regional deficit of hospital bed would be served by Pok Oi Hospital. 區域性醫院病床短缺會由博愛醫院處理。

Type of Facilities 設施種類	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) 《香港規劃標準與準則》	HKPSG Requirement (based on existing population) 《香港規劃標準 與準則》 (按現有人口)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population) 《香港規劃標準 與準則》 (按規劃人口)	Provision 供應		Surplus/ Shortfall (against existing provision) 過剩/短缺 (與現有供應 比較)	Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision) 過剩/短缺 (與已規劃供應 比較)
				Existing Provision 現有	Planned Provision 已規劃		
Clinic/Health Centre 診療所/健康中心	1 per 100,000 persons 每 100 000 人設一間	0.13	0.72	0	0	-0.13	-0.72
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms) 裁判法院 (8 個法庭)	1 per 660,000 persons 每 660 000 人設一間	0.02	0.11	0	0	-0.02*	-0.11*
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre 綜合青少年服務中心	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 每 12 000 名 6 至 24 歲的 兒童/青年設一間	0.21	0.81	0	1.00	-0.21 [#]	+0.19
Integrated Family Services Centre 綜合家庭服務中心	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons 每 100 000 至 150 000 人設一間	0.09	0.48	0	0	-0.09	-0.48
Library 圖書館	1 district library for every 200,000 persons 每 200 000 人設一間分區圖書館	0.07	0.36	0	0	-0.07	-0.36
Sports Centre 體育中心	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons 每 50 000 至 65 000 人設一個	0.20	1.10	0	0	-0.20	-1.10
Leisure Centre 康樂中心	1 per 50,000 persons 每 50 000 人設一個	0.26	1.43	0	0	-0.26	-1.43
Sports Ground/ Sport Complex 運動場/運動場館	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons 每 200 000 至 250 000 人設一個	0.05	0.29	0	0	-0.05	-0.29
Swimming Pool Complex - standard 游泳池 - 標準池	1 complex per 287,000 persons 每 287 000 人設一間場館	0.05	0.25	0	0	-0.05	-0.25

* Hospital bed and magistracy provision are determined on a regional basis. 醫院病床及裁判法院數目是按區域計算。
The regional deficit of hospital bed would be served by Pok Oi Hospital. 區域性醫院病床短缺會由博愛醫院處理。

Premises based. Subject to DSW's requirements. 處所為本。按社會福利署要求而提供。