



**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO  
THE APPROVED FU TEI AU AND SHA LING  
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/NE-FTA/16  
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

**I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan**

- Item A1 – Rezoning of a site in Wa Shan, Sheung Shui from “Agriculture” (“AGR”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item A2 – Rezoning of three pieces of land in Wa Shan, Sheung Shui from “Green Belt” to “R(A)” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item B – Rezoning of a piece of land to the west of the public housing site in Wa Shan, Sheung Shui from “AGR” to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”).

**II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan**

- (a) Incorporation of a new set of Notes for the “R(A)” zone.
- (b) Revision of ‘Shop and Services’ to ‘Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “G/IC” zone.

*28 April 2023*

*Town Planning Board*

**List of Representatives and Commenters**  
**in respect of the Draft Fu Tei Au and Sha Ling Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-FTA/17**

**I. List of Representatives**

<b>Representation No. (TPB/R/S/NE-FTA/17-)</b>	<b>Name of Representer</b>
R1	石湖新村（河北段）街坊會
R2	毛善良
R3	Mary Mulvihill

**II. List of Commenter**

<b>Comment No. (TPB/R/S/NE-FTA/17-)</b>	<b>Name of Commenter</b>
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，是可有理不合情理？</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





TPB/R/S/NE-FTA/17-C1

☐ 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

0001

**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

**Item 2 - Proposed Amendments to the Approved Fu Tei Au and Sha Ling Outline Zoning Plan (No. S/NE-FTA/16) and Public Housing Development at Wa Shan, Sheung Shui**  
(NDC Paper No. 30/2022)

3. The Chairman welcomed eight representatives of government departments and the consulting firm to attend the meeting, including Ms Margaret CHAN, District Planning Officer/Shia Tin, Tai Po and North, and Ms Amy CHONG, Assistant Town Planner/North of the Planning Department (“PlanD”); Mr SIT Fung-sing, Chief Engineer / Housing Projects 3, and Mr CHEUNG Li-chun, Senior Engineer 3 / Housing Projects 3 of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (“CEDD”); Ms Lily SZE, Senior Planning Officer 3, Mr Antony CHUNG, Senior Architect 25, and Mr Damon YUNG, Civil Engineer 6 of the HD; and Mr SO Yan-shing, Technical Director of WSP (Asia) Limited. He invited the representatives of the PlanD to present NDC Paper No. 30/2022.

(Mr CHEUNG Chun-wai joined the meeting at this juncture.)

4. Ms Margaret CHAN presented NDC Paper No. 30/2022 with the aid of PowerPoint slides at Annex I.

(Mr LI Kwok-fung joined the meeting at this juncture.)

5. Hon CHAN Yuet-ming pointed out that data showed that the Public Housing Development at Wa Shan, Sheung Shui would result in a population increase of 11 300 in the area. Thus, she was very concerned about the traffic problems arising from the development. She noted that the Secretary for Housing recently stated publicly that special attention would be paid to the arrangements for ancillary transport facilities in carrying out public housing programmes in future. However, at present, the paper only mentioned that a public transport terminus would be set up in the development area and lacked detailed information. She also pointed out that residents living in public housing generally relied on public transport for commuting. Therefore, ancillary transport facilities were crucial. She opined that the department should learn from the traffic problems in respect of the Queen’s Hill Estate. She asked the department concerned to explain the method used to calculate the traffic demand after the development in the area to assess whether the existing infrastructure was adequate and whether targeted traffic measures and improvements would be devised for the development.

6. Mr Warwick WAN also expressed his concerns about the ancillary transport facilities and said that transport infrastructure should be a planning

priority in the development of the Northern Metropolis. He pointed out that there were already many traffic problems in Sheung Shui Wa Shan. For example, Jockey Club Road in Shek Wu Hui and Tai Tau Leng Roundabout were traffic congestion hotspots. He inquired whether there was any room for the development of a bypass or other forward-looking planning in Wa Shan to connect Sheung Shui and Fanling including Lung Shan Tunnel as well as the vicinity of Liantang and Ta Kwu Ling, from the outside to accommodate future development and address the current traffic problems.

7. Mr HAU Chi-keung said that the Sheung Shui District Rural Committee supported the Public Housing Development at Wa Shan, Sheung Shui. However, he shared similar concerns about traffic issues since the current traffic situation in Sheung Shui was already very busy and an increase in population would add further strain. He supported Mr Warwick WAN's suggestion to develop a bypass and proposed the construction of a junction connecting to Fanling Highway, allowing drivers to reach Tai Po and Shatin areas directly without passing through Shek Wu Hui. He hoped the department would consider these proposals. In addition, he noted that the Public Housing Development at Wa Shan, Sheung Shui involved squatter huts and warehouses, and he inquired if the department had any corresponding rehousing plans, especially for squatters.

8. Mr Simon HAU expressed support for the Public Housing Development at Wa Shan, Sheung Shui, but he considered that there was a need for improvement and room for improvement in respect of the ancillary transport facilities in Kwu Tung North, Sheung Shui. He pointed out that the traffic at Tai Tau Leng Roundabout was extremely congested during morning peak hours and hoped that the department would address this issue.

9. Ms Margaret CHAN thanked Members for their questions, and she asked the representatives of the CEDD to respond to enquiries on transport.

10. Mr SIT Fung-sing said that the consulting firm had conducted a preliminary traffic assessment taking into account the existing and potential transport networks affected by the development in the area. It had also consulted the Transport Department ("TD") and made reference to the traffic and transport impact assessment study of the Fanling North New Development Area ("NDA"). The scope of the preliminary traffic assessment included 12 junctions in the vicinity of Wa Shan, among which, junctions J4, J5 and J11 required expansion (for the addition of a left-turn lane) to increase the traffic capacity. With these traffic improvements and the construction of new roads in the Fanling area, the existing transport network in the area would be sufficient to accommodate the future population growth in Wa Shan.

11. In response to Mr HAU Chi-keung's enquiry about rehousing the squatters, Ms Margaret CHAN responded that if it was confirmed that the Public Housing Development at Wa Shan, Sheung Shui would be implemented, the Lands Department ("LandsD") would record and verify the information of the affected occupants. If the affected persons needed rehousing, the Clearance Unit would make referrals to the Hong Kong Housing Authority and the Hong Kong Housing Society for follow-up. Besides, the Government had compensation arrangements and mechanisms in place for land resumption and development clearance matters.

12. Mr HAU Chi-keung said that at present vehicles mostly concentrated at Shek Wu Hui in Sheung Shui and then travelled to the highway through Jockey Club Road and Castle Peak Road, resulting in traffic congestion there (including Tai Tau Leng Roundabout and Kai Leng Roundabout). He reiterated his hope that the Government would improve road planning to provide junctions connecting to the Fanling Highway.

13. Mr SIT Fung-sing thanked Members for their opinions. He pointed out that the construction of Fanling Bypass was currently underway. The Eastern Section would be completed in a few years whereas the Western Section would be completed in about 2030. Provision had been made for junctions to connect the Bypass with other roads.

14. Hon CHAN Yuet-ming indicated that the departmental representatives had failed to address her question concerning the calculation methods used for assessing ancillary transport facilities requirements and in transport planning.

15. Mr SIT Fung-sing responded that the consulting firm had discussed with the TD about the calculation of the corresponding increase in traffic volume generated by the additional population in Wa Shan. Regarding the ancillary transport facilities, there would be a public transport terminus in the development area in Wa Shan for use by the bus and the green minibus. The TD would closely monitor the situation and liaise with the bus operators in due course to plan future bus routes to be incorporated.

16. Hon CHAN Yuet-ming opined that the responses above still failed to address her questions. She asked whether the representatives of the CEDD could provide supplementary information in writing after the meeting.

17. Mr Warwick WAN pointed out that North District had lacked comprehensive ancillary transport facilities, and the proposal to construct an outer loop was made years ago. However, the departmental representatives still

referred to the outdated Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines as planning standards, lacking forecast data based on population distribution and development needs, etc. As a result, they failed to keep up with and adjust to the development strategy of the entire North District. He once again asked the departmental representatives whether forward-looking planning had been conducted.

18. Mr HAU Chi-keung said that due to a lack of parking spaces in Shek Wu Hui, Sheung Shui, large lorries and private cars were parked along the road from North District Government Offices and Fanling Wai to the vicinity of Jockey Club Road in Sheung Shui near Shek Wu Hui after 5 p.m. Therefore, he hoped that the Police would crack down on illegal parking to prevent the road from becoming a parking lot. He urged the department to take note of the problem of insufficient parking spaces and suggested that the department might consider providing more car parks in the development area in Wa Shan or locations near Sheung Shui.

19. The Chairman asked whether there was a road connecting the development area in Wa Shan to the Fanling Bypass Eastern Section.

20. Mr SIT Fung-sing responded that a road connection would be provided in the development area in Wa Shan, which would lead to Sheung Shui direction, and allowing vehicles to directly access the Fanling Bypass Eastern Section via Lung Sum Avenue on the southwest side of the proposed public housing in Wa Shan, as well as the newly constructed L4 and L3 roads.

21. The Chairman asked if there was a more direct route to access Fanling Bypass.

22. Mr SIT Fung-sing responded that the routing mentioned by the Chairman involved the resumption of additional land (including land at Shek Wu San Tsuen and nearby designated burial ground sites). After negotiation and discussion, it was believed that the current traffic plan was more appropriate.

23. The Chairman asked whether the planning of the Fanling Bypass Western Section was underway, and whether there would be a road in the development area in Wa Shan which would connect to the said section. He was concerned about the alignment of the relevant projects in terms of their timelines: The Wa Shan development project was scheduled for completion in 2031/32, and by then, housing projects of similar scale in areas such as Po Shek Wu Estate, Fanling Wai and Tai Tau Leng would have been completed one after another. He pointed out that the current traffic planning only focused on connecting residents to Sheung Shui Station and questioned whether such planning could accommodate future population growth. Taking the example of the residents of Queen's Hill Estate,



a majority of whom currently relied on KMB Route 78A for transportation, he pointed out the long queue of passengers often caused congestion at the bus stop and the passageway at the bus stop. Besides, the roundabout near Landmark North was already overcrowded, and there was indeed a need to widen the roads in the vicinity of Sheung Shui Station, including the passenger holding area at the bus stop. He asked whether the departmental representatives could provide relevant forecast data, such as the proportion of commuting trips made by the railway and buses respectively, if the traffic planning objective was to encourage residents to primarily use the railway.

24. Mr SIT Fung-sing gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Regarding the computation methodology, the data used was based on the year of completion of the buildings (2030/31) covered by the project plus three years (i.e. 2033/34), including the data from concurrent development projects of the same period. Capacity changes at various road junction were then calculated by computer models. The results showed that road junctions J4, J5 and J11 required additional traffic improvement measures such as adding a lane before entering a road junction to enhance traffic capacity of the road junction;
- (b) As for forward-looking traffic planning, he pointed out that the Government launched the public consultation exercise on Three Railways and Three Roads the previous week, which included proposals such as Shatin Bypass and Northern Metropolis Highway. The proposed Fanling Bypass Eastern Section would be completed in around three years while the Western Section would be completed in 2030. It was believed that Fanling Bypass could ease the traffic burden in the vicinity;
- (c) In regard to the load capacity of the Sheung Shui MTR Station and the bus stop, he pointed out that the consulting firm had previously conducted a study to assess the usage of the bus stop and found that there was still room to increase the frequency of the bus service at the bus stop to accommodate the residents of the Wa Shan NDA; and
- (d) In respect of parking spaces, he pointed out that the HD would provide parking spaces in the public housing estates in the Wa Shan NDA according to the upper limit prescribed in the relevant standards.

25. Mr LEE Koon-hung considered that the existing planned routing was rather circuitous: Given that Fanling Bypass was located beside the Wa Shan

NDA, he questioned the necessity of bypassing the Sheung Shui Town to reach Fanling Bypass which was against the environmental protection principles. He also pointed out that the buildings within the routing proposed by the Chairman were mostly squatter huts, not villages. Given that the land resumption for the project already involved a large portion of these squatter huts in the area, he wondered why the remaining small plots of land were not resumed to construct a more direct road connecting to Fanling Bypass, effectively addressing the traffic load issues arising from the Public Housing Development at Wa Shan.

26. Mr SIT Fung-sing pointed out that the relevant proposal inevitably involved some non-vacant squatter huts. The results of the preliminary traffic impact assessment showed that the existing traffic planning proposal was capable of handling future traffic volume.

27. Mr LEE Koon-hung reiterated that the entire Public Housing Development at Wa Shan would resume a considerable amount of squatter huts in the area. He suggested resuming the remaining small portion of squatter huts to construct a more direct road connecting Fanling Bypass.

28. Mr SIT Fung-sing responded that the department had considered the proposal. However, it was not adopted due to issues including the involvement of squatter huts, the difference in terrain levels and road safety concerns.

29. Mr LEE Koon-hung pointed out that the issue of the difference in terrain levels could be addressed by the application of engineering techniques, and thus he did not understand what concerns the department had about road safety.

30. Mr SIT Fung-sing said that because of the complexity of the project and time constraints, it was impossible to provide a detailed explanation of the issue of road safety concerns at the meeting.

31. Ms Margaret CHAN thanked Members for their questions. She pointed out that the relevant proposal might face resistance due to the resumption of land with a higher number of residents. However, the department would endeavor to reduce the number of affected residents when considering different options. She also thanked Members for their views and would consider the views in consultation with relevant departments and consultants to examine if there was room for improvement. She responded that the buildings included in the project were public housing under the HD and no public parking spaces would be provided. Nevertheless, she would convey the related opinions to the TD for their follow-up action. She indicated that the TD was also aware of the demand for public parking spaces and would try to find suitable locations elsewhere for such purposes.

32. The Chairman asked if the Fanling Bypass Western Section would be completed by 2030 and whether the related section could be connected to the Eastern Section and the Wa Shan public housing development area. He also asked if the departmental representatives would submit information relating to the traffic assessment after the meeting, such as the proportion of people using the railway and buses for travel.

33. Mr SIT Fung-sing said that the construction of the Fanling Bypass Eastern Section was underway. According to the project schedule, the Section would be completed in about 2025 whereas the Western Section, in about 2030/31.

34. The Chairman said that if the construction of the Fanling Bypass Western Section had not yet begun, whether the traffic planning routing and exits under the traffic planning for the Public Housing Development at Wa Shan could be included in the project scope of the Western Section, in order to connect the two places and bring the entire transport infrastructure and community project of Wa Shan Tsuen to the area of Kwu Tung North and Man Kam To, to resolve the congestion in Shek Wu Hui.

35. Mr SIT Fung-sing said that according to the planning, road improvements would be carried out and new roads would be connected to the roundabout of Fanling Bypass, which would ultimately be connected to the Fanling Bypass Western Section.

36. The Chairman reiterated that the current planned routing of the road was rather circuitous. He remarked that emphasis should be placed on the connectivity with infrastructure to avoid the possibility of insufficient space for extension when other temporary housing projects were completed in the future.

37. Mr SIT Fung-sing said that the project design for the Fanling Bypass Western Section should have been completed and since the Western Section featured an elevated bridge design, there would be no direct road connection from the ground level to the Wa Shan public housing development area. According to the current design, vehicles would use the improved Lung Sum Avenue, and the new L4 and L3 roads to go to the Western Section via the roundabout of Fanling Bypass.

38. Mr LEE Koon-hung added that Members were concerned about there being only a single road to and from the Wa Shan public housing development area. If there was a traffic accident on that road, it would cause congestion on other roads. He pointed out that if there was a road directly connecting to the Fanling Bypass Western Section, drivers would have an additional road to return

to the Wa Shan public housing development area, which helped to ease the traffic flow.

39. Mr SIT Fung-sing said that the department had considered the scenario mentioned by Mr LEE Koon-hung and thus it was suggested to include the widening of Lung Sum Avenue in the junction improvement scheme. In the event of a traffic accident, vehicles could travel in a single lane.

40. Mr LEE Koon-hung suggested to the Chairman that the Members present generally agreed to the application of the PlanD to change the land use so that the department could proceed with the preparatory work as soon as possible. However, he considered that the department must explain the relevant planning for ancillary transport facilities at future NDC meetings and take into account Members' views to address their concerns.

41. The Chairman concluded that the NDC approved and supported in principle the Amendments to the Approved Fu Tei Au and Sha Ling Outline Zoning Plan (No. S/NE-FTA/16) and Public Housing Development at Wa Shan, Sheung Shui. However, it considered that the traffic planning for the connection of the Fanling Bypass Western Section was one of the key concerns, with significant room for improvement. He hoped that the departmental representatives would study the relevant views. If there was any update, it could be reported at the NDC meeting again.

(Post-meeting note: The PlanD, the CEDD, and other relevant departments provided supplementary responses to Members' views on traffic planning after the meeting. The details were at Annex II.)

~~**Item 3** **District Lands Office/North: Returns on Small House Applications and Redevelopment of New Territories Exempted House Applications in North District**  
(NDC Paper No. 31/2022)~~

42. The meeting noted NDC Paper No. 31/2022.

43. Hon CHAN Yuet-ming raised the following points of concern:

- (a) The paper showed that the accumulative number of cases was higher than that of the previous time. She enquired of the District Lands Office/North ("DLO/N") how to improve the situation; and