

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

TPB Paper No. 10902

**For Consideration by
the Town Planning Board on 12.6.2023**

**DRAFT FANLING/SHEUNG SHUI EXTENSION AREA
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/FSSE/1**

**CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-R1 TO R6791
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-C1 TO C51**

TPB Paper No. 10902
For Consideration by
the Town Planning Board
on 12.6.2023

**DRAFT FANLING/SHEUNG SHUI EXTENSION AREA
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/FSSE/1
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-R1 TO R6791
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-C1 TO C51**

| Subject of Representations | Representers (No. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-) Total: 6,7886,787 | Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-) Total: 51 |
|---|---|--|
| <p><u>Support</u> the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP), the proposed public housing development in “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone, and/or the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Conservation cum Recreation” (“OU(CR)”) zone</p> | <p><u>Total: 13</u></p> <p><i>Concern Group (1)</i> R10: 公屋聯會</p> <p><i>Individuals (12)</i> R1 to R5, R7, R8, R11 to R14 and R6551</p> | <p><u>Total: 35</u></p> <p><i>Concern Groups (10): Support the draft OZP</i> C1: Society for Community Organisation C2: 長者房屋關注組 C3: 基層房屋關注組 C4: 非長者單身人士房屋組 C5: 租務管制關注組 C6: 香港露宿權益協會 C7: Elderly Rights League HK C8: 兒童權利關注會 C9: 低收入在職家庭關注會 C10: 新移民互助會</p> <p><i>Individuals (25): Support the draft OZP</i> C17, C25, C33 and C34 supports R1 C11 to C16, C18 to C24, C26 to C32, and C35</p> |
| <p><u>Support</u> the proposed public housing development in “R(A)” zone, but <u>oppose</u> the “OU(CR)” zone</p> | <p><u>Total: 3</u></p> <p><i>Individuals (3)</i> R15 to R17</p> | |
| <p><u>Support</u> the “OU(CR)” zone, but <u>oppose</u> the proposed public housing development in “R(A)”</p> | <p><u>Total: 233</u></p> <p>R242: Hong Kong Golf Club (HKGC)</p> <p><i>Golf/Sports-related Organisations (2)</i> R19: The Chariot Club Limited R6707: Friends Of Asia Hong Kong</p> | <p><u>Total: 3</u></p> <p>C36: HKGC (also R242) provides further views and views on R1 to R5, R7 to R8, R10 to R17, R24, R42, R144, R160, R242, R250, R255, R256, R297, R320, R383, R387, R388, R389, R408, R448, R499, R506, R523, R524,</p> |

| Subject of Representations | Representers (No. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-) Total: 6,7886,787 | Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-) Total: 51 |
|--|---|--|
| | <p><u>Companies (3)</u> R18, R20 and R21</p> <p><u>Individuals (227)</u> R6, R9, R22 to R241, R243, R244 and R246 to R248</p> | <p>R556, R562, R600, R604, R605, R623, R624, R648, R659, R683, R684, R686, R737, R3378, R3461, R5816, R6713, R6728, R6754, R6758, R6773 and R6783</p> <p><u>Golf/Sports-related Organisation (1)</u></p> <p>C37: 北區足球康樂會 supports R242</p> <p><u>Individual (1)</u> C42 (also R383) provides further views and views on R2, R3, R10, R13 and R14</p> |
| <p><u>Oppose</u> the OZP, the proposed public housing development in “R(A)” zone, and/or the “OU(CR)” zone</p> | <p><u>Total: 6,5316,530</u></p> <p><u>Golf/Sports-related Organisations (28)</u> R252: Royal Harare Golf Club R253: 香港單車協會 R275: China Hong Kong Innovation Industry Golfers Society R387: The European Tour Group R389: Asian Tour R466: The 1872 Golf Society R501: Little Sai Wan Golfing Society R580: Travel Industry Golf Association of Hong Kong R582: The Hong Kong Senior Golf Society R583: 香港中華游樂會 R670: China - Hong Kong Executive Women's Golf Association R675: The Wednesday Afternoon Golf Society R676: The Indian Golfing Society R677: The Kellett Golf Society R679: The Clearwater Bay Golf & Country Club R681: 香港教師高爾夫聯會</p> | <p><u>Total: 10</u></p> <p><u>Golf/Sports-related Organisations (3)</u> C38: 北區清河足球會 opposes the OZP and provides views on R242 C39: Kam Tsin Village Ho Tung Kindergarten opposes the OZP and provides views on R242 C46: Asian Tour (also R389) provides further views and views on R242</p> <p><u>Golf Player (1)</u> C43 (also R327) provides further views and views on R1 to R5, R6 to R11, R14, R250, R297, R383, R387, R389, R684, R3378 and R6773</p> <p><u>Individuals (6)</u> C40 (also R529) provides further views C41(also R102) provides further views C44 (also R406) provides views on R1</p> |

| Subject of Representations | Representers (No. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-) Total: 6,7886,787 | Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-) Total: 51 |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>R682: Telant Golf Club R1380: Discovery Bay Residents Golf Society R2276: The Hong Kong Japanese Golfing Society R3265: The Hong Kong University Golfing Society R3353: PGA Development Center-Waterfall R6517: Hong Kong Medical Golfers Association Ltd. R6696: Hong Kong Football Club R6718: Bonnie Doon Golf Club R6726: Royal Wimbledon Golf Club Limited R6727: Shek O Country Club R6730: The Hong Kong Professionals Association Limited R6754: Hong Kong Golf Association</p> <p><u>Green Groups (4)</u> R388: Friends Of Hoi Ha R476: The Institute of International Sustainable Development R499: The Hong Kong Countryside Foundation R687: The Hong Kong Gardening Society Limited</p> <p><u>DC/RC/Local Representatives (9)</u> R250: 丙崗村公所 R254: 香港福建社團聯會(新界北分會) R255: 龍躍頭鄉公所 R256 and R684: North District Council members R556: Heung Yee Kuk R683: Sheung Shui District Rural Committee R685: Sha Tau Kok District Rural Committee R686: Fanling District Rural Committee</p> | <p>C47 (also R1383) opposes R9 and provides views on R4, R7 and R11 C48 provides views on R254 C51 (also R6774) provides further views</p> |

Non-Profit Making Organisation
(I)

R678: We R Family Foundation
Limited

Golf Players (III)

R245, R249, R286, R314, R320, R327, R328, R400, R403, R408, R418, R419, R421, R423, R425, R429, R431, R437, R446, R447, R451, R459, R463, R477, R480, R481, R484, R507, R514, R516, R523, R526, R532, R538, R542, R544, R551, R565, R592, R595, R596, R606, R614, R621, R624, R626, R633, R640, R642, R644, R659, R661, R1280, R1354, R1379, R1385, R1428, R1946, R1948, R1963, R1999, R2296, R2329, R2437, R2472, R3279, R3303, R3310, R3311, R3314, R3335, R3350, R3393, R3394, R3402, R3429, R3439, R3441, R3455, R3470, R3496, R3527, R3991, R4008, R4280, R4342, R4343, R4350, R6002, R6573, R6580, R6585, R6590, R6614, R6702, R6703, R6708, R6713, R6714, R6734, R6737, R6738, R6746, R6752, R6753, R6755 R6768, R6770, R6771, R6775 and R6785

Individuals (6,3786,377)

R251, R257 to R274, R276 to R285, R287 to R313, R315 to R319, R321 to R326, R329 to R332, R334 to R386, R390 to R399, R401, R402, R404 to R407, R409 to R417, R420, R422, R424, R426 to R428, R430, R432 to R435, R436, R438 to R445, R448 to R450, R452 to R458, R460 to R462, R464, R465, R467 to R475, R478, R479, R482, R483, R485 to R498, R500, R502 to R506, R508 to R513, R515, R517 to R522, R524, R525, R527 to R531, R533 to R537, R539 to R541, R543, R545 to R550, R552 to R555, R557 to R564, R566 to R579,

| Subject of Representations | Representers (No. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-) Total: 6,7886,787 | Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-) Total: 51 |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>R581, R584 to R591, R593, R594, R597 to R605, R607 to R613, R615 to R620, R622, R623, R625, R627 to R632, R634 to R639, R641, R643, R645 to R658, R660, R662 to R696, R671 to R674, R680, R688 to R1279, R1281 to R1353, R1355 to R1378, R1381 to R1384, R1386 to R1427, R1429 to R1945, R1947, R1949 to R1962, R1964 to R1998, R2000 to R2275, R2277 to R2295, R2298 to R2318, R2320 to R2328, R2330 to R2436, R2438 to R2471, R2473 to R3264, R3266 to R3278, R3280 to R3302, R3304 to R3309, R3312, R3313, R3315 to R3334, R3336 to R3349, R3351 to R3352, R3354 to R3392, R3395 to R3401, R3403 to R3428, R3430 to R3438, R3440, R3442 to R3454, R3456 to R3469, R3471 to R3495, R3497 to R3526, R3528 to R3390, R3392 to R4007, R4409 to R4279, R4281 to R4341, R4344 to R4349, R4351 to R4469, R4471 to R6001, R6003 to R6516, R6518 to R6550, R6552 to R6572, R6574 to R6579, R6581 to R6584, R6586 to R6589, R6591 to R6613, R6615 to R6695, R6697 to R6701, R6704 to R6706, R6709 to R6712, R6715 to R6717, R6719 to R6725, R6731 to R6733, R6736, R6739 to R6741, R6743 to R6745, R6747 to R6751, R6756 to R6758, R6760 to R6767, R6769, R6772 to R6774, R6776, R6777, R6779 to R6782, R6784, R6786 to R6789 and R6791</p> | |
| <p>Provide views on the OZP, the proposed public housing development in “R(A)” zone, and/or the “OU(CR)” zone</p> | <p>Total: 7</p> <p><i>Green Groups (3)</i></p> <p>R6728: Green Sense HK Limited</p> <p>R6729: Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden</p> <p>R6783: The Conservancy Association</p> | <p>Total: 3</p> <p><i>Green Group (1)</i></p> <p>C45: The Conservancy Association (also R6783) provides further views and views on R6729</p> |

| Subject of Representations | Representers (No. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-) Total: 6,788,787 | Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/FSSE/1-) Total: 51 |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | <u>Golf Players (2)</u> R6735 and R6742 <u>Individuals (2)</u> R6759 and R6778 | <u>Individuals (2)</u> C49 provides views C50 (also R6759) supports R6783 |
| <u>Not Expressing Any Views</u> | Total: 1 <u>Individual</u> R6790 | |

Note: The names of all representers and commenters are attached at **Annex II**. Soft copy of their submissions is sent to Town Planning Board (the Board) Member via electronic means; and is also available for public inspection at the Board's website at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/plan_making/S_FSSE_1.html and the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department (PlanD) in North Point and Sha Tin. A set of hard copy is deposited at the Board's Secretariat for Members' inspection.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 30.6.2022, the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan (draft OZP) No. S/FSSE/1 (**Annex I**) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).
- 1.2 During the two-month exhibition period, a total of ~~6,788~~ **6,787** valid representations were received. On 30.9.2022, the representations were published for three weeks for public comments. Upon expiry of the publication period, a total of 51 valid comments on the representations were received.
- 1.3 On 12.5.2023, the Board agreed to consider all the representations and comments collectively in one group.
- 1.4 On 12.5.2023, the Board agreed to apply to the Chief Executive (CE), under section 8(2) of the Ordinance, for an extension of the statutory time limit for the Board to submit the draft OZP to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval for a period of six months from 30.5.2023 to 30.11.2023. On 20.5.2023, the CE agreed to the extension.
- 1.5 This Paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations and comments. The list of representers and commenters is at **Annex II**. The representation sites are shown on **Plan H-1**. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to create land to meet

housing and other development needs. After public consultation on various land supply options in mid-2018, the Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS) in 2018 recommended the Government to accord priority to eight short to medium term land supply options, including considering resuming the 32 hectares (ha) of Fanling Golf Course (FGC) to the east of Fan Kam Road (hereinafter referred to as the Area).

- 2.2 In early 2019, the Government announced the endorsement of TFLS' recommendations, including the partial development of the FGC for housing development, with emphasis on public housing. To take forward the TFLS' recommendations, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) commissioned the "Technical Study on Partial Development of Fanling Golf Course Site – Feasibility Study" (the Technical Study), including an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), to ascertain the highest flat yield attainable in the Area in the short to medium term.
- 2.3 Based on the Technical Study, the northernmost portion of the Area zoned "R(A)" (i.e. Sub-Area 1 under the Technical Study) (**Plan H-2a**) is recommended for high density public housing development and a special school as the ecological value is relatively low according to the EIA. The remaining portion in the south zoned "OU(CR)" (i.e. Sub-Areas 2 to 4) comprises flora and fauna species of conservation importance, and is recommended to be preserved with minimal development, mainly on ecological considerations.
- 2.4 The major development parameters of the proposed public housing development and special school at Sub-Area 1 are summarised below while a notional layout of the proposed developments is attached in **Plan H-8**.

| Development at Sub-Area 1 | |
|---|--|
| Gross Site Area (ha) (about) | 11 |
| Net Site Area (ha) (about) ⁽¹⁾ | 8 |
| Domestic Plot Ratio (PR) | 6.5 |
| Domestic Gross Floor Area (m ²) (about) | 520,000 |
| Average Flat Size (m ²) | 43 ⁽²⁾ |
| Maximum Flat Production (about) | 12,000 ⁽²⁾ |
| Average Household Size | 2.8 |
| Estimated Design Population | 33,600 |
| Number of Domestic Blocks | 12 |
| Building Heights (BHs) in mPD and No. of Storeys | 127mPD to 170mPD 37 to 48 storeys |
| Social Welfare and Community Facilities (GFA) (m ²) (about) | 26,000 ^{(3)&(4)} (tentatively including neighbourhood elderly care centres, residential care homes for elderly, child care centre, day activity centre, hostels for handicapped persons, vocational rehabilitation services centre and community hall) |
| Public Transport Interchange (GFA) (m ²) | 8,600 ⁽⁴⁾ |
| Public Vehicle Park (no. of spaces) | 300 ⁽⁴⁾ |
| Non-Domestic Plot Ratio | Not more than 0.5 ⁽⁴⁾ |

| Development at Sub-Area 1 | |
|---|--|
| Proposed Non-Domestic GFA (m ²) | Not more than 40,000 ⁽⁵⁾ (Mainly include retail, 24-class kindergarten, and other non-domestic facilities) |
| Earliest Target Completion | 2029 |
| School Site | |
| Site Area (ha) (about) | 1 |

Notes

- (1) Excluding 1 ha of land for special school and 2 ha of land for reserved areas along Fan Kam Road for road widening if necessary.
- (2) The type of public housing (e.g. public rental housing (PRH), subsidised sale flat (SSF)) will be decided at the detailed design stage. As agreed with the Housing Department, average flat sizes of 40m² for PRH and 50m² for SSF were assumed in the Technical Study. With the assumed PRH/SSF ratio of 70:30, the average flat size for the proposed development is assumed to be 43m².
- (3) The GFA of social welfare facilities is equivalent to 5% of domestic GFA. The actual facilities to be provided will be subject to consideration of Social Welfare Department (SWD) when detailed planning for the public housing project proceeds.
- (4) The floor area of the public transport facilities, public vehicle park and government, institution or community (GIC) facilities (including social welfare facilities) as required by the Government is exempted from PR calculation.
- (5) Proposed GFA for non-domestic facilities would cover local retail, kindergartens and other non-domestic facilities.

EIA Ordinance Matters

- 2.5 In accordance with the EIA Ordinance, the EIA report of the Technical Study was exhibited for public comment from 20.5.2022 to 18.6.2022. The Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE) considered the EIA report on 8.8.2022 and 19.8.2022, and conveyed their views to the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP). Taking into account ACE's views, DEP on 31.8.2022 wrote to the project proponent i.e. CEDD to request additional information on the EIA report. On 3.5.2023, ACE considered the additional information from CEDD¹ on 18.4.2023. CEDD formally submitted the additional information to DEP on 4.5.2023. Having considered the public comments received during the public inspection period from 20.5.2022 to 18.6.2022, the comments from ACE received on 24.8.2022, the additional information from CEDD and comments of ACE at its meeting on 3.5.2023, DEP approved the EIA report on 11.5.2023, subject to a list of approval conditions (DEP's letter at **Annex III**).
- 2.6 The EIA approval conditions require CEDD as the project proponent to follow up on range of issues that may necessitate changes to the layout and key parameters such as PR and BH of the housing development. These include CEDD's follow-up work to review and revise the Layout Plan (LP) by adjusting the housing footprint, disposition and density with an aim to minimising the number of tree to be felled and preserving the 0.39 ha of woodland at the centre of Sub-Area 1 (**Plan H-2a**) as far as practicable. CEDD should also submit a detailed Landscape and Visual Plan (LVP) which covers a review of BHs and adoption of a stepped height profile with the BH descending from north to south, with a view to reducing the footprint while at the

¹ The approved EIA report including the additional information submitted by CEDD is available at EPD's website: <https://www.epd.gov.hk/cia/english/register/aciara/all.html>

same time minimising the visual impact to the surrounding rural environment. Furthermore, CEDD should minimise tree felling in Sub-Area 1 to reduce visual impact and to use the trees and woodland for generating a natural outlook as well as a barrier to minimise light impact to the surrounding rural environment. Another two conditions concern about the preservation of hydraulic performance in Sub-Area 1 and preparation of tree management plan covering the compensatory planting of trees in Sub-Areas 2 & 3. DEP further requires that the revised LP and the detailed LVP should be submitted for his approval before commencement of construction for the relevant phase of the project. DEP has also expressly demanded that before LP/LVP are submitted and approved, CEDD should review if the currently assumed development parameters for the proposed housing development in Sub-Area 1 remain valid and consider whether it is appropriate to propose high-density and high-rise development for Sub-Area 1.

- 2.7 In a press release of 11.5.2023 issued after DEP's decision, the Development Bureau (DEVB) reaffirmed Government's intention to develop public housing at Sub-Area 1, notwithstanding the need to review the layout and development parameters. In accordance with the EIA approval conditions, CEDD would review the layout design, BH and development intensity of the proposed development and submit to the DEP for approval, prior to the development, documents on the proposed revised layout design and tree preservation, landscape and visual aspects, etc. CEDD would work with the relevant departments to follow up on the DEP's requirements and report to the Board. DEVB further clarified in another press release of 12.5.2023 that the commencement of the development is subject to the completion of the compliance with EIA approval conditions and the consideration of the draft OZP including confirmation of the statutory land use and development parameters.
- 2.8 With the approval of the EIA report on 11.5.2023 and the need to complete the plan-making process by the extended statutory deadline of 30.11.2023, arrangements have been made to commence the statutory procedures for processing the representations/comments in respect of the draft OZP.

Lease Matters

- 2.9 With a history of over 100 years, the FGC is composed of three 18-hole courses (the Old, New and Eden Courses built in 1911, 1931 and 1970 respectively). The Area covers eight holes of the Old Course, with three holes in the northernmost portion within the area proposed for housing development and five holes in the southern portion within the area for conservation cum recreation. In other words, 10 holes of the Old Course as well as 18 holes each in New and Eden Courses (i.e. 46 holes in total) remain unaffected.
- 2.10 The FGC has been held by Hong Kong Golf Club (HKGC) under a Private Recreational Lease. The former lease of the whole FGC was granted for a term of 21 years from 1.9.1999 to 31.8.2020. Upon the lease expiry, the lease for the area to the west of Fan Kam Road was extended for a term up to 30.6.2027, while the remaining portion (i.e. the Area) was subject to a special three-year hold-over arrangement by way of a Short Term Tenancy (STT) up to 31.8.2023. The Government has stated that, upon expiry of the STT, the Area will be reverted to the Government on 1.9.2023 as planned. From then on, the Leisure and Cultural Services

Department (LCSD) will be responsible for the management and maintenance of the Area, including the northernmost portion earmarked for the public housing development until such is handed over to the CEDD for commencement of works. The LCSD will make separate announcement on the management and detailed opening arrangement. In case the HKGC requires temporary additional land in future for supporting the organisation of major events, the relevant departments would provide appropriate assistance where possible.

3. Local Consultation

Prior to Submission of the Draft OZP to the Board

- 3.1 Prior to the submission of the draft OZP for consideration by the Board, Sheung Shui District Rural Committee (SSDRC) and North District Council (NDC) were consulted on 8.6.2022 and 14.6.2022 respectively on the partial development of the FGC and the draft OZP.
- 3.2 Both SSDRC and NDC objected to the partial development of the FGC for the following major reasons: (1) the potential adverse impact on the operation of golf course, which is the only golf course meeting international standards in Hong Kong and have contributed a lot in the development of golf sports in Hong Kong. The proposed development might affect FGC's capabilities in holding the local and international golf tournaments; (2) the potential adverse traffic impacts on the local road networks leading to severe traffic congestion during peak hours; and (3) the potential adverse drainage impact arising from the proposed development. The NDC passed a motion on 14.6.2022 objecting to the partial development of the FGC for the drainage issue, traffic congestion and land rights.

Upon Gazettal of the Draft OZP

- 3.3 On 30.6.2022, the draft OZP was gazetted for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. NDC and SSDRC members were notified on the same date that members of the public can submit representations on the draft OZP in writing to the Secretary of the Board during the exhibition period of the draft OZP. Eight representations submitted by Heung Yee Kuk, NDC members, SSDRC, Fanling District Rural Committee (FDRC), Sha Tau Kok District Rural Committee (STKDRC), 龍躍頭鄉公所 and 丙崗村公所 objected to the draft OZP and proposed public housing development on similar grounds stated in paragraph 3.2 above.

4. The Draft OZP (Plan H-1)

4.1 Planning Scheme Area

- 4.1.1 The Area covers about 32 ha of land, which is part of the Old Course of the FGC. It is located to the southwest of the Fanling/Sheung Shui (FSS) New Town. It has an elongated shape with a length of about 1.89 km and width varying from 54 m to a maximum of 358 m. It is a piece of relatively flat land with general gradients of 21.8 mPD at the northern end, and 23.3 mPD at the southern area, intertwined with random pockets of small hilly areas

ranging from 29 mPD to 39 mPD.

- 4.1.2 The Area stretches from Ping Kong Road and Po Kin Road to its north (**Plan H-2b**), to the Tai Lung Experimental Farm to its southeastern end, with Fan Kam Road to its west and Ping Kong Village to its east. To the east across Ping Kong Road are public housing estates (Cheung Lung Wai Estate and Ching Ho Estate) and schools (Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Ma Kam Chan Memorial Primary School, Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association Buddhist Wisdom Primary School and Elegancia College). To the northeast across Po King Road is the North District Hospital and its extension (**Plan H-2a**).
- 4.1.3 The Area covers eight holes and golf fairways intermixed with natural landscape area grown with clusters of tree groups. Some existing trees on-site are mature in nature (some are trees of particular interest) while some tree groups together with wetland and stream course elements are of natural ecological significance, among which a group of Chinese Swamp Cypress (水松) identified in the swampy woodland in Sub-Area 4 is Class I protected species in China and globally Critically Endangered Species (**Plans H-2a, H-2b and H-4g**). There is a very specialised habitat requirement of preserving the swampy woodland as well as the hydrology around the Chinese Swamp Cypress.

4.2 General Planning Intention

- 4.2.1 The general planning intention of the Area is to develop its northernmost portion for public housing development and to conserve the remaining southern portion which is physically and ecologically connected as a whole and of higher ecological values. The remaining southern portion of the Area is intended primarily to conserve existing natural landscape and ecological features for appreciation by the community. It is also intended for the provision of space for passive recreational uses which are compatible with the conservation intention and which serve the general public. Certain facilities in support of the conservation and/or recreational uses may be permitted subject to planning permission from the Board.

4.3 Individual Zones

- 4.3.1 The “R(A)” zone (about 9.54 ha) is intended primarily for high-density residential developments. Commercial uses are always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building.
- 4.3.2 The “OU (CR)” zone (about 21.65 ha) is intended primarily to conserve existing natural landscape and ecological features. It is also intended for the provision of space for passive recreational uses which are compatible with the conservation intention and which serve the general public.

5. The Representations and Comments on the Representations

5.1 Subject of Representations

5.1.1 During the two-month exhibition period, a total of ~~6,788~~**6,787** representations were received, of which 13 support the OZP, the “R(A)” zone and/or the “OU(CR)” zone; three support the “R(A)” zone but oppose the “OU(CR)” zone; 233 support the “OU(CR)” zone but oppose the “R(A)” zone; ~~6,531~~**6,530** oppose the draft OZP, the “R(A)” zone and/or “OU(CR)” zone; seven provide views; and one submitted by an individual does not express any view.

5.1.2 The 13 supportive representations are submitted by one concern group (**R10**) and individuals.

5.1.3 The three representations supporting the “R(A)” zone but opposing the “OU(CR)” zone are submitted by individuals.

5.1.4 The 233 representation supporting the “OU(CR)” zone but opposing the “R(A)” zone are submitted by Hong Kong Golf Club (the operator of the FGC) (**R242**), two golf/sports-related organisations (**R19** and **R6707**), three companies (**R18**, **R20**, **R21**) and 277 individuals.

5.1.5 Out of ~~6,531~~**6,530** adverse representations, 28 representations are submitted by golf/sports-related organisations (**R252**, **R253**, **R275**, **R387**, **R389**, **R466**, **R501**, **R580**, **R582**, **R583**, **R670**, **R675 to R677**, **R679**, **R681**, **R682**, **R1380**, **R2276**, **R3265**, **R3353**, **R6517**, **R6696**, **R6718**, **R6726**, **R6727**, **R6730** and **R6754**), four by green groups (**R388**, **R476**, **R499** and **R687**), Heung Yee Kuk (**R556**), two by NDC members (**R256** and **R684**), three by SSDRC, STKDRC and FDRC (**R683**, **R685** and **R686**), 丙崗村公所 (**R250**), 龍躍頭鄉公所 (**R255**), 香港福建社團聯會(新界北分會) (**R254**), and a non-profit organisation (**R678**). Among the remaining ~~6,489~~**6,488** representations submitted by individuals, 111 are submitted by golf players.

5.1.6 Seven representations providing views are submitted by three green groups (**R6728**, **R6729** and **R6783**), and individuals including two golf players.

5.1.7 The major grounds and views of representations as well as their proposals, and PlanD’s responses, in consultation with the relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds), are at **Annex IV** and summarised in paragraphs 5.2.2 to 5.3.12 below.

5.2 Major Grounds, Views and Proposals of and Responses to Supportive Representations

The Draft OZP and the “R(A)” Zone

5.2.1 The major views of the 16 representations (**R1 to R5**, **R7**, **R8**, **R10 to R17** and **R6551**) supporting the draft OZP and/or “R(A)” zone are summarised as below.

5.2.2 Need for Housing Supply

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|---|
| (1) | The draft OZP balances the needs between acute housing demand, environmental and heritage, conservation and sports development. |
| (2) | The draft OZP is in line with the TFLS' recommendation, which was endorsed by the Government and supported by the Technical Study conducted by CEDD. The proposed public housing development has responded to the public aspiration and Government's commitment to increase the housing supply. |
| (3) | Since FGC's land lease (eastern part) expired in August 2020 and the three-year hold-over arrangement will expire in August 2023, the partial development of the FGC site would be a feasible and effective means to release a large piece of land for housing within a relatively short timeframe, and is not mutually exclusive with other land supply options and developments. |
| (4) | The proposed public housing with 12,000 flats targeted for completion by 2029 is critical to meet the 10-year housing supply target and ease Hong Kong's housing shortage. In view of the scarcity in land resources, there is no alternative site readily available to deliver 12,000 flats by 2029. |
| (5) | General consensus on partial development of the FGC as a short to medium term land supply option has been reached since the public consultation conducted by TFLS. The draft OZP and the proposed public housing are based on public opinion and in line with public expectation. The Board should conduct survey among those people who live in sub-divided flats and consider their views in making the decision. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | The supportive views are noted. |

5.2.3 Land Use Compatibility

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|---|
| (1) | The Area is located at the fringe of FSS New Town, and the proposed public housing development is adjacent to the existing public housing estates (i.e. Cheung Lung Wai Estate and Ching Ho Estate), hospital and schools. The Area is suitable to be developed as a New Town extension area to create synergy and the proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding areas. |
| (2) | The infrastructure will be enhanced for the proposed public housing development which shall benefit the surrounding areas. |

| Responses | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| (a) | The supportive views are noted. |

5.2.4 Impact on FGC

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|--|
| (1) | The proposed development only involves part of the FGC, and the impact on the operation of the FGC is limited. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | The supportive views are noted. |

5.2.5 Environmental and Ecological Perspectives

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|---|
| (1) | The area zoned “R(A)” is mainly occupied by open-air carpark and staff quarters, which has low ecological value, and adverse environmental and ecological impact arising from the proposed public housing development is limited. |
| (2) | While the proposed “R(A)” zone is supported, the existing golf course use is regarded as a land use not environmentally friendly. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | The supportive views are noted. |

5.2.6 Traffic Perspective

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|---|
| (1) | PTI should be provided in order to encourage the future residents to use public transport so as to alleviate the impact on Po Shek Wu Road Interchange in the north (Plan H-7). |
| (2) | Additional traffic access points should be provided at the public housing development connecting with Po Kin Road, Tai Ping Estate and North District Hospital to reduce the burden on Fan Kam Road. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | <p>The supportive views/suggestions are noted.</p> <p>In response to (1) to (2):</p> <p>As shown in paragraph 2.4 above, a PTI has been proposed in the public housing development (Plan H-8). Vehicular access will be further considered at detailed design stage.</p> |

5.2.7 Other Views

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|---|
| (1) | The entire FGC should be reverted to the Government for public housing and new town by phases or open for public enjoyment under the management of the FGC or other suitable organisations. |
| (2) | In response to the loss of 9ha land for golf course use and to promote golf, it is suggested allocating 18ha of land in Penny's Bay Phase 2 as a replacement. Besides, driving range is suggested to be provided in Penny's Bay Phase 2. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | <p>In response to (1) to (2):</p> <p>While 32ha of the FGC to the east of Fan Kam Road will be taken back by the Government on 1.9.2023, there is no plan to change the use of the remaining 140 ha of the FGC (with a total of 46 holes) to the west of Fan Kam Road which could continue to support the hosting of international golf tournaments and training of golfers. The existing lease will run up to 30.6.2027. Therefore, the Culture, Sports and Tourism Bureau (CSTB) will handle the lease renewal matter for the 140 ha of the FGC according to their prevailing policy as applicable to Private Recreational Leases. The reversion of the 32 ha to the Government does not give rise to any reprovisioning arrangement. Hence it is not necessary to consider using Penny's Bay for the proposed purpose.</p> |

The "OU(CR)" Zone

5.2.8 The major views of the 246 representations (**R1 to R14, R18 to R244, R246 to R248, R6707 and R6551**) supporting the "OU(CR)" zone are summarised as below.

5.2.9 Future Use of Area Zoned "OU(CR)"

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|---|
| (1) | The area could be developed as botanical/zoological garden and/or ecological park, which could preserve its ecological value, provide landscape area, and potentially become a landmark of the Northern Metropolis. |
| (2) | The area should be developed for recreational facilities, such as golf course, golf training centre, other suitable sports facilities, etc., and open to the public. |
| (3) | The area should maintain its status quo as a golf course run by the HKGC and should be open to the public since the FGC is playing a critical role in promoting the golf development in Hong Kong and supporting Hong Kong as "Asia's World City". FGC is also one of |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| | the oldest golf courses with high historical and heritage value. |
| (4) | The ecological value of the area zoned “OU(CR)” is high and suitable for conservation and/or passive recreational uses. |
| (5) | While the proposed “OU(CR)” zone is supported from environmental conservation perspective, the existing golf course use is regarded as a land use not environmentally friendly. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | <p>In response to (1) to (5):</p> <p>Based on the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) findings, Sub-Areas 2 to 4, which are mainly occupied by golf fairways, tree clusters, fauna and flora, would be protected and enhanced for appropriate passive recreational uses in order to meet the needs of the community. This could preserve the ecological value of the Area and is acceptable from ecological perspective.</p> <p>As mentioned in paragraph 2.10 above, the Area will be reverted to the Government on 1.9.2023 for management by LCSD. LCSD will take into account and balance the ecological values of Sub-Areas 2 to 4 and the needs for passive recreational facilities of the community in considering the appropriate types of recreational uses to be provided and the long-term mode of management and operation. LCSD will make separate announcement on the management and detailed opening arrangement. In case the HKGC requires temporary additional land in future for supporting the organisation of major events, the relevant government departments would provide appropriate assistance where possible.</p> |

5.2.10 Alternative Proposals

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Proposals | |
| (i) | While the “OU(CR)” zone is supported from environmental conservation perspective, in light of its ecological values, the area zoned “OU(CR)” should be designated as country park or zoned as “Conservation Area” (“CA”) or “Green Belt” (“GB”) to strengthen the protection of Sub-Areas 2 to 4. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | The planning intention of “OU(CR)” zone is to primarily conserve existing natural landscape and ecological features and to provide space for passive recreational uses which are compatible with the conservation intention for public enjoyment. The Government would strive to achieve conservation of habitats and ensure that no adverse ecological/environmental impact would be created. The current “OU(CR)” is considered appropriate to reflect the intention for conservation while allowing certain compatible passive recreational uses (e.g. park and garden). The suggestions of designating Sub- |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Areas 2 to 4 as country park, or “CA” or “GB” zone which are mainly for conservation with more restricted on uses are not supported.</p> <p>For the future use of Sub-Areas 2 to 4, responses in paragraph 5.2.9 (a) above are relevant.</p> |
|--|---|

5.3 **Major Grounds, Views and Proposals of and Responses to Adverse Representations**

5.3.1 A total of ~~6,774~~**6,773** representations (**R6, R9, R15 to R332, R334 to 2296, R2298 to R2318, R2320 to R4469, R4471 to R6550, R6552 to R6789 and R6791**) oppose or provide views on the “R(A)”, “OU(CR)” zone, and/or the draft OZP. The major views / alternative proposals of these adverse representations are summarised as below.

5.3.2 Golf / Sports / Recreational Perspectives

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|--|
| (1) | The FGC has a high international significance and recognition, and contributes to enhancing Hong Kong’s regional and global importance as Asia’s World City. The reduction of the FGC area will alter its position to promote Hong Kong and affect Hong Kong’s reputation on the international stage. The Area should maintain its status quo as a golf course. |
| (2) | The FGC is the only venue for hosting large scale international golf tournaments (including but not limited to Hong Kong Open (HKO) and Hong Kong Ladies Open (HKLO)) in Hong Kong. The decision of holding the HKO is not decided by HKGC but by the related international golf associations. The HKLO is exclusively played on the Old Course but not other parts of the FGC given the turfgrass type and special drainage on the Old Course. No possible solution is in sight for HKGC to host any large international golf tournament if the OZP is approved. In fact, FGC has long been well managed by HKGC, and the golf course should continue to be managed and maintained by HKGC. |
| (3) | The proposed housing development will discourage golf / sports development in Hong Kong, given that over 80% of Hong Kong National Team’s training is conducted in FGC. Besides, there are inadequate golf facilities in Hong Kong. The reduction of golf holes will affect the training of Hong Kong National Team as well as other non-members, which is not in line with the Government’s sport development policy. |
| (4) | The FGC is a major venue for not only golf but also other non-golf events, such as cross country run, football, tree climbing, nature interpretation tours, evening walks etc., as well as charity events. About 40% of the annual total number of rounds were played by non-members which more than fulfill Government’s open-up requirement |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| | of 30%. The reduction of the FGC area will be a loss to the community and charities. |
| Proposals | |
| (i) | The status quo of the Area as a golf course should be maintained. The “R(A)” zone should be deleted or replaced by the “OU(CR)” zone or other zones supporting conservation. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | <p>In response to (1) to (4):</p> <p>While the 32 ha of the FGC to the east of Fan Kam Road will be taken back by the Government on 1.9.2023, only the northern portion with an area of about 9 ha (about 5% of the FGC) involving three holes will be developed for public housing and special school, while the southern portion involving five holes will be preserved for conservation and recreation. The remaining 140 ha of the FGC with 46 holes in total to the west of Fan Kam Road would not be affected and could continue to support hosting international golf tournaments, training of golfers and hosting various types of non-golf community recreational and sports events. The proposal has balanced the needs to develop public housing and to support golf development in Hong Kong.</p> <p>As the Government has mentioned before, in case the HKGC requires temporary additional land in future for supporting the organisation of major events, the relevant government departments would provide appropriate assistance where possible.</p> <p>In addition, the southern part of the Area under “OU(CR)” zone can be used for passive recreational uses which are compatible with the conservation intention for public enjoyment. The Government will take into account and balance the ecological values and the needs for passive recreational facilities of the community in considering the appropriate types of recreational uses to be provided and the long-term mode of management and operation of Sub-Areas 2 to 4. The responses in paragraph 5.2.9(a) above are relevant.</p> |
| (b) | <p>In response to (i):</p> <p>In view of the above and that Sub-Area 1 is of relatively low ecological value and is generally suitable for residential use to meet the acute housing demand, it is considered not appropriate to rezone it to “OU(CR)” or other conservation zoning. On the management and future use of the Area, the responses in paragraph 5.2.9(a) above are relevant.</p> |

5.3.3 Land Supply and Site Selection

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|---|
| (1) | The FGC was wrongly picked as a short to medium-term land supply option by the TFLS. There will be a number of follow-up works (e.g. additional archaeological survey, land decontamination etc.) before the northernmost portion is ready for development. Government's Investigation, Design and Construction (IDC) consultancy tender documents state that site formation is expected to commence in Q1 2026, making flat completion in 2029 impossible. Therefore it is not a short to medium-term option. |
| (2) | The high-development intensity of the public housing deviates from the endorsed TFLS' recommendation for provision of about 4,000 units and principles of rural development. |
| (3) | Instead of taking forward the partial development of the FGC, priority should be accorded to other land supply options, including brownfields, artificial islands in Kau Yi Chau, vacant Government lands/premises, boundary areas, wetland, fringe areas of country parks, redevelopment of urban areas, reclamation, vacant Industrial Buildings, green belt, and increasing development intensity, etc. |
| (4) | In view of the Northern Metropolis Development Strategy (NMDS), the Government should review the need for partial development in the FGC in the context of overall development of the northern region of the New Territories, which should be planned as a whole whereas the FGC could serve as "high-quality outdoor eco-recreation/tourism outlets" with "proactive conservation" measures adopted. The OZP has failed to take the NMDS into consideration. |
| (5) | Low-rise private housing is more suitable than the proposed public housing in "R(A)" zone. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | <p>In response to (1), (2), (4) and (5):</p> <p>According to the TFLS' recommendation endorsed in 2019, a short to medium-term land supply option has the potential to provide additional land in around 10 years' time. The flat production of about 4,000 flats was an initial assessment at the TFLS stage which is by no means a limit, and can be increased subject to further technical study. To take forward the TFLS' recommendation, CEDD commissioned the Technical Study which concluded that the proposed public housing development with the total PR of 7.0 and 12,000 housing units is technically feasible.</p> <p>Given the EIA approval conditions requiring a review of the development density, layout and BH of the proposed public housing development as mentioned in paragraph 2.6 above, the development timeframe to complete the development in 2029 may need to be</p> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p>adjusted.</p> <p>CEDD estimates that the review may take about 12 months to complete, as time is required to develop and evaluate different layout options, undertake technical assessments on the revised housing development scheme and development parameters, prepare the revised LP and the detailed LVP, and consult concerned departments. CEDD will commence the review after the Board has completed discussion of the OZP in end November 2023, and review outcomes are expected to be available around end 2024 for DEP's consideration.</p> |
| (b) | <p>In response to (3):</p> <p>The Government has adopted a multi-pronged approach to create land to meet housing and other development needs. To meet acute housing demand, various land supply options, including partial development of the FGC and most of these options mentioned by the representers, have been vigorously pursued by the Government concurrently in a comprehensive manner. The northernmost part of the Area is considered suitable for housing use taking into account the Technical Study. The Area involves government land without the need to resume private lots and minimal clearance is required. The partial development option is one of the few short to medium land supply options recommended by TFLS and endorsed by the Government.</p> |

5.3.4 Heritage and Cultural Conservation Perspectives

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|--|
| (1) | The proposed public housing development would result in the loss of a living heritage of more than 110 years. Losing 8 holes will make the Old Course permanently incomplete. |
| (2) | In 2018, the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) voted to evaluate the cultural heritage value of the whole of the FGC as one site and the heritage grading of the FGC is still in process. The decision of the Board would pre-empt AAB's grading process. The FGC has conducted heritage value assessment against the six criteria adopted by AAB and concluded that the historical and heritage value will be permanently destroyed if part of the Old Course is lost. |
| (3) | The existing graves, in particular the Ming Dynasty graves, within the FGC will be destroyed and feng shui will be affected by the development. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | <p>In response to (1) and (2):</p> <p>Only 9 ha involving three holes in the northernmost portion of the Area of the FGC is proposed for public housing development, which is</p> |

| | |
|-----|--|
| | mainly occupied by staff quarters, ball courts and open-air car park at present, and accounts for about 5% of the FGC only (172 ha in total). The remaining five holes in the southern portion of the Area will be preserved for conservation and recreation. As such, it is anticipated that the overall heritage value of the whole FGC should not be significantly affected. Furthermore, the proposal seeks to strike a balance between meeting acute housing demand and the possibility of heritage conservation. |
| (b) | <p>In response to (3):</p> <p>A clan grave of Qing Dynasty in Sub-Area 1 (Plan H-2a) would have interface with the proposed public housing development and might require relocation subject to further study in the detailed design stage. According to the existing land administrative policy and the established procedures under the Land Acquisition (Possessory Title) Ordinance (Cap. 130), relevant government department would identify and liaise with the descendants of the clan grave on suitable relocation and compensation arrangements. Apart from the said clan grave in Sub-Area 1, the other clan graves including the oldest ones built in Ming Dynasty within Sub-Areas 2 and 3 would be preserved.</p> |

5.3.5 Environmental, Landscape and Ecological Perspectives

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|--|
| (1) | There are many errors in the EIA report, which does not fully comply with the EIAO Technical Memorandum. The EIA's conclusions have been drawn from insufficient data, and are not solidly based on scientific – direct or indirect – counting or census methods for identifying the types and quantities of wildlife. After considering the EIA report in August 2022, the ACE decided to request CEDD to provide further information including additional ecological surveys on bird, moth and bat, tree compensation plan, detailed layout plan, hydrological impact analysis, shading impact to the trees, and existing grave in Sub-Area 1. |
| (2) | There is no quantitative assessment of the permeability and groundwater flows. The impact of the tree planting in Sub-Areas 2 and 3 on the critically endangered <i>Chinese Swamp Cypress</i> in Sub-Area 4 is unknown. |
| (3) | The ecological value of Sub-Area 1 in the EIA conducted was underestimated, and extensive tree removal, including those potential old and valuable trees (OVTs), will be required to make way for the proposed public housing development. A total of 29 mature trees with diameters at breast height (DBHs) of 1,000mm or more in Sub-Area 1 are potentially registrable OVTs, of which 11 are proposed to be felled by Government. Survival of the retained/transplanted potential OVTs is doubtful as the roots may be affected by retaining structures or because the root balls are large. |

| | |
|-----|---|
| (4) | The proposed public housing development in “R(A)” zone will bring adverse air quality, noise, landscape impacts to the surrounding developments. According to the Landscape Value Mapping Study, the FGC has been rated as a landscape of high value and significance to Hong Kong. |
| (5) | The impact of light glare from artificial light on the habitat near Sub-Area 1, especially the nocturnal wildlife, has not been properly assessed. The EIA’s claim that the impact of light glare from artificial lightings on habitats near Sub-Area 1 is considered minor should be invalid as there is no quantitative assessment. |
| (6) | The draft OZP is contrary to the Hong Kong Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2016-21 (the BSAP), which is committed to conserving ecologically important habitats outside the existing protected areas. |

Responses

| | |
|-----|--|
| (a) | <p>In response to (1) to (5):</p> <p>A comprehensive EIA covering EcoIA, Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVIA) etc. has been conducted under the Technical Study in accordance with the EIAO. The EIA report concluded that with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures such as preservation of existing vegetation, proper landscape treatment within the proposed public housing development, woodland compensation planting, retention and transportation of species of conservation importance, as well as other good site management measures and noise mitigation measures, the proposed development will not result in significant adverse impacts on the environment during construction and operational phases.</p> <p>According to the EcoIA, the proposed development will avoid areas of higher ecological values in Sub-Areas 2 to 4 (moderate or moderate to high), and only Sub-Area 1 which has a lower ecological value (low to moderate) will be developed into public housing and special school. The EcoIA concludes that with the implementation of mitigation measures, the residual ecological impact of the proposed development is considered acceptable.</p> <p>As mentioned in paragraph 2.5 above, additional information on the EIA report was formally submitted to DEP on 4.5.2023 for consideration. It contains additional surveys on bird and moth which reaffirmed the corresponding surveys conducted in the EIA as representative. The additional hydrological impact analysis has reaffirmed that the main water source of the swampy woodland in Sub-Area 4 is not from Sub-Area 1 to 3. Also, the proposed housing development in Sub-Area 1 and compensatory tree planting in Sub-Area 3 would not affect the surface water sources of the swampy woodland in Sub-Area 4. The additional surveys and analysis conducted have reaffirmed the validity and robustness of the EIA findings with no underestimation of the ecological value. It is also</p> |
|-----|--|

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p>relevant to note that in a press release of 11.5.2023 about DEP's decision on the EIA report, DEP as the approving authority considered that the EIA report met the requirements of the EIA Study Brief and requirements of the EIAO Technical Memorandum.</p> <p>Taking into account the public comments, ACE's comments and the additional information from CEDD, DEP approved the EIA report on 11.5.2023, subject to some approval conditions including reviewing and revising the LP by adjusting the housing footprint, disposition and density with the aim of minimising the number of tree to be felled and preserving the 0.39 ha of woodland at the centre of Sub-Area 1 (Plan H-2a) as far as practicable, and submitting the LP and LVP with a view to reducing the footprint while at the same time addressing the concerns on various visual issues. On the issues of glare impact, measures such as non-reflective windows would be explored in detailed design stage; and if necessary, measures to reduce the glare impact could be included in CEDD's review.</p> <p>As explained in paragraph 2.7 above, in accordance with the EIA approval conditions, CEDD would review the layout design, BH and the development intensity of the proposed public housing development, and would work with the departments concerned to follow up on the DEP's requirements and report to the Board. Before the completion of the review, an interim zoning arrangement needs to be considered. The overall assessment is set out in paragraph 7 below.</p> |
| (b) | <p>In response to (6):</p> <p>As indicated in the EcoIA, Sub-Area 1 has relatively lower ecological value. Development within Sub-Area 1 would by no means impair the achievement of biodiversity target of Hong Kong. The responses in (a) above are also relevant.</p> |

5.3.6 Visual, Natural Light and Air Ventilation Perspectives

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|---|
| (1) | The proposed high-rise public housing development is incompatible with the surrounding rural setting and the remaining 140 ha FGC, thereby resulting in adverse visual impact. The visual impact to the FGC users was not considered in the VIA. |
| (2) | Turfgrasses require a 6-8 hours of full sunlight and the high-rise buildings will reduce the number of hours of sunlight especially in mid-winter when HKO is held. The shadow created by the proposed public housing development will adversely affect the turfgrass in the remaining part of the FGC. The impact of shade is further aggravated by the areas of stagnant air. |
| (3) | The proposed public housing development will lead to wall effect and |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| | create adverse air ventilation. Heat island effects will be created from the extensive site clearance and tree felling, which would undermine the temperature regulating function by the existing tree clusters. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | <p>In response to (1) to (3):</p> <p>The Area is located at the fringe of FSS New Town. To the north and east of the Area are existing/planned high-density high-rise developments (with BH from 118mPD to 140mPD), including Cheung Lung Wai Estate, Ching Ho Estate, planned public housing developments at Ching Hiu Road and Tai Tau Leng, planned private housing site at the junction of Castle Peak Road – Kwu Tung Section and Fan Kam Road, and Expansion of North District Hospital. The proposed development forms an extension of FSS New Town naturally and the proposed maximum BH of 170mPD is not incompatible in the high-rise setting of the New Town.</p> <p>In the notional layout of the proposed development, a total of five building gaps / building setbacks serving as wind corridors ranging from 15 to 30 m in width will be maintained to facilitate air ventilation. The LVIA and Air Ventilation Assessment (Expert Evaluation) (AVA(EE)) conclude that with the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures, such as the preservation of existing vegetation, proper landscape treatment within the proposed development, provision of wind / visual corridors etc., significant adverse visual and air ventilation impact on the surrounding areas are not anticipated. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD accepted the findings of LVIA and AVA(EE) and considered the proposed mitigation measures appropriate.</p> <p>In addition, the AVA(EE) has recommended that AVA Initial Study should be conducted to optimize scheme design during the detailed design stage and/or to assess the effectiveness of the above recommended mitigation measures.</p> <p>As elaborated in paragraph 5.3.5(a), CEDD will review the layout design and submit the revised LP and the detailed LVP to DEP for approval, and the concern on various visual issues could be further assessed in the review process.</p> |

5.3.7 Traffic and Transportation Perspectives

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Major Grounds | |
| (1) | The Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (TTIA) has underestimated the background traffic based on false assumptions, and has failed to include trip generation from PTI and to address the parking demand from large event (3,000-5,000 cars per day). Taking into account a number of omissions in TTIA, the Po Shek Wu Road |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| | roundabout Design Flow-to-Capacity (DFC) ratio of 0.95 should have exceeded 1 by 2032. |
| (2) | The public housing development would result in adverse traffic impact, and affect the access of emergency vehicles to the North District Hospital by blocking the Po Kin Road entrance. |
| (3) | Supporting transport facilities, including parking spaces, are insufficient to support the FGC use and hosting international tournaments. |
| (4) | In response to the NMDS, a comprehensive traffic review in North District is required to resolve the existing congestion problem and the additional traffic flow induced by the planned developments in North District. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | <p>In response to (1) and (2):</p> <p>TTIA has been conducted under the Technical Study with methodology and assumptions following the established standards and agreed by the Transport Department. The main access routes to and from the Area would be mainly via Ping Kong Road, Po Kin Road, Fan Kam Road and the Po Shek Wu Road Roundabout to the Fanling Highway. According to the TTIA, improvements to the relevant junctions in the vicinity are proposed to support the proposed development with target population of 33,600 including junction improvement works as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Po Shek Wu Road Roundabout (Plan H-6b): this includes the widening of the westbound approach arm of Fanling Highway, a new exclusive left turn lane at the northbound approach arm of Fan Kam Road and widening of the north and southbound arm of Fan Kam Road; (ii) Castle Peak Road – Kwu Tung / Fan Kam Road (Plan H-6b): signal junction improvement with an additional lane on the northbound and southbound arms of Fan Kam Road and Castle Peak Road – Kwu Tung / Fan Kam Road, and the westbound and eastbound arm of Castle Peak Road – Kwu Tung; (iii) Fan Kam Road / Po Kin Road (Plan H-6a): upgrading the existing priority junction into a roundabout; and (iv) Po Kin Road / Ping Kong Road (Plan H-6a): upgrading the existing priority junction into a signal-controlled junction and widening of both the north and southbound arms of Ping Kong Road. <p>All existing and planned developments in the vicinity, including the Expansion of North District Hospital, have been considered in the</p> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p>TTIA. With the implementation of the various junction road improvement schemes (Plans H-6a and H-6b), it is anticipated that the proposed development would not result in significant adverse traffic impacts on the local road network and the operation of the North District Hospital, and is considered acceptable from traffic engineering perspective. During special events/tournaments, temporary traffic arrangement and management measures would be implemented if necessary.</p> <p>The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) has accepted the TTIA and has no in-principle objection to the proposed development from traffic perspective.</p> |
| (b) | <p>In response to (3):</p> <p>A public vehicle park (PVP) with 300 parking spaces is proposed within the public housing site. Taking into account the current parking provision in the Area, the proposed 300 parking spaces should be able to meet the demand for public parking spaces generated by the hosting of local and international sports events in the FGC nearby. During the construction period, if the FGC requires space for parking to support its major tournaments, the relevant departments may offer assistance or facilitation where possible.</p> |
| (c) | <p>In response to (4):</p> <p>Apart from Northern Link Eastward Extension as recommended under the NMDS, the Government has commenced the “Strategic Studies on Railways and Major Roads Beyond 2030” (the RMR2030+ Study), which seeks to formulate a forward-looking Major Transport Infrastructure Development Blueprint for Hong Kong up to and beyond 2046 with a view to ensure that the planning of strategic railway and major road infrastructure can drive development or even reserve capacity for new development areas, especially the Northern Metropolis, for the long-term development needs of Hong Kong. Based on the preliminary findings of the RMR2030+ Study, three strategic railways and three major roads are recommended, among which it is anticipated that the Central Rail Link, the Northern Metropolis Highway, the Shatin Bypass would substantially improve the traffic condition of the North District.</p> |

5.3.8 Other Technical Perspectives

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|---|
| (1) | The proposed development will induce adverse drainage, geotechnical, sewerage, water supply etc. impacts. The Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) fails to assess the permeability and groundwater hydrology and therefore the potential flooding problem. |

| Responses | |
|-----------|---|
| (a) | <p>To ascertain the technical feasibility of the proposed development, technical assessments, including DIA, geological and geotechnical appraisal assessment (GAA), Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), Water Supply Impact Assessment (WSIA), etc., have been conducted under the Technical Study to assess the potential impacts arising from the proposed development. The assessments concluded that with incorporation of recommended mitigation measures such as enhanced stormwater drainage network, laying of new fresh water main and installing a new connection to existing flushing water mains etc., there is no insurmountable technical problem arising from the proposed development.</p> <p>The Chief Engineer/Mainland North of the Drainage Services Department (CE(MN) of DSD), Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office of CEDD (H(GEO) of CEDD), DEP, and Chief Engineer / Construction of the Water Supplies Department (CE(C) of WSD) have no in-principle objection to the proposed development from drainage, geotechnical, sewerage, and water supply perspectives.</p> |

5.3.9 Provision of Government, Institution or Community (GIC) and Supporting Facilities

| Major Grounds | |
|---------------|--|
| (1) | The GIC and supporting facilities are insufficient to meet the needs of additional population. In particular, the additional population would lead to insufficient provision of hospital beds and affect the medical services. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | <p>Based on the requirements in the HKPSG for the planned population, and the requirements of relevant government departments, the planned provision for GIC facilities (which include hospital beds) in FSS New Town including the Area is generally sufficient to meet the demand as shown in Annex VI, except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) there will be shortfalls in rehabilitation, child and elderly care facilities. As the HKPSG requirements for these facilities are long-term goals, the provision would be addressed by SWD on a wider district basis, having regard to such factors including the distribution of facilities, land supply and service demand as a result of population growth and demographic changes. PlanD and concerned government departments will work closely together to ensure that additional GIC facilities requested by SWD will be included in the planned GIC and residential developments in FSS New Town and the Area; and (ii) while there will be a deficit of about 7.4ha of planned district open space in the FSS New Town area, there is a surplus of about 29.72ha of planned local open space. The overall provision of |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>open space is considered generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population.</p> <p>No less than 5% of the domestic GFA of the proposed housing development for provision of various social welfare and GIC facilities including neighbourhood elderly centre, residential care home for the elderly, child care centre, hostels for mentally and physically handicapped persons, integrated vocational rehabilitation services centre, a community hall as well as local open space of 33,600m² will be provided within the proposed public housing in the Area. Details of the provision of the social welfare and GIC facilities and local open space will be worked out at detailed design stage.</p> |
|--|--|

5.3.10 Alternative Proposals

| Proposals | |
|------------------|---|
| (i) | In view of the high ecological value of the area, the “OU(CR)” zone should be rezoned to “CA” / “Site of Special Scientific Interest” / “GB” to restrict developments. |
| (ii) | In order to accord higher priority to conservation, amendments to the planning intention of the “OU(CR)” zone is suggested with reference to the “OU(Nature Park)” zone in Long Valley; and ‘Golf Course’ use should be moved from Column 1 to Column 2 of the zone to help identify and evaluate potential ecological impacts. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | <p>In response to (i) and (ii):</p> <p>Responses in paragraph 5.2.10(a) are relevant.</p> |

5.3.11 Job Loss

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|---|
| (1) | The FGC provides job opportunities to the nearby villagers. Nearly 70% of the FGC’s employees are from the nearby villages and communities. The proposed development will lead to loss of job opportunities. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | The majority part of the FGC involving 140 ha with 46 holes in total will remain unaffected and continue to be used for golfing. New job opportunities will be provided in the future uses of the Area including those arising from the commercial, residential and community uses within the public housing development, and maintenance and management of the natural landscape and ecological features and passive recreational uses in the “OU(CR)” zone. |

5.3.12 Public Consultation

| Major Grounds | |
|----------------------|---|
| (1) | There is inadequate public consultation on the proposed development. Affected parties, including members of the HKGC, golf players in Hong Kong and individuals who are interested in golf activities and heritage preservation, were not consulted. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | <p>The partial development option together with other land supply options were formulated by TFLS after an extensive public engagement exercise.</p> <p>The statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the draft OZP have been duly followed. Prior to the submission of the draft OZP for consideration of the Board, the NDC, FDRC and SSDRC were consulted as detailed in paragraph 3 above. Also, the exhibition of OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Ordinance.</p> |

6. Comments on Representations

- 6.1 51 comments are submitted by HKGC (C36), four sports-related organisations (C37 to C39 and C46), one green group (C45), 10 concern groups (C1 to C10), one golf player (C43), and individuals. C36, C40, C41, C42, C43, C44, C45, C46, C47, C50 and C51 are also representers R242, R529, R102, R383, R327, R406, R6783, R389, R1383, R6759 and R6774 respectively.
- 6.2 C1 to C16, C18 to C24, C26 to C33 and C35 support the “R(A)” zone, and C17, C25 and C34 support R1. These comments support the “R(A)” zone / R1 on the grounds that the proposed public housing development could address the acute housing demand in Hong Kong while balancing the needs of sports development, conservation, and general public consensus of using part of the FGC as short to medium-term housing supply. The remaining comments mainly oppose “R(A)” zone, support adverse representations and/or provide comments on / oppose supportive representations as summarised in the table below:

| Commenters | Nature | Remarks |
|--|---|--|
| C36 (also R242), C42 (also R383), C43 (also R327) and C47 (also R1383) | Oppose “R(A)” zone and comment on various representations | Similar grounds as raised in the paragraphs 5.3.2 to 5.3.8 above. |
| C37 to C39 | Oppose “R(A)” zone and support R242 | The FGC is making contribution to the community by providing venue to different organisations for various community sports uses. |

| Commenters | Nature | Remarks |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| C40 (also R529) | Oppose “R(A)” | - |
| C41 (also R102) | Oppose “R(A)” | On various grounds as stated in paragraphs 5.3.2 to 5.3.11 above and in paragraph 6.3(2) below. |
| C44 (also R406) | Comment on R1 who supports the OZP | R1 is inaccurate on the distance between the proposed public housing and Sheung Shui MTR Station and the commencement year of the proposed public housing development, and there are other housing supply measures introduced by the Government to speed up housing supply. |
| C45 (also R6783) | Comment on R6729 | Reiterates his alternative proposal to amend the planning intention of “OU(CR)” zone with reference to the “OU(Nature Park)” zone in his representation as stated in paragraph 5.3.11(2) above. |
| C46 (also R389) | Oppose “R(A)” and support R242 | Reiterates his views in his representation (R389) on the impact of the FGC on hosting international tournament as stated in paragraph 5.3.2(1) above. |
| C48 | Oppose “R(A)” and comment on R254 | Oppose “R(A)” from traffic, medical services, environmental and ecological perspectives as stated in paragraphs 5.3.6, 5.3.8 and 5.3.10 above. |
| C49 | Adverse views on the draft OZP | The proposed development would bring adverse impacts on the historical and heritage value of the FGC, affect golf development in Hong Kong, and other sites should be developed instead of the FGC as stated in paragraphs 5.3.2, 5.3.4 and 5.3.5 above. |
| C50 (also R6759) | Support R6783 | Support the proposal in relation to “OU(Nature Park)” use. |
| C51 (also 6774) | Oppose “R(A)” | Provide further views as detailed in paragraphs 6.3(1) and 6.3(2) below. |

- 6.3 The major grounds of comments, and PlanD's response, in consultation with relevant B/Ds, are at **Annex IV**. Apart from the major grounds/views/comments mentioned in paragraph 5, the additional major grounds of comments are summarised below.

| Other Major Grounds Opposing "R(A)" for Public Housing Developments | |
|--|--|
| (1) | 3,280 ha of developable land will be delivered over the coming 10 years with innovative methods to increase housing supply, such as light public housing. Hence, it is incorrect to claim that the proposed public housing development with about 12,000 flats is critical to meet the 10-year housing supply target. |
| (2) | 3D images with the aid of Building Information Model (BIM) from various vantage points, including birds-eye view, should be provided to allow the general public to better understand the proposal. |
| (3) | Measures should be taken to vacate the well-off tenants from public housing, and avoid young people lie flat in order to be qualified for public housing. |
| Responses | |
| (a) | In response to (1) and (3): Responses in paragraph 5.3.3(b) above is relevant. |
| (b) | In response to (2): In accordance with Town Planning Board Guidelines on submissions of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board (TPB PG-No. 41), photomontages (Plans H-9a to H-9f) from various viewing points (VP) have been prepared and incorporated in the LVIA conducted under the Technical Study. The VPs are key public viewing points that will be affected by the proposed public housing development, which include key pedestrian nodes, popular public areas for recreational activities, rest, leisure, sitting-out areas, walking, sight-seeing and prominent travel routes. VPs are assessed at human eye-level. The photomontages have adequately demonstrated the visual impacts brought about by the proposed development. |

7. Overall Assessment

- 7.1 As mentioned in paragraphs 2.6, 2.7 and 5.3.5(a) above, DEP's decision on 11.5.2023 requires CEDD to follow up with concerned departments on a range of issues including (i) reviewing the layout design, building height and development intensity of the public housing development; (ii) reviewing and revising the LP; and (iii) preparing a detailed LVP to address the visual and landscape concerns. CEDD estimates that the review in fulfilment of DEP's conditions may take about 12 months to complete, as time is required to develop and evaluate different layout options, undertake technical assessments on the revised housing development scheme and development parameters, prepare the revised LP and detailed LVP, and consult concerned departments. As it would be prudent for CEDD to commence the review after the Board has completed discussion of the OZP in end November 2023, review

outcomes are expected to be available around end 2024 for DEP's consideration.

- 7.2 While it remains Government's intention to pursue housing development in the Area, the planning parameters stated under a land use zone of the OZP should be based on a solid ground supported by technical assessments agreeable to concerned bureaus and departments. Before completion of the review by CEDD and DEP's approval of the revised LP and the detailed LVP, it would be premature to determine whether the originally proposed parameters for the public housing development are still possible. In anticipation of possible changes to the development parameters, pending CEDD's review, it may not be appropriate to retain a residential zone which specifically allows development of a high density on the draft OZP in the Board's recommendation to be submitted to the CE in C for decision no later than 30.11.2023. In light of the above, it is considered prudent to rezone Sub-Area 1 from "R(A)" to "Undetermined" ("U") in this interim period to serve as a stopgap arrangement pending completion of the review by CEDD and allow the flexibility to take on board the outcome of CEDD's review and DEP's corresponding decision.
- 7.3 It is noted that a total of 78 adverse representations opposing the "R(A)" zone in Sub-Area 1 are merely on the layout design, landscape and/or visual aspects in relation to the follow-up work to be undertaken by CEDD as mentioned in paragraph 7.1 above. The proposed "U" zone would partially meet these representations in the interim period.
- 7.4 Upon confirmation of appropriate development parameters after completion of CEDD's review and DEP's approval of the revised LP and the detailed LVP, the Government intends to initiate the necessary procedure to rezone Sub-Area 1 to an appropriate zoning permitting residential use with the appropriate development parameters. The public would then be consulted on the revised rezoning in accordance with the Ordinance. In the interim period, the Notes of the "U" zone should provide flexibility for using Sub-Area 1 for beneficial uses which are compatible with those uses in the "OU(CR)" zone such as recreational uses, public vehicle park, and open space, etc. The proposed amendments to the Plan, Notes and Explanatory Statement of the OZP are at **Annexes VII to IX** respectively.
- 7.5 The turn of events will inevitably affect the scale and timetable of the proposed public housing development. However, the Government has to respect and follow up on the conditions attached to the approval of the EIA report, and offer professional and practical advice to the Board on the follow-up arrangements. Although Sub-Area 1 is temporarily rezoned to "U", the intention to develop public housing thereat is retained and stated in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP.

8. Departmental Consultation

- 8.1 The following Government B/Ds have been consulted and their comments have been incorporated in the above paragraphs or **Annex IV**, where appropriate.
 - (a) Secretary for Development;
 - (b) Secretary for Culture, Sports and Tourism;
 - (c) Executive Secretary (Antiquities & Monuments), Antiquities and Monuments

- Office, Development Bureau;
- (d) Project Manager/North, CEDD;
 - (e) Director of Housing;
 - (f) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation;
 - (g) Director of Environmental Protection;
 - (h) District Land Officer/North, Lands Department;
 - (i) Commissioner for Transport;
 - (j) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department;
 - (k) Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department;
 - (l) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supply Department; and
 - (m) Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, PlanD.

8.2 The following B/Ds have no comment on the representations and comments:

- (a) Secretary for Education;
- (b) Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department;
- (c) Director of Fire Services;
- (d) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- (e) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (f) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (g) Director of Social Welfare;
- (h) District Officer (North), Home Affairs Department;
- (i) Government Property Administrator; and
- (j) Commissioner of Police.

9. Planning Department's Views

- 9.1 The supportive views provided in **R1 to R5, R6 (part), R7, R8, R9 (part), R10 to R13, R14 (part) to R244 (part), R246 (part) to R248 (part), R6551 and R6707 (part)** are noted.
- 9.2 Based on the assessments in paragraphs 5 and 7 above, the PlanD considers that the draft OZP should be amended to partially meet **R568, R1478, R1498, R1507, R1574, R1723, R2362, R2366, R2480, R2656, R2680, R2687, R2751, R2842, R3618 to R3620, R4024, R4026, R4034 to R4036, R4057, R4058, R4065, R4078, R4096, R4097, R4105, R4107, R4112, R4124, R4130, R4131, R4135 to R4138, R4148 to R4150, R4152, R4154 to R4156, R4164 to R4169, R4174 to R4177, R4188, R4189, R4200, R4214, R4215, R5191, R5194, R5197, R5208, R5234, R5291, R5406, R5588, R6069, R6074, R6081, R6386, R6393, R6394, R6424, R6557, R6656 and R6657** by rezoning Sub-Area 1 from “R(A)” to “U” as mentioned in paragraph 7 above.
- 9.3 PlanD does not support **R6 (part), R9 (part), R15 (part) to R244 (part), R245, R246 (part) to R248 (part), R249 to R332, R334 to R567, R569 to R1477, R1479 to R1497, R1499 to R1506, R1508 to R1573, R1575 to R1722, R1724 to R2296, R2298 to R2361, R2363 to R2365, R2367 to R2318, R2320 to R2479, R2481 to R2655, R2657 to R2679, R2681 to R2686, R2688 to R2750, R2752 to R2841, R2843 to R3617, R3621 to R4023, R4025, R4027 to R4033, R4037 to R4056, R4059 to R4064, R4066 to R4077, R4079 to R4095, R4098 to R4104, R4106,**

R4108 to R4111, R4113 to R4123, R4125 to R4129, R4132 to R4134, R4139 to R4147, R4151, R4153, R4157 to R4163, R4170 to R4173, R4178 to R4187, R4190 to R4199, R4201 to R4213, R4216 to R4469, R4471 to R5190, R5192, R5193, R5195, R5196, R5198 to R5207, R5209 to R5233, R5235 to R5290, R5292 to R5405, R5407 to R5587, R5589 to R6068, R6070 to R6073, R6075 to R6080, R6082 to R6385, R6387 to R6392, R6395 to R6423, R6425 to R6550, R6552 to R6556, R6558 to R6655, R6658 to R6706, R6707 (part), R6708 to R6789 and R6791 for the following reasons:

“R(A)”

- (a) the partial development of the FGC as a short to medium-term land supply option was recommended by the TFLS after public consultation and endorsed by the Government in 2019. Taking into account the findings of the Technical Study, Sub-Area 1 is suitable for public housing development to address the acute housing demand. Taking into account DEP’s recent decision, a review will be conducted by the Government on the appropriate development intensity/parameters, layout and design of the proposed development;
- (b) while 32 ha of the FGC to the east of Fan Kam Road will be taken back by the Government on 1.9.2023, only the northernmost portion of 9 ha will be developed for public housing and special school, and the remaining 140 ha of the FGC to the west of Fan Kam Road could continue to be used for hosting international golf tournaments, training of golfers and hosting various types of non-golf community recreational and sports events. In case HKGC requires temporary additional land in future for supporting the organisation of major events, the relevant departments would provide appropriate assistance;
- (c) the Technical Study covering environmental, visual and landscape, ecological, traffic, air ventilation, drainage, sewerage, water supply, geotechnical and other relevant aspects conducted has confirmed that the use of Sub-Area 1 for public housing development is technically feasible, upon implementation of mitigation measures. Taking into account the need for a review to be conducted by CEDD of the development intensity, layout and BH, Sub-Area 1 is proposed to be rezoned to “Undetermined” in the meantime;
- (d) except some social welfare facilities, the planned GIC facilities are generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in FSS New Town including the Area in accordance with the HKPSG and the assessments by relevant government bureaux/departments. Appropriate GIC facilities will be provided in the proposed housing development to serve the residents and locals. The GIC and open space provision will be closely monitored by the relevant government bureau/departments to meet the public needs;
- (e) the proposed public housing development at Sub-Area 1 only accounts for about 5% of the FGC. The overall heritage value of the whole FGC should not be affected;
- (f) job opportunities with different varieties including commercial and servicing types of jobs will be provided in the future uses of the Area and are available in

nearby FSS New Town Area;

“OU(CR)”

- (g) the “OU(CR)” zone for Sub-Areas 2 to 4 is considered appropriate to conserve existing natural landscape and ecological features, while allowing for passive recreational facilities of the community. Designating Sub-Areas 2 to 4 as country park or “GB” or “CA” zone with more restricted uses may not serve the public recreational needs. The appropriate types of public recreational uses to be provided and the mode of management and operation of the “OU(CR)” zone would be considered by LCSD;
- (h) the Technical Study covering environmental, ecological, landscape, visual, drainage, sewerage, water supply, geotechnical and other relevant aspects conducted has confirmed that the proposed “OU(CR)” zone will not induce insurmountable adverse impacts; and

Draft OZP

- (i) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the draft OZP have been duly followed. The exhibition of the representations / comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Ordinance.

10. Decision Sought

- 10.1 The Board is invited to give consideration to the representations and comments taking into consideration the points raised in the hearing session, and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendment to the draft OZP to meet/partially meet the representations.
- 10.2 Should the Board decide to propose amendments to the draft OZP to meet or partially meet the representations, the relevant amendments will be exhibited for public inspection under section 6C(2) of the Ordinance. In particular, Members are invited to agree to the proposed amendments to the Plan, Notes and Explanatory Statement of the draft OZP as described in paragraph 7.4 above and set out in **Annexes VII, VIII and IX** respectively.
- 10.3 Should the Board decide that no amendments should be made to the draft OZP to meet the representations, Members are also invited to agree that the draft OZP, together with the Notes and Explanatory Statement, are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval.

11. Attachments

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Annex I | Draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area OZP No. S/FSSE/1 (reduced size) |
| Annex II | List of Representers and Commenters |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Annex III | Decision letter from DEP on EIA report (English Version Only) |
| Annex IV | Summary of Representations and Comments and the Planning Department's Responses |
| Annex Va | Extract of the Minutes of RNTPC Meeting held on 17.6.2022 |
| Annex Vb | Extract of the Minutes of RNTPC Meeting held on 22.6.2022 |
| Annex VI | Provision of Major GIC Facilities and Open Spaces in Fanling/Sheung Shui New Town |
| Annex VII | Amendments incorporated on the Draft OZP |
| Annex VIII | Proposed revisions to the Notes of the Plan |
| Annex IX | Proposed revisions to the Explanatory Statement of the Plan |
| Plan H-1 | Location Plan of the Representation Sites |
| Plan H-2a | Key Plan of the Area Showing the Sub-Areas and the Surrounding Existing Land Uses |
| Plan H-2b | Site Plan |
| Plan H-2c | Habitat Map and Locations of Flora Species of Conservation Importance |
| Plan H-2d | Summary of Tree Treatment |
| Plan H-3 | Aerial Photo |
| Plan H-4a | Drone Photos of Sub-Areas 1 to 4 |
| Plans H-4b to H-4g | Site Photos |
| Plan H-5 | Existing Natural Landscape, Habitats and Land Uses |
| Plans H-6a and H-6b | Junction Improvement Measures |
| Plan H-7 | Plot Ratio, Building Height and Number of Storeys of Surrounding Existing / Planned Developments |
| Plan H-8 | Notional Layout of the Proposed Development in Sub-Area 1 |
| Plan H-9a to H-9f | Photomontages of the Proposed Development |
| Plan H-10 | Trees of Particular Interest in Sub-Area 1 |
| Plan H-11 | Conceptual Landscape and Mitigation Plan |