

**SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
THE DRAFT SHA TIN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/ST/33
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendment to Matters shown on the Plan



- Item A – Rezoning of a site at On Muk Street, Shek Mun from “Residential (Group A)6” (“R(A)6”) to “Open Space” with corresponding deletion of building height restriction.

II. Amendment to the Notes of the Plan

Revisions to the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone to delete all the provisions related to the “R(A)6” sub-zone.

Town Planning Board

13 October 2017




SCALE 1 : 20 000 比例尺

草圖編號 S/S T/3 3 的建議修訂
 PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO DRAFT PLAN No. S/S T/33

根據城市規劃條例第 6 C (2) 條公布的建議修訂
 PROPOSED AMENDMENT PUBLISHED UNDER SECTION 6C(2)
 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

A 項 ITEM A



由「住宅(甲類)6」地帶改劃為「休憩用地」地帶
 REZONING FROM "RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)6" TO "OPEN SPACE"


夾附的《註釋》屬這份圖則的一部分，
 《註釋》的建議修訂已根據城市規劃條例第 6 C (2) 條公布。
 THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN
 AND THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT THERETO HAS BEEN PUBLISHED
 UNDER SECTION 6C(2) OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

(參看附表)
 (SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

2017年10月13日根據城市規劃條例第6C(2)條公布
 對草圖編號 S/S T/3 3 作出的建議修訂
 PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO DRAFT PLAN No. S/S T/33
 PUBLISHED UNDER SECTION 6C(2) OF THE TOWN
 PLANNING ORDINANCE ON 13 OCTOBER 2017

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

沙田分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/S T/3 3 的建議修訂
 PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO DRAFT SHA TIN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN No. S/S T/33



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



圖則編號
 PLAN No. R/S/ST/33 - A1

**Proposed Amendments to the Notes of
the Draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/33
in relation to Amendment Plan No. R/S/ST/33-A1**

The Remarks of the Notes of the “Residential (Group A)” zone are proposed to be amended:

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)

Column 1 Uses always permitted	Column 2 Uses that may be permitted with or without conditions on application to the Town Planning Board
Ambulance Depot	Commercial Bathhouse/ Massage Establishment
Flat	Eating Place
Government Use (not elsewhere specified)	Educational Institution
House	Exhibition or Convention Hall
Library	Government Refuse Collection Point
Market	Hospital
Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture	Hotel
Public Clinic	Institutional Use (not elsewhere specified)
Public Transport Terminus or Station (excluding open-air terminus or station)	Office
Residential Institution	Petrol Filling Station
School (in free-standing purpose-designed building only)	Place of Entertainment
Social Welfare Facility	Private Club
Utility Installation for Private Project	Public Convenience
	Public Transport Terminus or Station (not elsewhere specified)
	Public Utility Installation
	Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle)
	Religious Institution
	School (not elsewhere specified)
	Shop and Services
	Training Centre

(Please see next page)

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A) (Cont'd)

Column 1
Uses always permitted

Column 2
Uses that may be permitted with or
without conditions on application
to the Town Planning Board

In addition, the following uses are always permitted (a) on the lowest three floors of a building, taken to include basements; or (b) in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building, both excluding floors containing wholly or mainly car parking, loading/unloading bays and/or plant room:

Eating Place
Educational Institution
Institutional Use (not elsewhere specified)
Off-course Betting Centre
Office
Place of Entertainment
Private Club
Public Convenience
Recyclable Collection Centre
School
Shop and Services
Training Centre

Planning Intention

This zone 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.

Remarks

- (a) On land designated “Residential (Group A)1” (“R(A)1”), no new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 501,800m² and a maximum building height in terms of number of storeys or metres above Principal Datum as stipulated on the Plan, or the GFA and height of the existing building, whichever is the greater.

(Please see next page)

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A) (Cont'd)

Remarks (Cont'd)

- (b) On land designated “Residential (Group A)2” (“R(A)2”), no new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum GFA of 194,500m² and a maximum building height in terms of metres above Principal Datum as stipulated on the Plan, or the GFA and height of the existing building, whichever is the greater.
- (c) On land designated “Residential (Group A)3” (“R(A)3”), no new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum GFA of 43,600m² and a maximum building height in terms of metres above Principal Datum as stipulated on the Plan, or the GFA and height of the existing building, whichever is the greater.
- (d) On land designated “Residential (Group A)4” (“R(A)4”), no new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum domestic GFA of 234,000m², non-domestic GFA of 19,500m² and a maximum building height in terms of metres above Principal Datum as stipulated on the Plan, or the GFA and height of the existing building, whichever is the greater.
- (e) On land designated “Residential (Group A)5” (“R(A)5”), no new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum GFA of 38,580m² and a maximum building height in terms of metres above Principal Datum as stipulated on the Plan, or the GFA and height of the existing building, whichever is the greater.
- ~~(f) On land designated “Residential (Group A)6” (“R(A)6”), no new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum GFA of 26,240m² and a maximum building height in terms of metres above Principal Datum as stipulated on the Plan, or the GFA and height of the existing building, whichever is the greater.~~
- ~~(g)~~(f) In determining the maximum number of storeys for the purpose of paragraph (a) above, any basement floor(s) may be disregarded.
- ~~(h)~~(g) In determining the maximum GFA for the purposes of paragraphs (a) to ~~(f)~~(e) above, any floor space that is constructed or intended for use solely as car park, loading/unloading bay, plant room and caretaker’s office, or caretaker’s quarters and recreational facilities for the use and benefit of all the owners or occupiers of the domestic building or domestic part of the building, provided such uses and facilities are ancillary and directly related to the development or redevelopment, may be disregarded.

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A) (Cont'd)

Remarks (Cont'd)

- (h)** Where the permitted plot ratio/GFA as defined in Building (Planning) Regulations is permitted to be exceeded in circumstances as set out in Regulation 22(1) or (2) of the said Regulations, the plot ratio/GFA for the building on land to which paragraphs (a) to **(e)** above applies may be increased by the additional plot ratio by which the permitted plot ratio is permitted to be exceeded under and in accordance with the said Regulation 22(1) or (2), notwithstanding that the relevant maximum GFA specified in paragraphs (a) to **(e)** above may thereby be exceeded.
- (i)** Based on the individual merits of a development or redevelopment proposal, minor relaxation of the building height and/or GFA restrictions stated in paragraphs (a) to **(e)** above may be considered by the Town Planning Board on application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance.

**Proposed Amendments to the Explanatory Statement of
the Draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/33
in relation to Amendment Plan No. R/S/ST/33-A1**

(This does not form part of the proposed amendment to the
draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/33)

Paragraphs 7.4, 7.4.2, 7.4.3, 7.4.3(g), 7.4.5 and 7.10 of the Explanatory Statement are proposed to be amended:

7.4 Residential (Group A) (“R(A)”) : Total Area ~~250.27~~**249.84** ha

7.4.2 There are fourteen existing public rental housing estates, twelve HOS, three PSPS and one Sandwich Class Housing in the Area. There are also ~~six~~ **five** planned public housing developments in Planning Areas 11, 16, 52 and 58D. Within public housing estates, there are a wide range of low-rise free-standing GIC facilities including schools, community halls, children and youth centres, elderly centres, social and welfare centres as well as ancillary facility buildings such as car parks, shopping centres and markets serving the residents of the concerned estates. Such low-rise free-standing GIC and ancillary facility buildings should be kept as breathing spaces and visual relief for the building mass. No new addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of these existing individual free-standing GIC and ancillary facility buildings shall result in a height exceeding that of the existing building. All public housing estates are governed by planning brief. Upon the future redevelopment of the estates, the layout and design of these GIC and ancillary facility buildings should be comprehensively reviewed with the support of relevant impact assessments on air ventilation and visual aspects. In addition, planning briefs setting out the development parameters, design requirements and the relevant technical assessments to be conducted for the planned public housing developments will be provided to guide the future development of the sites.

7.4.3 This zoning includes ~~six~~ **five** sub-areas which are subject to the following development restrictions:

~~“Residential (Group A)6” (“R(A)6”)~~: Total Area 0.43 ha

~~(g) The planned public housing development at On Muk Street in Planning Area 11 is under this zoning. Development/redevelopment within this zoning is subject to restrictions on the maximum total gross floor area of 26,240m² and building height restriction as shown on the Plan, or the GFA and height of existing building, whichever is the greater.~~

7.4.5 Minor relaxation of the GFA and building height restrictions for the “R(A)1”, “R(A)2”, “R(A)3”, “R(A)4” **and** “R(A)5” ~~and “R(A)6”~~ zones may be considered by the Board on application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance. Each application for minor relaxation of GFA/building height restrictions will be considered on its own merits.

7.10 Open Space (“O”) : Total Area ~~253.68~~**254.11** ha

**Summary of Further Representations made on
the Proposed Amendments to the Draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/33**

Further Rep. No. TPB/FR/S/ST/33-	Subject of Further Representations	Planning Department's Responses
<p>F1</p> <p>Prof. Bernard Vincent LIM Wan-fung (The Chairman of the Building Committee, Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA))</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Major Grounds:</u></p> <p>1.1 There is an acute shortage of land for public housing. Delay in rezoning the subject site for residential use would mean that it would not be possible to complete the public housing development in 2021/22 and the flats would not be available to citizens in need.</p> <p>1.2 The proposed development will not have significant impacts on traffic, visual and air ventilation aspects. Appropriate design measures including setback and façade orientation are incorporated to minimize the effect of light and noise generated from Kitchee Football Centre. The proposed public housing development can be co-existed with the Kitchee Football Centre before its relocation.</p>	<p>1.1 Should the site be zoned for residential development, the proposed public housing development at On Muk Street, Shek Mun is targeted for completion in 2021/22 and accounted for about 10% of the total subsidised sales flat (SSF) supply in that year. Hence, the contribution of the site in the SSF supply was crucial to meet the pressing need for housing for grass roots citizens.</p> <p>1.2 The findings of the technical assessments reveal that the proposed development will not have significant impacts on traffic, visual and air ventilation aspects to the surrounding areas. The proposed public housing development is set back about 20m from its eastern boundary to allow buffer distance with Kitchee Football Centre. Most flats are oriented towards the Shing Mun River or the adjacent On Muk Street Garden to minimize the effect of light and noise generated from Kitchee Football Centre. Although the lowest two floors of the proposed development are below the top level of the light pole at Kitchee Football Centre (i.e. about 20mPD), however, as the lights point inwards and downwards to the football fields, it is not anticipated that the light source will be directly visible from those flats. Furthermore, no spectator stands, benches and public address system are provided at the football pitch at the Kitchee Football Centre, thus noise generated from the crowd of spectators and daily football training activities is not anticipated. An Environmental Assessment Study would be conducted by HD at the detailed design stage to address the potential environmental impacts for the approval of Environmental Protection Department. The mitigation measures to be provided should meet the requirements of relevant legislation.</p>

Further Rep. No. TPB/FR/S/ST/33-	Subject of Further Representations	Planning Department's Responses
	<p><u>Proposal</u> 1.3 To rezone the site to residential use.</p>	<p>1.3 The Site together with the adjoining Kitchee Football Centre site, which was identified as one of the 150 potential housing sites according to the 2013 Policy Address, was all along reserved for public housing development. In view that the Site is formed and located in proximity to MTR Shek Mun Station and supporting retail facilities in Shek Mun, it is considered suitable for public housing development to meet the housing needs in the short-to-medium term. Should the site be zoned for residential development, it would facilitate early production of 560 public housing flats by 2021/2022.</p>
<p>F2</p> <p>Mr WAN Man-yee (Member of the HKHA)</p> <p>Dr LAU Kwok-yu (Member of the HKHA)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item A</p> <p><u>Major Grounds:</u></p> <p>2.1 SSF is an integral part of public housing development. To meet the production targets set down in the Long Term Housing Strategy (LTHS) 2014, the HKHA has no choice but to develop sites of all sizes that are available.</p> <p>2.2 The waiting time of families on the waiting list to be given the first offer has increased from 3 years (March 2014) to 4.6 years (March 2017). Individual families have waited much longer than 6 years. In view of the shortage of land supply and long waiting list for public housing, piecemeal rezoning for public housing development is necessary, urgent and important.</p>	<p>2.1 As stated in the LTHS Annual Progress Report 2017, assuming that all sites identified can be smoothly delivered on time for housing development, the Government has identified land for constructing about 237,000 public housing units for the ten-year period from 2018/19 to 2027/28, which already lags behind the ten-year public housing supply target of 280,000 units. If the proposed public housing development at On Muk Street cannot be materialised, this will further aggravate the overall public housing supply situation.</p> <p>2.2 The Government has formulated the LTHS and adopted a multi-pronged approach to identify suitable land to address the pressing needs for housing. The proposed development is in line with the strategic direction under LTHS of providing more subsidised sale flats to meet the home ownership aspirations of low to middle income families. Furthermore, with SSF from the proposed public housing development at On Muk Street coming on stream, more public rental housing (PRH) units could be released from Green Form buyers who are PRH tenants for re-allocation to waiting list applicants and to those with more pressing needs.</p>

Further Rep. No. TPB/FR/S/ST/33-	Subject of Further Representations	Planning Department's Responses
	<p>2.3 The scheme design is with a layout unaffected by any possible light impact from Kitchee Football Centre. The next phase of On Muk Street will not take place until the Kitchee Football Centre is satisfactory re-provisioned.</p> <p>2.4 The district and local open space is sufficient to meet the needs of planned population of Sha Tin in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG).</p> <p>2.5 When there is no overwhelming reasons not to allow the public housing developments to proceed, particularly in the case of On Muk Street where all development impacts have been found to be acceptable, public housing development should be allowed priority. Cost effectiveness is a concern but regularly superseded by production priorities.</p>	<p>2.3 HD would adopt a sensitive design to minimize the noise nuisances from Kitchee Football Centre. The proposed public housing development is set back about 20m from its eastern boundary to allow buffer distance with Kitchee Football Centre. Most flats are oriented towards the Shing Mun River or the adjacent On Muk Street Garden to minimize the effect of light generated from Kitchee Football Centre. Although the lowest two floors of the proposed development are below the top level of the light pole at Kitchee Football Centre (i.e. about 20mPD), however, as the lights point inwards and downwards to the football fields, it is not anticipated that the light source will be directly visible from those flats. In view of the keen demand for public housing and the importance of supporting and developing soccer sports, the Government decided that Kitchee Football Centre would not be included in the current rezoning proposal and would be rezoned after the relevant relocation arrangement has been settled.</p> <p>2.4 Should the site be zoned for residential development, the proposed development would not have adverse impact on the open space provision within the area covered by the OZP. The district and local open space have been sufficiently provided in the Sha Tin Planning Area in accordance with the HKPSG. There are number of open spaces provided in Shek Mun area. A 20m-wide public riverside promenade to the southwest of the site will be been retained as open space for public enjoyment.</p> <p>2.5 The findings of the technical assessments reveal that the proposed development will not have significant impacts on traffic, visual and air ventilation aspects to the surrounding areas. Given the subject site was readily available for development with good accessibility and supporting facilities in the vicinity, it should be used for public housing development as soon as possible to meet the imminent public housing need.</p>

Further Rep. No. TPB/FR/S/ST/33-	Subject of Further Representations	Planning Department's Responses
	<u>Proposal</u> 2.6 To rezone the site from "O" to "R(A)6".	2.6 Please refer to the response to FR 1.3.
F3, F4 to F186 Society for Community Organization (F3) and Individuals (F4 to F186)	Oppose Amendment Item A <u>Major Grounds:</u> 3.1 There is a shortage of public housing and the overall public housing production is far below the targets. Up till June 2017, the average waiting time for general applicants for public housing is 4.7 years. Among them, the average waiting time for elderly one-person applicants is 2.6 years. Furthermore, many families with 3 to 4-person households have waited for more than 6 years. In view of the shortage of land for public housing development and pressing need for housing for grass roots citizens, the Board Members should reconsider rezoning the site to "R(A)6". 3.2 The proposed public housing development is feasible and the open space provision in Sha Tin is sufficient. <u>Proposal</u> 3.3 To rezone the site from "O" to "R(A)6".	3.1 There were about 152,700 PRH general applicants and about 127,400 non-elderly one-person applicants under the Quota and Points System as at end-September 2017. The average waiting time for general applicants was 4.6 years, exceeding the target of providing the first flat offer to general applicants at around three years on average. In addition to new public housing flat supply, recovery of PRH units is another major source of supply. With subsidised sale flats from the proposed public housing development at On Muk Street coming on stream, more PRH units could be released from Green Form buyers who are PRH tenants for re-allocation to waiting list applicants and to those with more pressing needs. 3.2 The findings of the technical assessments revealed that the proposed development will not have significant impacts on traffic, visual and air ventilation aspects to the surrounding areas. The district and local open space and a range of GIC facilities are generally sufficient to meet the needs in accordance with the HKPSG. 3.3 Please refer to the response to FR 1.3.



Our Ref. : HD 1-7/COMM1/BC-2 (Pt. 3)
Tel. No. : 2761 7465
Fax No. : 2761 0019

Date : 3 November 2017

Secretary, Town Planning Board
15/F, North Point Government Offices
333 Java Road, North Point
Hong Kong

Dear Sir/Madam



**Further Representation in Respect of Proposed Amendment to
the Draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/33**

I refer to the proposed amendment to the Draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan gazetted on 13 October 2017, and to express our disappointment with the Town Planning Board's decision of 22 September 2017 to revert the "Residential (Group A)6" zone of the public housing site at On Muk Street to "Open Space".

Implications of Public Housing Production

There is an acute shortage of land for public housing, and the Housing Authority has been trying its very best to use land suitable for public housing to provide as much housing and, as early as feasible, to our citizens.

The proposed development at the On Muk Street site is targeted for completion in the 2021/22 financial year and will account for about 10% of the total Subsidized Sale Flats (SSF) production of that year. Delay

in rezoning this site for residential use would mean that it would no longer be possible to complete this development in 2021/22, and the flats would not be available at that time to citizens in need of such flats.

Co-existence between Residential and Recreation Uses

While making the maximum use of land for public housing, at the same time we have always taken great care to ensure that the design of proposed development complies with or exceed standards. Previous submissions to the Town Planning Board have already demonstrated the suitability of the site for SSF development, not only in aspects such as traffic, environment and infrastructure capacity, but also in the compatibility of the design of the development with the adjacent temporary sports facility, namely the Jockey Club Kitchee Centre, through the incorporation of building set back and facade orientation to minimize potential glare and noise from the Centre to future residents of this development.

There is therefore no conflict between zoning this site for residential use and the temporary use of the adjacent land for sports. The proposed SSF development can co-exist here with the Kitchee Centre before it is relocated to a permanent facility.

In view of all the above, the Town Planning Board is respectfully requested to favourably consider our objection to the proposed amendment, and to consider rezoning the site to residential use.

Yours faithfully,



Prof Bernard Vincent LIM Wan-fung, JP
Chairman, Building Committee
Hong Kong Housing Authority

c.c. Members of HKHA and its Committees

就草圖的建議修訂作出進一步申述
Further Representation in Respect of Proposed Amendments to Draft Plan

圖則編號
Plan No.

S/ST/33

TPB/R/S/ST/33-F2

「進一步申述人」姓名／名稱
Name of "Further Representer"

先生 Mr. 夫人 Mrs. 小姐 Miss 女士 Ms. 其他 Other

Mr MY WAN and Dr LAU Kwok Yu

(必須資料 Required information)

這部分不會公開予公眾查閱。

This part will not be made available for public inspection.

聯絡人

Contact Person

(只適用於非個人的「進一步申述人」)

(Applicable to non-individual "further representer" only)

通訊地址 *

Postal Address *

電話號碼

Tel. No.

(非必須資料 Optional information)

傳真號碼 *


Fax No. *

電郵地址 *

E-mail Address *

* 為方便聯絡，「進一步申述人」必須最少提供通訊地址、傳真號碼或電郵地址其中一項資料。

* To facilitate communication, either postal address, fax number or email address must be provided.



進一步申述詳情

Details of Further Representation

(必須資料 Required information)

相關的建議修訂 Related Proposed Amendment	性質 Nature	理由 Reasons 每項不多於8000中文字或英文字母(包括空格) Not more than 8000 Chinese characters or English characters (including spaces) for each item
(請註明進一步申述所關乎的在建議修訂項目附表的修訂項目編號(例如「第x項」)。) (Please specify the amendment item number in the Schedule of Proposed Amendments to which the further representation relates (for example, "Item x").)		
	<input type="radio"/> 支持 Support <input checked="" type="radio"/> 反對 Oppose	

Plan No. R/S/ST/33-A1
Item A

See attachment.

- 支持 Support
- 反對 Oppose

- 支持 Support
- 反對 Oppose

提交 Submit

Further Representation in Respect of Proposed Amendments to Draft Plan
By Mr MY WAN and Dr LAU Kwok Yu (2nd November 2017)

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
THE DRAFT SHA TIN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/ST/33**

Amendment Plan No. R/S/ST/33-A1

1. We are members of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (the Authority) and its Building Committee (BC). Dr LAU Kwok Yu is also a member of the Subsidized Housing Committee (SHC) of the Authority.
2. This is our representation with regard to the rezoning of the site at On Muk Street (the subject site) from “R(A)6” to “O”.
3. We request that the “R(A)6” should be retained.
4. Long Term Housing Strategy 2014 (LTHS) states “**PRH is the primary housing solution for low-income families, and the Government is fully committed to providing PRH to those who cannot afford private rental housing**” (LTHS, 2014, para.4.1), and “**Subsidized sale flats also provide an avenue for better-off PRH tenants to buy their own homes, thereby releasing their PRH flats for use by those who are in genuine needs.**” (LTHS, 2014, para.5.1).
5. The work of the Authority follows the terms of LTHS. Regarding the supply of Public Rental Housing (PRH) and Subsidized Sale Flats (SSF), the annual production is in the region of 28 000 units (of which 20 000 units are PRH and 8 000 units are SSF) at least in the first 10 years. The Authority adopts a policy of interchangeability between PRH and SSF that enables the approved productions to change from rental to sale or vice versa to meet changing circumstances.

6. The principal duty of BC is to approve scheme designs of public housing undertaken by the Authority and the corresponding budgets. BC approved the scheme design of On Muk Street for the development of 543 flats in May 2017. This is of course subject to successful conclusion of rezoning.
7. In the last 5 years, there were 53 cases of public housing development projects submitted and approved by BC. Of these cases, there were 25 cases where the flat numbers in the scheme designs are less than 1000. Of these 25 cases, there were 10 cases with the flat numbers less than 600. (The confidentiality requirement of the Authority is such that we cannot tabulate the details.) This phenomenon indicates that to meet the production targets set down in the LTHS, the Authority has no choice but to develop sites of all sizes that are available.
8. It is therefore a wrong impression to say that small sites like the subject site which only produces around 500 units are unsuitable for the Authority's productions.
9. Notwithstanding the utilization of sites of all sizes including small sites, the approved overall production so far is far below the targets set down in LTHS. The deficit will be 70 743 units in the first 7 years (2015/16 to 2021/22)¹ since the promulgation of LTHS. **Please refer to Table 1.** In the remaining 3 years if the target of LTHS is to be achieved, an annual production has to reach 51 581 units². This is obviously impossible. The figures however fully reflect the dire situation in public housing production. Future sites for further production await land production from new development areas. From current indications, sites for the forthcoming years are dwindling until the community takes a bold decision on land production. On the other hand, long term land production targets are unable to meet short and medium term needs. It is our humble view that extensive but piecemeal rezoning for PRH developments is necessary, urgent and important.

¹ If Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS)'s actual production of 988 Subsidised Sale Flats (SSF) in 2015/16-2016/17 and its planned production of 1 871 PRH flats and 1 640 SSF in 2017/18-2021/22 are included, the deficit of 70 743 units in the first 7 years (2015/16 to 2021/22) will be reduced to 66 244 units. This is still a substantial number (about one-third of LTHS target production of 196 000 public sector housing units in the 7-year period).

² If HKHS' actual production and planned production within the 7 financial years (2015/16-2021/22) are included, the average annual production in the remaining three years of the 10-year LTHS period will be 50 081 units. In other words, LTHS's annual production target of public housing units will have to be substantially increased from 28 000 units per annum to 50 081 units per annum (almost 80% increase) in the Financial Year 2022/23, 2023/24 and 2024/25 respectively.

Table 1

Housing Authority Public Housing Production
(2015/16-2016/17, Actual; 2017/18-2021/22, Planned; 2022/23-2024/25, Target)

	Deficit against PRH & SSF production target of 28000 units per annum under LTHS 2014	PRH & SSF Total Production
2015/16	13 736	14 264
2016/17	13 707	14 293
2017/18	9 000	19 000
2018/19	6 300	21 700
2019/20	9 200	18 800
2020/21	10 000	18 000
2021/22	8 800	19 200
2022/23	0	51 581
2023/24	0	51 581
2024/25	0	51 581
Ten-Year Total	70 743	280 000

10. In the meantime, the waiting list for public housing expands to a total of around 280 000 applicants. **Please refer to Table 2.**
11. The waiting time of waiting list families to be given the first offer has increased by over 60% from 3 years (March 2014) to 4.6 (March 2017) years. Individual families have waited much longer than 6 years. **Please refer also to Table 2.**

Table 2

Acute demand for Public Rental Housing as reflected by long waiting list and long waiting time

End of March	Live Application on the Housing Authority Public Rental Housing Waiting List			Average Waiting Time* (Years)	
	General Applications	Non-elderly one-person applications under the Quota and Points System	Total Applications	General Applicants	Elderly Applicants among General Applicants
2007	70 514	36 743	107 257	1.8	1.3
2008	73 096	38 536	111 632	1.9	1.1
2009	71 678	42 749	114 427	1.8	1.2
2010	77 795	51 283	129 078	2.0	1.1
2011	89 058	63 362	152 420	2.0	1.1
2012	101 727	87 768	189 495	2.6	1.3
2013	116 927	111 528	228 455	2.7	1.5
2014	121 878	126 245	248 123	3.0	1.6
2015	137 900	140 600	278 500	3.3	1.8
2016	150 500	134 300	284 800	3.9	2.3
2017	147 300	128 600	275 900	4.6	2.6

*Waiting time refers to the time taken between registration for PRH and first flat offer, excluding any frozen period during the application period (e.g. when the applicant has not yet fulfilled the residence requirement; the applicant has requested to put his/her application on hold pending arrival of family members for family reunion; the applicant is imprisoned, etc). The average waiting time for general applicants refers to the average of the waiting time of those general applicants who were housed to PRH in the past 12 months.

As at end-June 2017, there were about 150 200 general applications for PRH, and about 127 600 non-elderly one-person applications under the Quota and Points System. The average waiting time for general applicants was 4.7 years. Among them, the average waiting time for elderly one-person applicants was 2.6 years.

Source: Housing Authority

<http://www.housingauthority.gov.hk/en/about-us/publications-and-statistics/prh-applications-average-waiting-time/index.html>

12. The inhuman living conditions of many of those on the waiting list are captured in two photo albums produced by SoCO. They are “Sojourning as Tempura (住住先)” and “Trapped (焗住)”. One copy each of the albums are attached herewith for each member’s reading. The production of public housing is for the eradication of the unfairness and grave hardship.
13. Subsidized Sale Flats (SSF) is an integral part of public housing development. The high demand for SSF is well reflected in the high applications to flat ratio in the recent sale exercises of the Authority. Please refer to Table 3.

Table 3

Housing Authority (HA) Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) and Housing Society (HS) Subsidised Sale Flats (SSF) Application Statistics


HA Home Ownership Scheme / HS Subsidised Sale Scheme (Application date: Month/Year)	Number of Flats on Sale	Total Application (Green Form + White Form)	Green Form Application	White Form Application	Application to Flat Ratio
HS Greenview Villa SSF (12 / 2012)	988	58 331	1 749	56 582	59.0 : 1
HA HOS (12 / 2014)	2 160	135 049	11 507	123 542	62.5 : 1
HA HOS (2 / 2016)	2 657	--	--	--	--
HS Greenhill Villa (2 / 2016)	1 020	--	--	--	--
HA HOS + HS Greenhill Villa (2 / 2016)	3 677	52 822	4 123	48 699	14.4: 1
HA Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Pilot Scheme (GSH) (10 / 2016)	857	--	16 198	--	18.9 : 1
HA HOS (3 / 2017)	2 120	104 600	12 500	92 100	49.3 : 1

Source: Housing Department information dated 7 August 2014 and 4 October 2017 and Housing Society information dated 24 October 2017 provided to Dr LAU Kwok Yu


14. In addition to the above explanations on use of small sites and the acute housing shortage, our planning comments on the views of some Town Planning Board (TPB) members who preferred the rezoning to "O" are as follows.
- A) The building height limit was introduced by TPB and no stepped building height issue was raised in the last round of representations.
 - B) It was inaccurate to say the proposed development was keeping with the surrounding areas as obviously there are many buildings across the street.
 - C) Admittedly, small sites are less cost effective. However, there are many other PRH/SSF projects on sites large and small, approved by BC with unit prices of the flats higher than that of On Muk Street scheme- this demonstrates that cost effectiveness is a concern but regularly superseded by production priorities.
 - D) The scheme design is with a layout unaffected by any possible light impact from the Kit Chee compound. The next phase of On Muk Street will not take place until the Kit Chee compound is satisfactorily re-provisioned.
 - E) On the question of the provision of open space, we note that Sha Tin New Town has a provision far in excess of that required under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. The excess is further complimented by the Penfold Park which is zoned "OU" and sports ground opportunities available at the Hong Kong Sports Institute zoned "GI/C". The subject site is also unsuited for sports ground development.

15. “Among all livelihood issues, the housing problem is the most challenging, formidable and complex. This is also the very issue that our people most earnestly look to the current-term Government to resolve with innovative solutions in a resolute manner. The current shortage in housing supply and surging property prices have resulted from both external and internal factors. The current-term Government is determined to rectify the situation with the greatest effort.” The forging statement on housing of the CE in her maiden policy address (Policy Address, 11 October 2017) is loud and clear on her determination to eradicate housing shortage. On the strength of this commitment, it can be said that, on planning terms, there is a presumption for public housing development. When there is no overwhelming reasons not to allow the PRH/SSF developments to proceed, particularly in the case of On Muk Street where all development impacts have been found to be acceptable, public housing development should be allowed priority.

Above representation is made by Mr MY WAN and Dr LAU Kwok Yu.



Mr MY WAN



Dr LAU Kwok Yu.

2 November 2017

20萬「焗住」的基層市民打開
家門,邀請你在營役打拼的途中
停下腳步,一同反思人的尊嚴
與社會公義。By opening-up their
hot, stuffy homes, 200,000 grassroots people
invite you to think again about human dignity
and social justice.

焗住
TRAPPED



Photography by Benny Lam



SOJOURNING
AS TEMPURA



寄件者: SoCO [REDACTED]
 寄件日期: 02日11月2017年星期四 13:42
 收件者: tpbpd@pland.gov.hk
 副本: LUI Angela; Sze Lai Shan; Chui Jennie; Gordon Chick; [REDACTED]
 主旨: 反對石門安睦街成休憩用地, 要求興建公營房屋
 附件: 20171102香港社區組織協會石門安睦街項目意見書.pdf

TPB/R/S/ST/33-F3

香港社區組織協會 基層房屋關注組
 就《沙田分區計劃大綱草圖編號 R/S/ST/33-A1》
 石門安睦街項目致城規會意見書


本會對於城規會於 2017 年 9 月 22 日會議上決定將沙田石門安睦街項目由「住宅(甲類)」重新改為「休憩用地」表示極度反對、遺憾及抗議，並來函強烈要求各委員考慮到本港房屋問題險峻，公營房屋的土地供應短缺、基層市民有迫切房屋需要，重新考慮上述改劃項目。

本港約有 20 萬人居於籠屋、板間房、劏房等不適切居所。他們的居住環境惡劣、處所有安全隱患，每年面對加租甚或迫遷的威脅。他們縱然已申請公屋，但上樓遙遙無期。截至 2017 年 6 月，政府公佈一般申請者的平均輪候時間再創新高，達 4.7 年。而當中長者一人申請者的輪候時間亦增至 2.6 年，但不少家庭要輪候十年八年。而以上的數字仍未包括輪候冊上超過 120 000 名非長者單身人士，他們更要輪候幾十年。在現時配額及計分制下，非長者單身人士動輒輪候逾十年，上樓機會渺茫。而本會於前線接觸到許多三、四人家家庭的公屋申請者已輪候超過六年仍未獲得首次編配，可見基層家庭的住屋需求殷切，政府急需增建公屋。可是，於《長遠房屋策略》2016 年周年進度報告中，政府已坦言，即使假設截至目前為止所有覓得的土地能如期順利推出作建屋之用，政府只覓得在 2017-18 至 2026-27 年度十年期興建約 236 000 個公營房屋單位的土地，跟十年供應 280 000 的目標仍有 44 000 個單位的落差。

在現時土地短缺的情況下，實急需社會各界及不同政府部門的協力方可解決困境。針對石門安睦街項目，規劃署已多次重申其改劃成公營房屋項目的可行性，沙田亦是全世界最多休憩地的地區，根本不急此休憩地，惟最後各委員以未能確定毗鄰該地盤的賽馬會傑志中心用地的長遠土地用途，綑綁式反對將第一期發展計劃地盤由「休憩用地」改劃為「住宅(甲類)6」地帶，實為不智，此決定亦非市民之福，妄顧 20 萬生活在水深火熱中的籠屋、板房及劏房貧民的困境，實在很不公義的決定，所以本會強烈要求各委員體恤基層居民的困境，以解決本港嚴峻的房屋問題作出發點，支持將安睦街第一期發展計劃地盤改建作「住宅(甲類)」的方案，興建公營房屋，裨益基層大眾。

聯絡: [REDACTED]
 傳真: [REDACTED]

2017 年 11 月 2 日



香港社區組織協會 基層房屋關注組
就《沙田分區計劃大綱草圖編號 R/S/ST/33-A1》
石門安睦街項目致城規會意見書

本會對於城規會於 2017 年 9 月 22 日會議上決定將沙田石門安睦街項目由「住宅(甲類)」重新改為「休憩用地」表示極度反對、遺憾及抗議，並來函強烈要求各委員考慮到本港房屋問題險峻，公營房屋的土地供應短缺、基層市民有迫切房屋需要，重新考慮上述改劃項目。

本港約有 20 萬人居於籠屋、板間房、劏房等不適切居所。他們的居住環境惡劣、處所有安全隱患，每年面對加租甚或迫遷的威脅。他們縱然已申請公屋，但上樓遙遙無期。截至 2017 年 6 月，政府公佈一般申請者的平均輪候時間再創新高，達 4.7 年。而當中長者一人申請者的輪候時間亦增至 2.6 年，但不少家庭要輪候十年八年。而以上的數字仍未包括輪候冊上超過 120 000 名非長者單身人士，他們更要輪候幾十年。在現時配額及計分制下，非長者單身人士動輒輪候逾十年，上樓機會渺茫。而本會於前線接觸到許多三、四人家家庭的公屋申請者已輪候超過六年仍未獲得首次編配，可見基層家庭的住屋需求殷切，政府急需增建公屋。可是，於《長遠房屋策略》2016 年周年進度報告中，政府已坦言，即使假設截至目前為止所有覓得的土地能如期順利推出作建屋之用，政府只覓得在 2017-18 至 2026-27 年度十年期興建約 236 000 個公營房屋單位的土地，跟十年供應 280 000 的目標仍有 44 000 個單位的落差。

在現時土地短缺的情況下，實急需社會各界及不同政府部門的協力方可解決困境。針對石門安睦街項目，規劃署已多次重申其改劃成公營房屋項目的可行性，沙田亦是全世界最多休憩地的地區，根本不急此休憩地，惟最後各委員以未能確定毗鄰該地盤的賽馬會傑志中心用地的長遠土地用途，網綁式反對將第一期發展計劃地盤由「休憩用地」改劃為「住宅(甲類)6」地帶，實為不智，此決定亦非市民之福，妄顧 20 萬生活在水深火熱中的籠屋、板房及劏房貧民的困境，實在很不公義的決定，所以本會強烈要求各委員體恤基層居民的困境，以解決本港嚴峻的房屋問題作出發點，支持將安睦街第一期發展計劃地盤改建作「住宅(甲類)」的方案，興建公營房屋，裨益基層大眾。

聯絡:
傳真:

2017 年 11 月 2 日



TPB/R/S/ST/33-F79

就草圖的建議修訂作出進一步申述

Further Representation In Respect of Proposed Amendments to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

171102-132507-06580

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

03/11/2017

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

02/11/2017 13:25:07

提出此宗進一步申述的人士

Person Making This Further Representation:

先生 Mr. 徐志明

與進一步申述相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the further representation relates:

S/ST/33

進一步申述詳情

Details of the Further Representation :

相關的建議修訂 Related Proposed Amendments	性質 Nature	理由 Reasons
R/S/ST/33-A1	反對 Oppose	<p>本人現已59歲，與妻子及兩女租住天台劏房多年，等候公屋十多年，對於城規會於2017年9月22日會議上決定將沙田石門安睦街項目由「住宅(甲類)」重新改為「休憩用地」表示極度反對、遺憾及抗議，強烈要求各委員考慮到本港房屋問題險峻，公營房屋的土地供應短缺、基層市民有迫切房屋需要，重新考慮上述改劃項目。</p> <p>本港約有20萬人居於籠屋、板間房、劏房等不適切居所。我便是其中一員，我的居住環境惡劣，每年面對加租甚或迫遷的威脅。縱然已申請公屋，但上樓遙遙無期。截至2017年6月，政府公佈一般申請者的平均輪候時間再創新高，達4.7年。而當中長者一人申請者的輪候時間亦增至2.6年，但不少家庭要輪候十年八年。而以上的數字仍未包括輪候冊上超過120 000名非長者單身人士，更要輪候幾十年。在現時配額及計分制下，非長者單身人士動輒輪候逾十年，上樓機會渺茫。</p> <p>在現時土地短缺的情況下，實急需社會各界及不同政府部門的協力方可解</p>

決困境。針對石門安睦街項目，規劃署已多次重申其改劃成公營房屋項目的可行性，惟最後各委員以未能確定毗鄰該地盤的賽馬會傑志中心用地的長遠土地用途，綑綁式反對將第一期發展計劃地盤由『休憩用地』改劃為『住宅（甲類）6』地帶，實為不智，此決定亦非市民之福，妄顧我等20萬生活在水深火熱中的籠屋、板房及劏房貧民的困境，實在很不公義的決定，本人強烈要求各委員體恤我等貧民的困境，大家可知道我們生活得多痛苦，懇請以解決本港嚴峻的房屋問題作出發點，支持將安睦街第一期發展計劃地盤改建作「住宅(甲類)」的方案，興建公營房屋，裨益基層大眾。

TPB/R/S/ST/33-F81

就草圖的建議修訂作出進一步申述

Further Representation In Respect of Proposed Amendments to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

171102-133714-12446

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

03/11/2017

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

02/11/2017 13:37:14

提出此宗進一步申述的人士

Person Making This Further Representation:

先生 Mr. 梁耀偉

與進一步申述相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the further representation relates:

S/ST/33

進一步申述詳情

Details of the Further Representation :

相關的建議修訂 Related Proposed Amendments	性質 Nature	理由 Reasons
R/S/ST/33-A1	反對 Oppose	<p>本人與妻子及兩個年幼兒子，蝸居劏房多年，等候公屋六年，對於城規會於2017年9月22日會議上決定將沙田石門安睦街項目由「住宅(甲類)」重新改為「休憩用地」表示極度反對、遺憾及抗議，強烈要求各委員考慮到本港房屋問題險峻，公營房屋的土地供應短缺、基層市民有迫切房屋需要，重新考慮上述改劃項目。</p> <p>本港約有20萬人居於籠屋、板間房、劏房等不適切居所。我便是其中一員，我的居住環境惡劣，每年面對加租甚或迫遷的威脅。縱然已申請公屋，但上樓遙遙無期。截至2017年6月，政府公佈一般申請者的平均輪候時間再創新高，達4.7年。而當中長者一人申請者的輪候時間亦增至2.6年，但不少家庭要輪候十年八年。而以上的數字仍未包括輪候冊上超過120 000名非長者單身人士，更要輪候幾十年。在現時配額及計分制下，非長者單身人士動輒輪候逾十年，上樓機會渺茫。</p> <p>在現時土地短缺的情況下，實急需社會各界及不同政府部門的協力方可解決困境。針對石門安睦街項目，規劃</p>

署已多次重申其改劃成公營房屋項目的可行性，沙田亦是全世界最多休憩地的地區，根本不急此休憩地，惟最後各委員以未能確定毗鄰該地盤的賽馬會傑志中心用地的長遠土地用途，綑綁式反對將第一期發展計劃地盤由『休憩用地』改劃為『住宅（甲類）6』地帶，實為不智，此決定亦非市民之福，妄顧我等20萬生活在水深火熱中的籠屋、板房及劏房貧民的困境，實在很不公義的決定，本人強烈要求各委員體恤我等貧民的困境，懇請以解決本港嚴峻的房屋問題作出發點，支持將安睦街第一期發展計劃地盤改建作「住宅(甲類)」的方案，興建公營房屋，裨益基層大眾。

TPB/R/S/ST/33-F103

就草圖的建議修訂作出進一步申述

Further Representation In Respect of Proposed Amendments to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

171103-144229-36505

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

03/11/2017

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

03/11/2017 14:42:29

提出此宗進一步申述的人士

Person Making This Further Representation:

女士 Ms. 馮錦煥

與進一步申述相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the further representation relates: S/ST/33

進一步申述詳情

Details of the Further Representation :

相關的建議修訂 Related Proposed Amendments	性質 Nature	理由 Reasons
R/S/ST/33-A1	反對 Oppose	<p>本人對於城規會於2017年9月22日會議上決定將沙田石門安睦街項目由「住宅(甲類)」重新改為「休憩用地」表示極度反對、遺憾及抗議，並來函強烈要求各委員考慮到本港房屋問題險峻，公營房屋的土地供應短缺、基層市民有迫切房屋需要，重新考慮上述改劃項目。</p> <p>本港約有20萬人居於籠屋、板間房、劏房等不適切居所。我便是其中一員，我的居住環境惡劣，每年面對加租甚或迫遷的威脅。縱然已申請公屋，但上樓遙遙無期。截至2017年6月，政府公佈一般申請者的平均輪候時間再創新高，達4.7年。而當中長者一人申請者的輪候時間亦增至2.6年，但不少家庭要輪候十年八年。而以上的數字仍未包括輪候冊上超過120 000名非長者單身人士，更要輪候幾十年。在現時配額及計分制下，非長者單身人士動輒輪候逾十年，上樓機會渺茫。可見基層家庭的住屋需求殷切，政府急需增建公屋。可是，於《長遠房屋策略》2016年周年進度報告中，政府已坦言，即使假設截至目前為止所有覓得的土地能如期順利推出作建屋之用，政府只覓得在 2017-18 至 202</p>

6-27 年度十年期興建約236 000個公營房屋單位的土地，跟十年供應280 000的目標仍有44 000個單位的落差。

在現時土地短缺的情況下，實急需社會各界及不同政府部門的協力方可解決困境。針對石門安睦街項目，規劃署已多次重申其改劃成公營房屋項目的可行性，沙田亦是全世界最多休憩地的地區，根本不急此休憩地，惟最後各委員以未能確定毗鄰該地盤的賽馬會傑志中心用地的長遠土地用途，網綁式反對將第一期發展計劃地盤由『休憩用地』改劃為『住宅（甲類）6』地帶，實為不智，此決定亦非市民之福，妄顧我等20萬生活在水深火熱中的籠屋、板房及劏房貧民的困境，實在很不公義的決定，本人強烈要求各委員體恤我等貧民的困境，以解決本港嚴峻的房屋問題作出發點，支持將安睦街第一期發展計劃地盤改建作「住宅(甲類)」的方案，興建公營房屋，裨益基層大眾。

**List of Further Representers in respect of the
Proposed Amendment to the Draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/ST/33**

Further Representation No.	Name of Further Representer
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F1	林雲峯教授 (香港房屋委員會建築小組委員會主席) Prof. Bernard Vincent LIM Wan Fung (Chairman, Building Committee of the Hong Kong Housing Authority)
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F2	溫文儀先生及劉國裕博士 (香港房屋委員會委員) Mr. WAN Man-ye & Dr. LAI Kwok-yu (Members of the Hong Kong Housing Authority)
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F3	香港社區組織會 Society for Community Organization
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F4	基層房屋關注組
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F5	新移民互助會
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F6	Sze Lai Shan
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F7	張莉園
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F8	陳換仙
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F9	梁有金
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F10	譚潔媛
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F11	黃輝蓮
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F12	黃彩文
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F13	Lilian
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F14	尚金花
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F15	吳瑞錫
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F16	李誠
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F17	李誠
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F18	陳有嫦
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F19	陳文強
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F20	陳文妮
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F21	陳莉雲 Chan Li Wan
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F22	鄒七妹
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F23	周佩潔

Further Representation No.	Name of Further Representer
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F24	周嘉華
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F25	張月明
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F26	鄭志惠
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F27	朱效君
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F28	官紅波
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F29	關美惠
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F30	關凌昆
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F31	劉健軍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F32	劉晚金
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F33	劉秀蓮
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F34	劉佩萍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F35	劉月嬌
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F36	黎慧娟
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F37	廖敏清
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F38	林淑嬋
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F39	羅艾青
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F40	羅月芝
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F41	凌曉蘭
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F42	李能
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F43	李文香
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F44	李連多
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F45	李國超
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F46	梁麗
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F47	梁少梅
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F48	梁洪月
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F49	梁士紳
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F50	梁鳳環
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F51	夏麗梅
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F52	孟桂齊

Further Representation No.	Name of Further Representer
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F53	孟凡軍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F54	魏裔珍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F55	關淑霞
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F56	彭潔
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F57	譚雪梅
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F58	鄧愛霞
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F59	謝瓊玲
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F60	胡上仁
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F61	孫金梅
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F62	黃明鳳
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F63	黃小群
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F64	黃五梅
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F65	黃貴素
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F66	黃雅娜
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F67	王丹
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F68	胡惠蘭
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F69	胡葉萍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F70	丘譚蓉
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F71	楊國慧
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F72	楊宏平
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F73	Lam Chau Ling
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F74	Leung Nga Ki
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F75	Wong Lai Sheung
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F76	黃志城
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F77	黃志城
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F78	陳至玉
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F79	徐志明
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F80	林國強
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F81	梁糧偉

Further Representation No.	Name of Further Representer
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F82	鄧杏華
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F83	司徒玉蓮
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F84	葉達基
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F85	陳媛
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F86	陳路強
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F87	陳明福
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F88	陳華珍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F89	陳榕珍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F90	陳映詩
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F91	周碧貞
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F92	張玲
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F93	張麗娟
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F94	張美利
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F95	張愛宏
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F96	張佶毅
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F97	鍾瓊英
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F98	鍾志偉
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F99	趙翠蘭
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F100	符金嬋
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F101	馮琴
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F102	馮小盈
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F103	馮錦煥
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F104	馮華春
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F105	何水金
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F106	何惠珍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F107	何瑞鵬
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F108	許慧
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F109	甘杏顏
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F110	高華苑

Further Representation No.	Name of Further Representer
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F111	高新松
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F112	江兒通
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F113	江卓琰
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F114	江舜華
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F115	劉彩萍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F116	劉惠英
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F117	黎德賢
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F118	雷佩芬
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F119	羅衛連
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F120	呂榮祥
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F121	范冰冰
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F122	李文艷
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F123	李悅英
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F124	李寶美
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F125	李燕華
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F126	李艷萍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F127	梁青
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F128	李小玲
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F129	李銀英
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F130	李曉玲
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F131	連翠珍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F132	凌連之
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F133	勞潔
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F134	盧韻雯
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F135	馬綺雯
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F136	莫水連
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F137	魏元軍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F138	蒲雅絲
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F139	蕭汝群

Further Representation No.	Name of Further Representer
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F140	舒桂青
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F141	舒靜文
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F142	蘇艷紅
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F143	施賽莉
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F144	譚潔嫦
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F145	譚婉劍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F146	談德健
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F147	鄧玉霞
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F148	鄧龍華
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F149	鄧順明
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F150	鄧淑儀
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F151	鄧滿葵
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F152	田鳳英
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F153	曾月嬋
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F154	王方菊
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F155	王小兵
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F156	王淑華
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F157	王姿懿
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F158	王桂英
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F159	黃果竹
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F160	黃翠英
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F161	黃智慧
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F162	黃麗萍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F163	黃雪雲
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F164	黃媛芳
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F165	黃澤明
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F166	嚴小容
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F167	余文靜
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F168	余少偉

Further Representation No.	Name of Further Representer
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F169	余秀玉
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F170	余運珍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F171	楊潔
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F172	楊大光
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F173	楊秀珍
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F174	楊巧瑤
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F175	阮華深
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F176	葉振芳
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F177	祝亞妮
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F178	譚田香
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F179	鄒振豪
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F180	周慧淋
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F181	林美琳
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F182	羅衛見
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F183	董穎怡
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F184	董湛洪
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F185	余惠婷
TPB/R/S/ST/33-F186	宋愛紅