



城市規劃委員會根據《城市規劃條例》（第 131 章）  
對虎地坳及沙嶺分區計劃大綱核准圖編號 S/NE-FTA/16  
所作修訂項目附表

---

**I. 就圖則所顯示的事項作出的修訂項目**

- A1 項 — 把位於上水華山的一幅用地由「農業」地帶改劃為「住宅(甲類)」地帶，並訂明建築物高度限制。
- A2 項 — 把位於上水華山的三幅土地由「綠化地帶」改劃為「住宅(甲類)」地帶，並訂明建築物高度限制。
- B 項 — 把位於上水華山公營房屋發展西面的一幅土地由「農業」地帶改劃為「政府、機構或社區」地帶。

**II. 就圖則《註釋》作出的修訂項目**

- (a) 加入新的「住宅（甲類）」地帶的《註釋》。
- (b) 在「政府、機構或社區」地帶的第二欄用途內，把「商店及服務行業」修訂為「商店及服務行業(未另有列明者)」。

城市規劃委員會

2023 年 4 月 28 日

有關《虎地坳及沙嶺分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/NE-FTA/17》  
的申述人和提意見人名單

---

**I. 申述人名單**

申述編號 (TPB/R/S/NE-FTA/17-)	申述人名稱
R1	石湖新村（河北段）街坊會
R2	毛善良
R3	Mary Mulvihill

**II. 提意見人名單**

意見編號 (TPB/R/S/NE-FTA/17-)	提意見人名稱
C1	Mary Mulvihill

## 就草圖作出申述

## Representation Relating to Draft Plan

## 參考編號

Reference Number:

230627-014912-68202

## 提交限期

Deadline for submission:

28/06/2023

## 提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

27/06/2023 01:49:12

## 「申述人」全名

Full Name of "Representer":

先生 Mr. 石湖新村(河北段)街坊會

## 「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

Leung Tat Tung

## 與申述相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the representation relates:

S/NE-FTA/17

## 申述的性質及理由

Nature of and reasons for the representation:

有關事項 Subject Matters	性質 Nature	理由 Reason
反對華山公屋群	反對 Oppose	<p>若真的要發展，工程、收地、住屋等問題，對政府、對我們有著十分多影響，綠色鄉郊地方減少了、政府要提供地方容納我們、兩項工程同時影響著一些街坊引來十分不便。十分多車輛出入、塵土飛揚、噪音、去水、道路交通等等的問題</p> <p>前期工程的問題影響著街坊，住屋有問題影響，我們只有自行維修，在啞口無言下，吞聲忍氣、因投訴無門等難題下、受害的就是受影響的街坊、我們只有一個簡單我願望，就是保留現在的居所。過著一向適合自己居住的居所，在石湖新村(河北段)地方上的公屋群，是命名為華山公屋，是可有可無不合情理？</p> <p>1. 此計劃起於2022年的10月，為何我們完全沒有知事之下，迄今強行接受這意見安排；這計劃的起源，我們完成不知；香港還有很多地方比這地方更為適合，使用更適當的地方更為重</p>

0601

要，如皇后山一帶，會否更理想。

2. 暫時有粉北前、後期工程影響下，交通會有嚴重加大的而且嚴重超出道路的負荷影響，長者和嬰孩更甚；牽涉到不少墳墓，對陰宅、對先人、(麵包山)，對風水有一定的影響；

3. 地方與大嶺靶場的距離接近只有數百米，對靶場的運作及居民有相當的影響；

4. 會否安排適當及清楚事件的官員可以抽空到村，向我們村民街坊徵詢意見，好讓我們有清楚情況及有安排的準備

5. 鳥類，很多時因航道有障礙物，使牠們不知道而撞死

6. 在一遍平原上加上很多高樓之下，加重了地殼負擔，有機會使地殼變形。

對草圖的建議修訂(如有的話)

**Proposed Amendments to Draft Plan(if any):**

## 就草圖作出申述

## Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230627-184253-58178

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

28/06/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

27/06/2023 18:42:53

「申述人」全名

Full Name of "Representer":

先生 Mr. 毛善良 Mo Sin Leung

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與申述相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the representation relates:

S/NE-FTA/17

申述的性質及理由

Nature of and reasons for the representation:

有關事項 Subject Matters	性質 Nature	理由 Reason
修訂項目A1及A2	反對 Oppose	在粉嶺北發展規劃中 梧桐河與其北岸一帶 由始至終都是被規劃為 河畔公園 及 通風長廊；發展區的整體佈局是把所有高樓集中在 梧桐河以南 而且建築物高度 由地區中心 為最高 然後向河畔遞減。因為梧桐河北岸山崗 山脊線高度偏低 (普遍在100 米以下) 所以梧桐河北岸 縱有物業發展 都要嚴格控制其高度與坐向，以免破壞預期的景觀與通風效果。作為修訂項目A1及A2 選址背景的多個華山山峰，最高的亦只不過80米左右，所以在該地構建任何有相當高度的建築物 都會對整體景觀與通風 帶來一定負面影響 更遑論修訂項目A1及A2 中建議的170米住宅大樓。這項發展不但與週邊環境格格不入 更無視發展區原先的設計意念。

對草圖的建議修訂(如有的話)

Proposed Amendments to Draft Plan(if any):

擬議樓宇高度 減為與背景華山山脊線較匹配的 50米 。

0603

☐ Urgent ☐ Return Receipt Requested ☐ Sign ☐ Encrypt ☐ Mark Subject Restricted ☐ Expand personal&publi



28/06/2023 04:09

From:

To:

tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>

File Ref:

## **AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROVED FU TEI AU AND SHA LING OZP NO. S/NE-FTA/16**

**Items A1 and A2:** (about 3.7ha) Rezoning of a site in Wa Shan, Sheung Shui from "AGR" and "GB" zones to "R(A)" zone, subject to a total maximum PR of 6.7 and maximum BH of 170mPD for PH development.

4 blocks / 4,200 units / Population (about) 12,000

1 Public Transport Terminus with ancillary carparking storeys atop)

Kindergarten / Retail Facilities / Social Welfare Facilities

**Item B:** about 0.1ha Rezoning from "AGR" to "G/IC" for reprovisioning of the RCP and PT currently located in the western part of Item A

Dear TPB Members,

While the plan will certainly be approved, members must take a good look at the details because the proposed lay out and bulk is unacceptable. The proposed location, size and visual impact of the PTI block is shocking. This when we are being told that the community going forward will enjoy better conditions.

The paper admits this:

**Although the overall visual impact of the proposed development to some VPs is considered as 'substantially adverse' (i.e. VPs 2, 3, 4 and 9) (Plans 9a, 9b and 9e) and that it will inevitably alter the existing visual context and visual amenity of its locality**

But then tries to excuse it under the Suck It Up routine:

*"the proposed development, when materialized, is expected to form as the extension of the urban context of FSS New Town in the wider context "*

*"According to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), visual impact could be relieved by adopting visual mitigation measures where feasible, such as variation in building height profile (from 50mPD to 167mPD), sufficient spacing*

0002

*between high-rise buildings (minimum 15m), building setback from the site boundary (about 20m wide from the south), and careful design and façade treatment of buildings to enhance visual permeability ”*

**SO WHY ONLY 15M SPACE BETWEEN THE BUILDINGS? WHY ALWAYS THE MINIMUM AND NOT WHAT WOULD MAKE FOR A MORE HEALTHY AND ATTRACTIVE ENVIRONMENT?**

**THE PTI BUILDING IS A MONSTER. WHY NOT PARKING UNDERGROUND? IS THIS TO SAVE \$\$\$\$\$\$?**

Not only is it of exceptional bulk, it also blocks ventilation at the lower levels and members should note that the community facilities are placed right behind it, clearly impacting any chance of penetration of natural light and ventilation. Block 1 is almost stuck like glue to the PTI

That there should be such bad ventilation in what was once countryside is unacceptable.

The development is inefficient use of space. Why so many roads and EVA? With better layout there would be no need for all that asphalt on the right side of the development.

**Trees** – as usual not important and there will be 1:1. However most of them are packed into one corner or in military rows along the periphery

And again “**noise mitigation measures such as acoustic fin/windows, fixed glazing window** and enhanced acoustic balcony will be adopted for those residential blocks vulnerable to noise exceedance.

**SO NO LESSONS LEARNED FROM COVID WITH REGARD TO THE IMPORTANCE OF NATURAL VENTILATION AND LETS NOT GO INTO THE ISSUE OF TENANTS HAVING TO RUN AIR CON 24/7. GLOBAL WARMING IS IGNORED IN HK**

And “**no less than 5% of the domestic GFA of the proposed public housing development will be provided**”

**NO LONG SUFFICIENT WITH AN AGEING POPULATION.**

No mention of including a certain number of units that would be elderly friendly. This should be mandatory in all PH developments going forward.

While members are under pressure to approve all plans, they can still play a part in achieving improvements to them.

Mary Mulviill





☐ Urgent ☐ Return Receipt Requested ☐ Sign ☐ Encrypt ☐ Mark Subject Restricted ☐ Expand personal&publi



FU TEI AU AND SHA LING OZP NO. S/NE-FTA/16  
28/07/2023 20:45

From: [REDACTED]  
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>  
File Ref:

Dear TPB Members,

## LAND FOR HOUSING

It is time for all sectors of the community to unite and stop the 'Land for Housing' juggernaut in its tracks before it devours and eliminates everything and anything that is treasured and enjoyed by the community be it of historical, cultural, ecological, recreational or community value.

Unfortunately the subtle message is that anyone who opposes development plans that include the word 'housing' are daubed as being unpatriotic and enemies of the state. However it is time to make a stand. Unfortunately those campaigning for more public housing units are put in a difficult position as they are expected to endorse all plans regardless of their merit and long term implications.

**The Propaganda : "The Government adopts a multi-pronged approach to build up land reserve with a view to meeting housing and other development needs"**

**The Reality: The only approach evident so far is the easy solution REZONE REZONE REZONE.**

No matter what the existing use and its place in the formation of a liveable city:

- The land grab is decimating Green Belt, chopping down thousands of trees and eliminating flora and fauna. This reduces our tools in the battle against climate change.
- Our parks and open spaces are being converted under the one site multi-use formula into nothing more than landscaped podium tops where only ornamental trees can take root.
- Recreational venues are no longer pop in at grade options open to all. One has to go through security and layers of petty regulations that deter the more free spirited from enjoying public facilities.
- Village communities are being evicted and dispersed. Heritage and culture have not been spared.
- Unique heritage and cultural structures have been reduced to a shell and then filled with shiny glass and lots of lights under the 'adaptive reuse' policy that strips them of their integrity and original form.

There has not been a single initiative put forward other than rezone.

Regrettably there is no incentive to explore other solutions now that the

**administration can ram through whatever plans it wants** as TPB will not dare to overturn the applications and Legco will rubber stamp the expenditure without question. Secretary for Development made that clear in her statement that by the time plans are put to Finance Committee *"the concerns of the LegCo members will be on technical details, like whether we have sufficient facilities to support the new population, whether the timing of the whole construction schedule is reasonable, and whether we have done our best to respond to the concerns of the local residents affected."*

**It is appalling that no member of the Finance Panel attends Town Planning Board meetings on developments that will cost billions of dollars and radically transform our neighbourhoods.**

### **QUESTION THE JUSTIFICATION FOR DEVELOPING SO MANY UNITS**

#### **1. Abuse of PH units has not been addressed.**

While there are hundreds of officers investigating NS no dedicated team has been set up to look into this issue that would free up probably thousands of units. Most HK people know folk living in PH who own properties and have cash stashed away or invested elsewhere. Many units are used for storage or as accommodation for domestic helpers. A number of media reports have revealed the lax attitude on the part of HA when it comes to dealing with allocation of its resources. The most recent is the Ombudsman's revelation that hundreds of units with shared facilities have been left vacant. It is ridiculous that HA uses the excuse that it cannot remodel these units until all tenants have moved out. In the private market tenants are often forced to vacate units to accommodate redevelopment and under the Compulsory Sale for Redevelopment) Ordinance. Surely HA tenants agreement has a clause that covers redevelopment needs. PH is not a birth right.

<https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/society/article/3227578/vacancies-hong-kong-unpopular-shared-facility-public-sector-flats-should-be-reduced-ease-housing>

#### **2. No incentive for PH residents to downsize when family member move out.**

I was talking to a lady recently who lives in a large PH unit. At one time there were 7 members of the family spanning 3 generations living there. The parents have passed away and her husband and the children have moved out. One daughter stays with her from time to time. She moans about the rent but likes the space. One solution would be to offer new custom built elderly units to such tenants as many have health issues. Data indicates that each new PH unit houses an average of 1.16 persons.

#### **3. The population is SHRINKING both here and on the mainland. Failure of administration to take advantage of current market conditions:**

There are thousands of empty units on the mainland – even in GBA developers have unfinished projects. Many of the developers are in financial difficulties so this would be a good opportunity to acquire properties at a low cost that could be fitted

out as HK style public housing nodes. This is in line with government policy. The Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau has been airing a TV ad encouraging the elderly to move to GBA. Mrs Lam when CE stated that many of Hong Kong's elderly people were receiving old-age living allowances and based in Guangdong. "If our welfare policies make it more convenient for them to spend their retirement years there"

Some people in the queue for PH, including retirees, would prefer to live on the mainland. With an abundant supply of distressed stock available, the administration should be actively seeking to purchase vacant estates that could be adapted to the format of a regular Hong Kong PH complete with community and health services.

One way permit holders who prefer to live on the mainland could be granted residency here but allocated a unit on these estates. It is estimated that 60% of those living in subdivided units are recent arrivals.

This would be compatible with the mandate of the Central Government for better integration with the mainland.

#### **4. Failure to drive forward the Tenants Purchase Scheme.**

140,000+ such units were sold and each tranche was oversubscribed, indication that affordability was not an issue but the programme had been allowed to lapse. This would unlock the value of currently dormant government owned sites.

#### **5. Emigration is growing and interest rates are rising as the economy is slowing down and this is driving down the price of homes.**

**The Quota and Points System** introduced in 2005 has had the negative outcome of encouraging young folk to join the PH queue. This has consequences as it extinguishes the drive to look for better employment and opportunities as this would result in a wage increase that would exceed the limits.

The **Home Ownership Scheme** has attracted investment by families under the name of their younger members who can tick the financial status boxes and have become investment vehicles rather than the solution to the provision of affordable homes.

In view of the soon to be abundant supply of vacant units on the private market at more affordable prices, the administration should introduce more programmes to assist these young people in purchasing their own homes.

Only 60% of the units put on the market recently have sold and there is a record number of units being held back. In addition the administration has not provided an update on the number of empty units, over 200,000 when the Vacancy Tax was touted so certainly grown since then.

The administration is pursuing an outdated development model that is not in sync with the emerging conditions of both China and Hong Kong, shrinking population, significant increase in issues related to global warming and pollution and the need for prudent fiscal policies that reflect the reality that there is economic stagnation that is likely to persist for many years. Housing targets must reflect genuine need

but not overestimate it, as is currently the situation.

**In addition eligibility does not equate with need.**

The government has refused over the years to find alternative sources of revenue and persists with its high land prices policy. The result is a society with a shockingly high degree of wealth inequality that prohibits a large portion of the population from enjoying affordable housing. This translates into an inordinate demand for public housing and the miserable reality that all many can look forward to is to living in small, poorly constructed boxes on estates with ever dwindling open spaces and amenities.

Mary Mulvihill



30.9.2023,

- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implementation of FSIs and water supplies for fire-fighting within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 31.12.2023;
- (f) if the above planning condition (c) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (g) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (d) or (e) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

22. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

## **Agenda Item 12**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Fu Tei Au & Sha Ling Outline Zoning Plan

No. S/NE-FTA/16

(RNTPC Paper No. 1/23)

23. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments mainly involved a public housing development to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), of which the Housing Department (HD) was the executive arm, and supported by an Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The following Members had declared interests on the item :

- Mr Paul Y.K. Au - being a representative of the Director of Home  
(as Chief Engineer Affairs who was a member of the Strategic  
(Works), Home Affairs Planning Committee and the Subsidised Housing  
Department) Committee of HKHA;
- Dr C.H. Hau - currently conducting contract research projects  
with CEDD and being a voluntary member of a  
focus group of CEDD;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHA;  
and
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and an ex-employee of the Hong  
Kong Housing Society which currently had  
discussion with HD on housing development  
issues.

24. The Committee noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) in relation to the public housing development were proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Members in relation to HKHA and HD on the item only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. As Dr C.H. Hau had no involvement in the EFS conducted by CEDD, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

25. The following government representatives from PlanD, CEDD, HD and WSP (Asia) Limited (WSP) (consultant of CEDD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

##### ***PlanD***

- Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan - District Planning Officer/Shia Tin, Tai Po and  
North (DPO/STN)

Mr Tim T.Y. Fung	-	Senior Town Planner/Shau Tin, Tai Po and North
Ms Amy Y.T. Chong	-	Assistant Town Planner/Shau Tin, Tai Po and North

***CEDD***

Mr F.S. Sit	-	Chief Engineer/Housing Projects 3 Division (CE/HP3D)
Mr Bruce L.C. Cheung	-	Senior Engineer/Housing Projects 3 Division
Ms O.Y. Yip	-	Engineer/Housing Projects 3 Division
Ms Sandy T.F. Chan	-	Landscape Architect/Housing Projects 3 Division

***HD***

Ms Lily L.H. Sze	-	Senior Planning Officer
Mr Tony M.H. Leung	-	Senior Architect (SA)
Ms Cindy S.M. Chan	-	Architect
Mr Damon S.F. Yung	-	Civil Engineer
Ms Janet H.Y. Ngai	-	Planning Officer

***WSP***

Mr Vincent Y.S. So	-	Technical Director
Mr Dan W.H. Chau	-	Associate
Mr C.L. Yau	-	Principal Engineer
Mr Sam T.Y. Wong	-	Principal Engineer
Ms Daphne Y.M. Lam	-	Senior Landscape Consultant
Ms Kelly X.H. He	-	Tree Specialist
Mr Y.F. Lin	-	Senior Associate (Air Ventilation)
Ms Taylor P.S. Hung	-	Associate (Air Ventilation)
Mr Nate Y.C. Lee	-	Assistant Engineer (Air Ventilation)
Mr Bill H.B. Chan	-	Senior Associate (Environmental)
Ms Lily H.C. Chow	-	Assistant Environmental Consultant

26. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, technical considerations, provision of government institution and community (GIC) facilities and open

space in the area, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments were as follows:

- (a) Amendment Items A1 and A2 – to rezone a site in Wa Shan, Sheung Shui (the Site) from “Agriculture” (“AGR”) and “Green Belt” to “Residential (Group A)”, subject to a total maximum plot ratio of 6.7 and maximum building height of 170mPD for the proposed public housing development; and
- (b) Amendment Item B – to rezone a piece of land to the west of the Site from “AGR” to “Government, Institution or Community” for reprovisioning of the refuse collection point and public toilet currently located within the Site.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Mr Paul Y.K. Au joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

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

#### *Traffic Aspect*

28. A Member asked about the details of the existing vehicular-cum-pedestrian bridge across Ng Tung River, whether the bridge was the only access road serving the Site, and whether the capacity of which was adequate to serve the additional traffic flow upon the population intake of the proposed public housing development at the Site. In response, Mr F.S. Sit, CE/HP3D, CEDD, said that the existing vehicular-cum-pedestrian bridge over Ng Tung River was a proper vehicular access road with one inbound lane and one outbound lane, and was the only access road serving the Site. Taking into account that the anticipated traffic flow arising from the proposed public housing development at the Site was not substantial, the capacity of the bridge would be adequate.

#### *Fanling Bypass and its Interface with the Proposed Public Housing Development*

29. A Member asked about the design of the planned Fanling Bypass (Western



Section) (FLBP(W)) located to the south of the Site along Ng Tung River and its current status. In response, Mr F.S. Sit, CE/HP3D, CEDD, said that FLBP(W), the construction of which was targeted to commence in 2024 for completion in 2031, was a key component of the road network serving the Fanling North New Development Area (FLNND) as well as its surrounding areas. It was aimed to divert part of the traffic flow which currently relied on the Fanling Highway, offering alternative routes to the main urban area and the New Territories West, so as to relieve the traffic congestion problem and capacity issues. In respect of design, FLBP(W) would be in the form of viaduct whereas FLBP(Eastern Section) (FLBP(E)) near the Site would be at-grade. While the construction of FLBP(E) had already commenced, the road scheme of FLBP(W) had been gazetted under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370), subject to authorisation by the Executive Council after resolution of objections. The road scheme of FLBP(W) had been formulated before the Site was identified for the proposed public housing development.

30. The same Member asked if there were any design measures adopted in the indicative scheme for the proposed public housing development to address the potential environmental nuisances and interface issues with FLBP(W). In response, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that the environmental impact of FLBP(W) on the proposed public housing development had been duly assessed and addressed in the Preliminary Environmental Review conducted under the EFS. Concerning design measure, in addition to a building setback of 20m from the southern boundary of the Site, the proposed Public Transport Terminus cum carpark block in the southern part of the Site would serve as a buffer between Block 1 of the proposed public housing development and FLBP(W).

31. The same Member asked whether there were mitigation measures proposed at source, i.e. FLBP(W), to alleviate the potential traffic noise impacts. In response, Mr F.S. Sit, CE/HP3D, CEDD, said that as FLBP(W) might adopt a typical maximum speed of 50km/h, at-source mitigation measure such as the use of low-noise road surfacing was considered not efficient. CEDD would explore ways to further improve the design of FLBP(W) with a view to alleviating potential environmental impacts on the surrounding areas including the proposed public housing development without compromising the implementation programme.

32. The same Member observed that HD had endeavoured to address the potential air

ventilation and traffic noise with sensitive layout design. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Tony M.H. Leung, SA, HD, responded that HD had considered alternative design for the proposed public housing development, including the adoption of building blocks of smaller footprints. However, the current scheme was considered a more favourable and balanced option in terms of flat production, air ventilation performance and traffic arrangements. There would still be scope to further optimise the building layout/disposition and to incorporate additional design measures at the detailed design stage. The same Member, while appreciating HD's effort in deriving a sensitive layout and building design to deal with air ventilation and traffic noise issues, suggested that relevant government departments should consider the adoption of additional mitigation measures at FLBP(W) in order to minimise its environmental impact on the immediate surroundings including the proposed public housing development.

33. In response to the Chairman's question regarding the planning of the area around FLBP(W), Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, said that the area to the south of FLBP(W) across Ng Tung River was the northern part of FLNNDA where there were planned GIC facilities and the planned Central Park of the FLNNDA, and other planned residential developments were located to the further south-east.

#### *Hill Fire Risk*

34. Noting that the Site was located in close proximity to the hillslopes to its east and northeast where hill fires frequently occurred, a Member asked whether the potential risks and impacts of hill fires had been assessed and taken into account in the proposed public housing development. In response, Ms Taylor P.S. Hung, Associate (Air Ventilation) of WSP said that while an Air Ventilation Assessment – Expert Evaluation was conducted under the EFS, no assessment was conducted regarding the potential hill fire risk on the proposed public housing development. Given a considerable distance between the residential blocks and the concerned hillslopes, it was considered that no substantial impacts would be caused to the proposed public housing development in case of hill fires.

35. The same Member opined that the disturbance of potential hill fires to the future residents of the proposed public housing development should be properly evaluated by a risk assessment and addressed with mitigation measures, and suggested that tree planting in

appropriate location might be an effective way to prevent the spread of hill fires.

36. Noting that Members had no further questions or views, the Chairman remarked that Members' concerns regarding the potential environmental impacts of FLBP(W) and the potential hill fire risks would be recorded in the minutes of meeting and the relevant government departments, including CEDD and HD, would follow up as appropriate in the upcoming development stages of FLBP(W) and the proposed public housing development, respectively.

37. Members had no questions regarding other proposed amendments to the OZP and generally considered that they were acceptable.

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Fu Tei Au & Sha Ling Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-FTA/16 and that the draft OZP No. S/NE-FTA/16A at Attachment II (to be numbered as S/NE-FTA/17 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III are suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV for the draft OZP No. S/NE-FTA/16A (to be renumbered as S/NE-FTA/17 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

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

[Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung joined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

[The Chairman thanked the government representatives and the consultants from WSP for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

### Agenda Item 13

#### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-FTA/222      Proposed Three Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses - Small Houses) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lots 208 S.A, 208 S.B and 208 S.C in D.D. 52, Sheung Shui Wa Shan, Sheung Shui  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-FTA/222)

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

40.            With the aid of some plans, Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed developments, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department did not support the application.

41.            Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

42.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were :

“(a)    the proposed developments are not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and

(b)    land is still available within the “Village Type Development” zone of Wa

第 1 項——通過上次會議記錄

~~2. 大會通過 2022 年 10 月 11 日第 13 次會議的記錄。~~

第 2 項——擬議修訂《虎地坳及沙嶺分區計劃大綱核准圖編號 S/N E-FTA/16》及上水華山公營房屋發展計劃  
(北區區議會文件第 30/2022 號)

3. 主席歡迎八位政府部門及顧問公司代表列席會議，包括規劃署沙田、大埔及北區規劃專員陳巧賢女士、助理城市規劃師／北區莊琬婷女士、土木工程拓展署總工程師／房屋工程 3 薛鳳聲先生、高級工程師 3／房屋工程 3 張李進先生、房屋署高級規劃師／3 施麗虹女士、高級建築師／25 鍾錦財先生、土木工程師／6 翁兆鋒先生和科進顧問(亞洲)有限公司技術總監蘇欣承先生。他請規劃署代表介紹北區區議會文件第 30/2022 號。

(張浚偉議員於此時到席。)

4. 陳巧賢女士以投影片介紹北區區議會文件第 30/2022 號。有關投影片載於附件一。

(李國鳳議員於此時到席。)

5. 陳月明議員指數據顯示上水華山公營房屋發展計劃將會令當區人口增加 11 300 人，故十分關注有關計劃所帶來的交通問題。她指房屋局局長最近曾公開表示，往後的公共房屋計劃將特別關注交通配套安排，但現時文件只提及該發展區將設置一個公共交通總站，卻缺乏詳細資料。她指入住公共房屋的市民一般依賴公共交通工具出行，因此交通配套十分重要。她並認為部門應以皇后山邨的交通問題為前車之鑑。她請有關部門交代用何方法計算該區發展後的交通需求，以評估現時的配套是否足夠，以及有否為該發展計劃訂立針對性的交通措施和改善工程。

6. 溫和達議員亦表達對交通配套的關注，並指交通基建應是發展北部都會區的規劃重點。他指上水華山本來已存在不少交通問題，例如石湖墟馬會道、大頭嶺迴旋處均是交通擠塞熱點。他詢問華山是否有發展繞道或其他前瞻性規劃的空間，從外圍連接上水和粉嶺，包括龍山隧道和蓮塘、打鼓嶺一帶，以配合日後發展，並改善現時的交通問題。

7. 侯志強議員指上水鄉事委員會對上水華山公營房屋發展計劃表示支持。但他同樣關注交通問題，因現時上水的交通已很繁忙，若再增加人口，勢將令負荷更重。他支持溫和達議員所提出的發展繞道建議，並指可建造路口連接至粉嶺公路，讓駕駛人士不必經過石湖墟而可直接前往大埔、沙田一帶，他希望局方考慮這些建議。此外，他表示上水華山公營房屋發展計劃用地牽涉寮屋和貨倉，故詢問部門會否有相應的安置計劃，尤其是為寮屋居民。
8. 侯福達議員對上水華山公營房屋發展計劃表示支持，但認為上水古洞北的交通配套仍有改善的需要和空間，並指現時大頭嶺迴旋處早上繁忙時段交通非常擠塞，希望部門注視有關問題。
9. 陳巧賢女士感謝各位議員的提問，並請土木工程拓展署(下稱「土拓署」)代表回應有關交通方面的查詢。
10. 薛鳳聲先生表示，顧問公司曾按當區現時及潛在受發展影響的交通網絡進行初步交通評估，亦曾諮詢運輸署和參考粉嶺北新發展區的交通運輸影響評估研究。初步的交通評估範圍包括華山附近 12 個交通路口，當中 J4、J5 和 J11 交通路口均需要擴展(增加一條左轉專用的行車道)，以提高交通容量。若通過以上交通改善工程，配合粉嶺區新建的道路，現時區內交通網絡將足以應付華山日後新增的人口。
11. 陳巧賢女士回應侯志強議員就安置寮屋居民的詢問，指若落實上水華山公營房屋發展計劃，地政總署將記錄及查核受影響人士的資料。受影響人士如有住屋需要，清拆組會將有關個案轉介香港房屋委員會或香港房屋協會跟進。此外，政府就收地及發展清拆事宜亦設有補償安排及機制。
12. 侯志強議員指出，現時大部分車輛均匯聚於上水石湖墟，經馬會道、青山公路上高速公路，導致該處(包括大頭嶺及雞嶺迴旋處)交通擠塞。他重申，希望政府能改善道路規劃，建立路口連接粉嶺公路。
13. 薛鳳聲先生感謝各議員的意見，並指現時正在建造粉嶺繞道，東段將於數年後竣工，西段工程則於 2030 年左右完成，當中已預留路口連接該繞道及其他道路。
14. 陳月明議員指部門代表仍未回應有關交通配套及交通規劃計算方法的提問。

15. 薛鳳聲先生回應，顧問公司曾與運輸署商議，就華山額外新增的人口計算相應產生的行車量。就交通配套方面，華山發展區內將設有公共交通總站，供巴士和專線小巴使用。運輸署亦會密切留意情況，適時與巴士公司聯絡，制定將來納入的巴士線。

16. 陳月明議員認為，以上回應仍未能解答她的提問，她詢問土拓署代表會後可否提交書面補充。

17. 溫和達議員指北區一直缺乏完善的交通配套，建造外環線的建議早於多年前已經提出，但部門代表仍只參照早已過時的《香港規劃標準與準則》作規劃準則，缺乏根據人口分佈及發展需要等的預測數據，因而未能與時並進地配合整個北區發展的部署。他再次詢問部門代表有否作前瞻性的規劃。

18. 侯志強議員表示因現時上水石湖墟缺乏停車位，下午五時後，由北區政府合署、粉嶺圍至上水馬會道近石湖墟附近都泊滿大貨車和私家車，故希望警方會打擊違例泊車，以免令馬路變成停車場。他並希望部門能夠關注停車位不足問題，建議部門可考慮在華山發展區內或上水附近的地點設立更多停車場。

19. 主席追問華山發展區內是否有道路連接粉嶺繞道東段。

20. 薛鳳聲先生回應華山發展區內將會有道路連接至上水方向，車輛可以直接經擬議華山公營房屋西南面的龍琛路、新建的 L4 道路及 L3 道路連接粉嶺繞道東段。

21. 主席詢問可否有更加直接的道路前往粉嶺繞道。

22. 薛鳳聲先生回應說，主席提及的路線範圍涉及徵收額外土地(包括石湖新村及附近指定殯葬區)，經磋商討論後，認為現時的交通方案較為恰當。

23. 主席詢問粉嶺繞道西段的規劃是否正在進行，以及華山發展區內會否有道路接駁至該路段。他關注相關工程項目在時間上能否配合：華山發展項目預算在 2031/32 年竣工，而屆時在寶石湖邨、粉嶺圍和大頭嶺一帶等，亦會有差不多規模的房屋項目相繼落成。他指現時的交通規劃只集中於接駁居民往返上水站，質疑此等規劃能否承受將來新增的人口。他以皇后山邨居民現時大多依賴九巴 78A 號線出入為例，候車人龍常令巴士站及其站內通道十分擠迫；而現時上水廣場附近的迴旋處已十分擠迫，實有需要擴闊上水站附近一帶的道路，包括乘客在巴士站內的等候位置。若交通規

劃目標是以鼓勵居民使用鐵路為主，部門代表能否交代相關的預測數據，例如分別以鐵路和巴士出行的人次比例等。

24. 薛鳳聲先生綜合回應如下：

- (a) 就計算方法而言，採用項目內樓宇落成的年份(2030/31 年度)再加三年(即 2033/34 年度)的數據，並涵蓋同期發展項目的數據，然後由電腦模型演算不同路口的容量變化，結果得出 J4、J5 和 J11 的路口需要額外交通改善措施，例如增加一條進入路口前的行車線，以提高路口的交通容量；
- (b) 前瞻性的交通規劃方面，他指政府剛在上星期開展「三鐵三路」的公眾諮詢，當中包括沙田繞道和北都公路等建議。其中所建議的粉嶺繞道東段約在三年後竣工，西段則在 2030 年落成。相信粉嶺繞道能夠紓緩附近一帶的交通負荷；
- (c) 就上水港鐵站和巴士站的負荷量問題，他指顧問公司曾對巴士站使用量作出研究評估，指該站還有空間增加巴士班次，以容納華山新發展區的居民；以及
- (d) 就泊車位問題，他指房屋署會在華山新發展區內按標準上限提供屋邨泊車位。

25. 李冠洪議員認為現時所規劃的行車路線較為迂迴：粉嶺繞道就在華山新發展區旁邊，為何需要繞過上水市區才能接駁至粉嶺繞道，有違環保原則。他並指剛才主席所建議路線範圍內的建築物多是寮屋，而非村莊。既然項目收地已涉及區內大部分寮屋，為何不一併徵收餘下的小片土地，以建造一條較為直接連接粉嶺繞道的道路，有效解決華山公營房屋發展計劃帶來的交通負荷問題。

26. 薛鳳聲先生指有關建議始終另涉一些非空置寮屋，而初步的交通評估計算結果亦顯示現時的交通規劃建議已可應付日後的交通流量。

27. 李冠洪議員重申當整個華山公營房屋發展計劃將徵收區內相當數量的寮屋，為何不再徵收餘下的小部分寮屋，以建造更直接快捷的道路連貫粉嶺繞道。

28. 薛鳳聲先生回應表示，署方曾考慮相關建議，除因涉及寮屋外，還有地勢高低差、交通安全等問題，故沒有採納。



29. 李冠洪議員指地勢高低差問題可藉工程技術解決，故不明白在交通安全上有何考慮。

30. 薛鳳聲先生表示，由於工程複雜及時間關係，未能於會上詳細解釋有關交通安全考慮的細節。

31. 陳巧賢女士感謝議員的提問。她指出相關建議涉及徵收較多人士居住的土地，存有阻力；而署方在考慮不同方案時會儘量減少受影響的居民人數。她感謝各議員的意見，並會與相關部門及顧問考慮議員的意見，研究有否改善空間。她並回應指項目內的樓宇屬房屋署的公營房屋，不設公眾泊車位，但她會把相關意見轉達運輸署跟進。她指運輸署亦有留意到公眾泊車位的需求問題，會盡量在其他地方物色公眾泊車位置。

32. 主席追問粉嶺繞道西段是否在 2030 年落成，並指相關路段能否接駁東段和華山公營房屋發展區。他亦詢問部門代表會否在會後提交關於交通評估的資料，例如分別以鐵路和巴士出行的人次比例等。

33. 薛鳳聲先生表示，粉嶺繞道東段的工程正在興建當中。根據工程時間表，此路段約在 2025 年竣工，而西段則在 2030/31 年度落成。

34. 主席表示，若粉嶺繞道西段的工程還未開始，華山公營房屋發展計劃的交通規劃走線和出口能否納入西段工程範圍，從而接駁該兩處地方，並把華山邨整個交通配套和社區項目帶至古洞北和文錦渡一帶，以解決石湖墟擠塞問題。

35. 薛鳳聲先生表示，按規劃將有道路改善工程及新道路接駁至粉嶺繞道迴旋處，最終能接駁至粉嶺繞道西段。

36. 主席重申，現時的道路規劃路線較為迂迴，並指應着重接駁基建，以免日後有其他臨時房屋項目落成時，沒有擴建空間。

37. 薛鳳聲先生表示，粉嶺繞道西段的工程設計應已完成，而西段屬凌空高架橋設計，故不會有道路直接從地面接駁華山公營房屋發展區。現行設計將使用改善後的龍琛路、新建的 L4 及 L3 道路經粉嶺繞道迴旋處前往西段。

38. 李冠洪議員補充，議員對只有單一道路往返華山公營房屋發展區表示擔憂。一旦該道路發生交通意外，將導致其他道路擠

塞。他指若有道路直接連接粉嶺繞道西段，駕駛人士便能有多一條道路返回華山公營房屋發展區，疏導交通流量。

39. 薛鳳聲先生表示，署方已考慮李冠洪議員提及的情況，故在建議路口改善計劃中包括了「擴闊龍琛路」一項。一旦發生交通意外，車輛也能單線行駛。

40. 李冠洪議員向主席建議，在座議員大致上同意規劃署更改土地用途的申請，以便署方儘早展開籌備工作，但認為署方將來必須在往後的北區區議會會議交代相關的交通配套規劃，以及考慮議員的意見，釋除議員的憂慮。

41. 主席總結，北區區議會原則上同意及支持修訂《虎地坳及沙嶺分區計劃大綱核准圖編號 S/NE-FTA/16》及上水華山公營房屋發展計劃，但認為接駁粉嶺繞道西段的交通規劃是關注重點之一，存有很大的改善空間，希望部門代表研究相關意見。若有消息，可再次於北區區議會中匯報。

(會後補註：規劃署、土拓署和其他相關部門就議員對交通規劃的意見，在會後提供補充回應。詳情見附件二。)

~~**第 3 項** 北區地政處處理小型屋宇申請及處理重建新界豁免屋宇申請績效表~~  
(北區區議會文件第 31/2022 號)

42. 大會備悉北區區議會文件第 31/2022 號。

43. 陳月明議員提出以下關注：

- (a) 文件顯示的累積個案數目較上次多，她詢問北區地政處(下稱「地政處」)有何方法改善情況；以及
- (b) 就小型屋宇重建方面，她表示曾接獲村長投訴，有打鼓嶺松園下村的申請人在繳交小型屋宇重建相關文件後，沒接獲處方發出「開工紙」，且被要求修改圖則，改以化糞池排污。她到現場視察後，認為處方的要求並不合理。該申請人的小型屋宇早於十年前左右建成，現時只是申請小型屋宇重建，故不理解為何處方要求申請人須建造化糞池才會發出「開工紙」。她並詢問處方是否有不少累積個案屬類似情況。若處方代表未能於會議上回應，可於會後提供解釋或書面回應。