



**圖例 NOTATION**

ZONES	地帶	COMMUNICATIONS	交通
COMMERCIAL	商業	RAILWAY AND STATION (ELEVATED)	鐵路及車站 (高架)
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	綜合發展區	LIGHT RAIL	輕鐵
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	住宅 (甲類)	ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY TRANSPORT SERVICES	環保運輸服務
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	住宅 (乙類)	MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION	主要道路及路口
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	住宅 (丙類)	ELEVATED ROAD	高架道路
VILLAGE TYPE DEVELOPMENT	鄉村式發展	PEDESTRIAN PRECINCT / STREET	行人專用區或街道
INDUSTRIAL	工業	MISCELLANEOUS	其他
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	政府、機構或社區	BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME	規劃範圍界線
OPEN SPACE	休憩用地	PLANNING AREA NUMBER	規劃區編號
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	其他指定用途	BUILDING HEIGHT CONTROL ZONE BOUNDARY	建築物高度管制區界線
GREEN BELT	綠化地帶	MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN METRES ABOVE PRINCIPAL DATUM)	最高建築物高度 (在主要平基準上若干米)
		MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT RESTRICTION AS STIPULATED ON THE NOTES	(《註釋》內訂明最高建築物高度限制)
		MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN NUMBER OF STOREYS)	最高建築物高度 (樓層數目)
		PETROL FILLING STATION	加油站
		AREA DESIGNATED FOR 'RIVERSIDE PROMENADE'	指定為「河畔長廊」的地區

**土地用途及面積一覽表 SCHEDULE OF USES AND AREAS**

USES	大約面積及百分比 APPROXIMATE AREA & %		用途
	公頃 HECTARES	% 百分比	
COMMERCIAL	24.12	3.41	商業
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	3.65	0.52	綜合發展區
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	69.44	9.82	住宅 (甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	16.10	2.26	住宅 (乙類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	0.40	0.06	住宅 (丙類)
VILLAGE TYPE DEVELOPMENT	118.08	16.69	鄉村式發展
INDUSTRIAL	15.07	2.13	工業
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	68.52	9.69	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	99.11	14.01	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	104.91	14.83	其他指定用途
GREEN BELT	55.92	7.90	綠化地帶
DRAINAGE CHANNEL	15.04	2.13	排水渠
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	115.06	16.25	主要道路等
<b>TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA</b>	<b>707.42</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>規劃範圍總面積</b>

夾附的《註釋》屬這份圖則的一部分  
THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN

2017年5月26日 按照城市規劃條例第5條展示的草圖  
DRAFT PLAN EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON 26 MAY 2017

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

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱圖  
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
HUNG SHUI KIU AND HA TSUEN - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN

SCALE 1:7500 比例尺

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

圖則編號 PLAN No. S/HSK/1

**元朗區議會-洪水橋新發展區工作小組會議** 會議記錄於 27.7.2017 獲得通過  
**二零一七年度第三次會議記錄**

日期：二零一七年六月十四日（星期三）

時間：下午二時三十分至下午五時二十分

地點：元朗橋樂坊二號元朗政府合署十三樓元朗區議會會議廳

<u>出席者</u>	<u>出席時間</u>	<u>離席時間</u>
召集人： 湛家雄議員, BBS, MH, JP	會議開始	會議結束
副召集人： 鄧家良議員	會議開始	會議結束
成員： 張木林議員	會議開始	會議結束
周永勤議員	會議開始	會議結束
郭 強議員, MH	下午 2:43	下午 3:42
呂 堅議員	下午 2:42	會議結束
麥業成議員	會議開始	會議結束
文炳南議員, MH	會議開始	會議結束
沈豪傑議員	下午 2:43	會議結束
姚國威議員	會議開始	下午 3:10
蕭浪鳴議員	會議開始	會議結束
鄧卓然議員	會議開始	會議結束
鄧慶業議員, BBS	會議開始	會議結束
杜嘉倫議員	會議開始	會議結束
曾樹和議員	會議開始	下午 4:35
王威信議員	下午 2:43	下午 4:10
楊家安議員	會議開始	會議結束
袁敏兒議員	會議開始	會議結束
梁明堅議員	會議開始	會議結束
趙志豪先生	會議開始	會議結束
郭時興先生	會議開始	下午 4:04
鄧作霖先生	會議開始	會議結束

秘書： 梁伊年女士 元朗民政事務處行政主任(區議會)3  
陳晞旻小姐 元朗民政事務處行政助理(區議會)3

列席者

鍾文傑先生	發展局首席助理秘書長(規劃及地政)5
黃立基先生	發展局助理秘書長(規劃)6
林智文先生	規劃署屯門及元朗西規劃專員
吳育民先生	規劃署高級城市規劃師/洪水橋新發展區
張家亮先生	土木工程拓展署總工程師/新界西 3(新界西)
李杏儀女士	土木工程拓展署高級工程師/5(新界西)
任世寧先生	地政總署首席地政主任/特別工程
吳美球先生	地政總署總地政主任/特別工程
胡栢霖先生	地政總署總(高級經理/清拆)
李自榮先生	地政總署總助理經理/清拆(三)二
李綺華女士	地政總署總高級產業測量師/西(元朗地政處)

### 缺席者

鄧鎔耀議員	(因事請假)
馬淑燕議員	(因事請假)
陳思靜議員	
李月民議員, MH	
梁福元議員	
文光明議員	
劉桂容議員	
鄧勵東議員	

\* \* \* \*

### 歡迎詞

召集人歡迎各成員及政府部門代表出席洪水橋新發展區工作小組(工作小組)二零一七年度第三次會議。

### 議程第一項：

通過元朗區議會洪水橋新發展區工作小組二零一七年度第二次會議記錄

2. 成員一致通過上述會議記錄。

### 議程第二項：

《洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱草圖》及擬議修訂相關的圖則

(洪水橋新發展區工作小組文件 2017/第 4 號)

(洪水橋新發展區工作小組文件 2017/第 5 號)

3. 召集人歡迎下列人士出席今次會議，簡介文件以及與成員進行討論：

林智文 先生	規劃署屯門及元朗西規劃專員
吳育民 先生	規劃署高級城市規劃師/洪水橋新發展區
張家亮 先生	土木工程拓展署總工程師/新界西 3 (新界西)
李杏儀 女士	土木工程拓展署高級工程師/5 (新界西)

4. 成員就程序安排發表的意見及查詢摘錄如下：

- (1) 成員反對當局在諮詢工作小組前將《洪水橋及廈村分區計劃大綱草圖》(《大綱草圖》)刊登憲報，展開有關的法定程序，有別於以往類似發展項目的諮詢程序，並要求局方解釋；
- (2) 成員表示工作小組是收集及整合不同方面意見的平台，目前把《大綱草圖》先刊登憲報後展開有關的法定程序後才向工作小組作出諮詢，令工作小組未能發揮反映居民意見的功能，不利諮詢程序及新發展區發展；
- (3) 成員對修訂《大綱草圖》的內容有保留。《大綱草圖》只顯示土地用途，當局與受影響的居民及業務經營者未就收回土地的補償安排達成共識，收回土地的方案及補償安排仍在討論階段，難以確定《大綱草圖》建議的土地用途是否符合社區要求；
- (4) 成員堅持應優先就收回土地及補償方案取得共識並諮詢廈村鄉事委員會才進一步去討論《大綱草圖》；及
- (5) 成員反映城市規劃委員會（城規會）未接納過往諮詢中居民及區議會的意見以納入《大綱草圖》，包括取消天影路的要求，而對廈村附近擬發展密度高的多層式大廈會做成屏風效應及加重屏廈路交通負荷，與及主要道路與鄉村重疊問題。

5. 就圖則的諮詢程序，規劃署代表林智文先生綜合回應如下：

- (1) 城規會已於五月二十六日依據《城市規劃條例》(下稱「條例」) 第5條，公布《洪水橋及廈村分區計劃大綱草圖編號S/HSK/1》，開展為期兩個月的法定公眾諮詢程序。任何公眾人士包括區議員，如欲對草圖提出意見，須於兩個月的展示期內，向城規會秘書處作出申述。城規會會按條例舉行聆訊，以考慮所收到就草圖提出的申述和意見。而作出申述的人士，均可出席城規會的聆訊及在聆訊上陳詞；

- (2) 根據既定的安排，規劃署會在草圖的展示期內向相關區議會介紹分區計劃大綱草圖。由於元朗區議會轄下設有專責的洪水橋新發展區工作小組，所以規劃署向工作小組介紹《洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱草圖》。署方希望成員能在會議上提出意見，以便向城規會反映，及在法定期內直接向城規會秘書處提交申述；
- (3) 當局在把草圖提交給城規會考慮及刊憲前，已在「洪水橋新發展區規劃及工程研究」的三個階段社區參與中，諮詢區議會對新發展區規劃建議的意見。

6. 委員對規劃署的回應及解釋表示不滿，經討論後，鄧家良議員提出以下動議，張木林議員、周永勤議員、梁明堅議員、文炳南議員, MH、麥業成議員、鄧卓然議員、鄧慶業議員, BBS、杜嘉倫議員、曾樹和議員、楊家安議員、袁敏兒議員、趙志豪先生、郭時興先生和鄧作霖先生和議：

7. 「強烈反對《洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱草圖編號S/HSK/1》及擬議修訂刊憲，並要求有關修訂在充份諮詢元朗區議會後才重新啟動刊憲程序，在此之前，本會堅決反對擬議之一切修訂。」

8. 召集人宣布，有19票贊成、0票反對及0票棄權，以絕對多數票通過上述動議。

9. 召集人表示，是次會議原本的專題討論是「新發展區的教育、福利、體育、文化及康樂設施及商業和住宅發展土地用途」，在5月發出會議通告後，收到有關部門的通知表示「新發展區土地收回、補償及安置安排」已有建議及文件，要求在是次會議中作出討論。因此召集人同意將9月的「新發展區土地收回、補償及安置安排」專題討論與原定今次會議的專題轉換。其後有關部門再要求加入諮詢《大綱草圖》。按以往的安排，有關部門在向區議會諮詢前，應先向有關鄉事會作出諮詢，而規劃署在6月1日已經向厦村鄉鄉事委員會作出諮詢，因此他容許在今次會議中加入有關議程。

10. 召集人總結，洪水橋新發展區工作小組在第一次會議上，為每次會議都訂立了一個專題，收集委員意見，而分區計劃大綱草圖應在最後一次會議後才商討，目的是希望工作小組為各專題都達致某程度上的共識後才討論有關分區大綱草圖的修訂。現時草圖在五月尾刊憲後，在將來會議中商討的各項議題的意見和共識能夠在草圖上反映反映的空間會難以達到，委員的意見亦會難以接納；因此預計將來在落實規劃建議及發展的過程中，會遇到不少困難和阻力。

議程第三項：

洪水橋新發展區計劃的實施安排和土地收回、安置及補償

(洪水橋新發展區工作小組文件 2017/第6號)

11. 召集人歡迎下列人士出席今次會議，簡介文件以及與成員進行討論：

鍾文傑先生	發展局首席助理秘書長(規劃及地政) 5
黃立基先生	發展局助理秘書長(規劃) 6
林智文先生	規劃署屯門及元朗西規劃專員
吳育民先生	規劃署高級城市規劃師/洪水橋新發展區
張家亮先生	土木工程拓展署總工程師/新界西 3 (新界西)
李杏儀女士	土木工程拓展署高級工程師/5 (新界西)
任世寧先生	地政總署首席地政主任/特別工程
吳美球先生	地政總署總地政主任/特別工程
胡栢霖先生	地政總署高級經理/清拆
李自榮先生	地政總署助理經理/清拆(三)二
李綺華女士	地政總署高級產業測量師/西(元朗地政處)

12. 發展局代表黃立基先生以投影片簡介洪水橋新發展區計劃的實施安排摘錄如下：

- (1) 洪水橋新發展區定位為新界西北的「區域經濟及文娛樞紐」。將來人口近22萬，就業機會15萬個。整個發展用地約441公頃，當中約324公頃為私人土地，受影響住戶約1600個，受影響棕地約190公頃，受影響工業大廈共九幢及約七公頃常耕農地；
- (2) 基於新發展區的重要性及影響範圍，會為合資格的受影響住戶提供特設的補償及安置安排，當中包括一般及特設兩部分。一般部分包括：香港房屋委員會（房委會）的公共租住房屋單位（公屋）；核准佔用人特惠津貼；收回私人農地／屋地而發放的特惠補償和其他收回及清理土地適用的一般補償及安置安排。特設部分專為洪水橋新發展區而設，包括特設安置方案、特設特惠現金津貼及放寬住戶搬遷津貼三項額外措施；
- (3) 為落實特設安置方案，政府於洪福邨周邊規劃兩幅用地預留作特設安置屋邨，大約2100個單位，首批安置單位預計於2024年左右落成。政府會邀請香港房屋協會（房協）進行此項目；

- (4) 除一般安置提供的公屋外，特設安置方案為受影響合資格住戶提供特設的安置選項，讓他們可選擇特設安置屋邨的資助出租及出售單位。政府將採用現行較房委會寬鬆的房協乙類屋邨出租單位的家庭最高入息限額及家庭總資產淨值最高限額，評估選擇特設安置屋邨出租單位的住戶的資格。而選擇資助出售單位的住戶，不需通過入息及資產審查。此項政策回應公眾對放寬入息和資產審查，及提供更多安置選項的訴求；
- (5) 受影響的合資格住戶亦可申請準則較寬鬆的特設特惠現金津貼，準則與入住房協出售單位的資格大致相同。如住戶選擇了房委會的公屋或房協的出租單位便不能享有特設特惠現金津貼。如住戶選擇了房協的出售單位，則最高可以得到五十萬的現金津貼。如住戶沒有選擇任何安置單位，最高可以得到六十萬的現金津貼。住戶搬遷津貼將惠及所有已作凍結登記及受政府清拆影響的住戶；
- (6) 政府收回所有規劃作發展的私人土地，並在市場出售。在收回土地前，容許私人土地業權人就規劃作私人發展的地區提出原址換地申請，惟他們須符合指定準則及條件。並確保佔用人獲得與政府現金補償方案相若的金錢補償；根據《洪水橋及厦村發展大綱圖》，約60公頃土地可提出原址換地申請；其餘約380公頃土地不會接受申請，大部分規劃作道路、基建、公營房屋、休憩用地、政府/機構/社區設施等用途；
- (7) 針對受清拆影響的棕地作業，政府致力改善棕地使用情況，透過探討可行並能善用土地的措施以容納棕地作業。政府已開展在多層樓宇容納棕地作業的可行性研究，並會諮詢相關持份者。有關研究預計於2018年內完成，政府已於洪水橋新發展區內預留約24公頃土地以容納棕地作業；
- (8) 對受影響農戶的安排根據為農戶提出的特殊農地復耕計劃，將優先協助他們與願意出售或出租土地作農業用途的土地業權人進行配對。根據考察，流浮山及白泥一帶有農地適合作復耕；及
- (9) 現階段計劃於2024年落成特設安置屋邨的首批單位，以進行後續工作，故此計劃需要盡快開展。工程預計最早於2019年開始，早段工程所佔土地只屬整個新發展區的一小部分，到2020年才開始收回私人土地，涉及面積亦只有約一公頃。當2024年特設安置屋邨落成後，才會進行較大規模的寮屋清拆工作。直到2024年累積收回的私人土地約36公頃，只佔整個新發展區約一成私人土地。

13. 應主席的要求，地政總署代表吳美球先生簡介為受政府發展工程影響的業務經營者而設的特惠津貼的建議安排：

- (1) 政府於2017年4月向立法會發展事務委員會提交用全港的建議，目的在於把部分在現行機制下未能符合申領特惠津貼資格的業務經營者，納入可申領特惠津貼的行列之中；
- (2) 業務經營者如在私人農地上營運最少達十年(緊接凍結登記日期前)且沒有違契情況下，其戶外或露天業務運作的地方可獲發放特惠津貼，其津貼額為每平方米390元，惟有關戶外/露天作業的最低合資格面積為20平方米及獲計算津貼額的面積上限為5 000平方米；及
- (3) 就獲地政總署發出的短期土地文書核准佔用私人農地及以短期租約佔用政府土地的業務經營者，基於短期土地文書規定，在現行機制下是不合資格申領特惠津貼。然而，現在政府建議如在緊接凍結登記日期前營運最少達十年且沒有違反有關短期土地文書條件的情況下，亦可被納入可申領特惠津貼的行列。

14. 成員就議題發表的意見及查詢摘錄如下：

- (1) 成員反映當局收回土地交由私人發展商發展的房屋售價昂貴，未能照顧一般市民的居住需要；
- (2) 成員關注調整為受政府發展清拆行動影響的業務經營者而設的特惠津貼條款後，部份條款仍待商榷，例如要求業務經營者營運十年是太長及未能令大部份經營者受惠，而完全沒有違反土地契約才能獲得津貼的條件是太嚴苛，建議當局以業務經營者在營運棕地作業，包括持有短期租約期間，作為衡量獲得津貼的基本資格；
- (3) 成員指出發展局提出針對受影響業務經營者的措施未能適切地提供幫助。建議當局應考慮原區安置被收地影響的業務經營者，及與業界商討有關補償金額及補償面積的上限；
- (4) 成員表示受影響居民由於現時租金負擔有限所以能累積一定資產，如今可能會因應發展而被收回土地，未必能夠通過入息審查從而被剝奪分配公屋的機會，對居民並不公平；而特惠津貼金額有限，即使居民可購買特設安置的居屋，仍未能紓解居民的房屋問題；
- (5) 成員查詢詳細收回土地及補償政策尤其就丁屋和寮屋的補償方案；
- (6) 成員指出區內部份土地業權人希望發展祖堂地或祖堂地現時已用作物流及工業相關用途，建議放寬換地政策範圍至商業和住宅用途以外，降低可換地面積下



限及提供相關機制讓土地業權人適當地發展或保留祖堂地；

- (7) 成員關注飼養禽畜牌照在活雞養殖場搬遷後會即時取消，促請當局設立機制容許受影響農戶另覓地點繼續經營；
- (8) 成員指出古洞北粉嶺北新發展區與洪水橋新發展區的經濟價值不同，古洞北粉嶺北新發展區的補償方案未獲當區的北區區議會接納，欠缺參考性，建議當局參考數年前興建廣深港高速鐵路(香港段)時搬遷菜園村的補償方案；及
- (9) 成員關注現時的收回土地及補償政策已沿用數十年，促請當局檢討政策是否仍合時宜，否則應予檢討以提高補償金額以高於現時最高的甲區補償額。

15. 發展局代表鍾文傑先生的綜合回應如下：

- (1) 政府在公共房屋資源的應用採取較審慎的態度。現時輪候公屋的人數較多，如全面取消受影響住戶的入息及資產審查，會對其他正在輪候公屋的市民帶來影響；
- (2) 政府明白受影響住戶對清拆後房屋問題的關注，因此發展局邀請房協而非房委會作為提供特設安置屋邨的負責機構。房協在入息及資產審查上較房委會寬鬆，而出售房屋方面更豁免審查；
- (3) 政府理解現時有老年人士居住於發展範圍內，他們或有一定積蓄以備養老。按照特設安置方案，如受影響的合資格住戶中老年人的比例佔百分之五十，入住特設安置屋邨的出租單位的資產審查會進一步放寬；
- (4) 就受政府發展工程影響業務經營者而設的特惠津貼的新建議，立法會發展事務委員會將在六月底舉行特別會議，邀請各界就特惠補償方案表達意見。發展局及地政總署代表將出席該會議，聆聽不同持份者的意見。成員可積極考慮出席該特別會議，表達意見；
- (5) 洪水橋新發展區會以一貫的原則收地補償。根據現有機制，洪水橋新發展區屬於新市鎮發展範圍，故此收地補償的級別為最高的甲區補償額；
- (6) 有成員表示政府以低價收回土地，高價賣出的關注，澄清政府在加強版新市鎮模式是擔當主導角色，除少量土地涉及原址換地外，政府會將收回的所有受影響土地進行各項基建、公共工程及其他發展。收地過程會按現有法例及程序進行，並會進行公開諮詢，最終由行政長官會同行政會議通過後才能進行收地；

- (7) 明白部分業權人士有意參與洪水橋新發展區的發展過程，因此在商業及住宅用地上有機制讓土地持有人參與，但必須符合有關的準則及條件。有成員提及希望原址換地政策放寬至涵蓋物流及工業用地，但由於物流及工業的土地發展需要配合相關決策局及部門的政策措施，因此現時並不接受物流及工業用地原址換地的要求；及
- (8) 回應成員認為政府與區內居民溝通不足問題。為了加強與受影響市民的溝通，政府已經在擬議新發展區範圍內設立社區聯絡隊以收集居民意見。同時，地政總署會製作有關補償安置方案的小冊子，讓受影響人士知悉方案的詳細內容。

16. 地政總署代表吳美球先生綜合回應如下：

- (1) 現存的新界農地大部份屬於舊批農地，其批地條款並沒有對戶外/露天活動作出規限。戶外/露天業務運作的部份如沒有違契並符合相關規定的話，業務經營者便符合資格申領特惠津貼；及
- (2) 回應成員對收地補償金額方面的問題。收地的法定補償主要是按照《土地收回條例》(第124章)及《道路(工程、使用及補償)條例》(第370章)規定而評估。另外，政府現行的新界收地補償制度亦提供了法定補償以外的土地特惠補償機制，作為業權人的另一個選擇。補償額以私人土地復歸政府當日的收回土地特惠補償率計算。如有關位置處於新市鎮發展區或與全港有關且必須的工程影響地區，根據現有機制會評定屬甲區土地特惠補償級別。收地補償率會因應土地市場價值變化而每半年檢討一次。擬議洪水橋新發展區早段工程的收回私人土地時間約於2020年左右開始，成員可參考2017年4月的甲區收地補償率：農地每平方呎1,112.40元；屋地每平方呎2,205加上屋地的評估市值。

17. 地政總署代表胡栢霖先生綜合回應如下：

- (1) 今年4月18日地政總署於洪水橋新發展區的相關發展大綱圖所涵蓋的發展地區進行清拆前凍結登記。根據現行全港適用的特惠津貼及安置安排，所有經清拆前凍結登記並受清拆影響的住戶，其佔用的構築物若屬持牌住用或經1982年寮屋登記作居住用途的構築物，他們須在緊接清拆前凍結登記前已在該構築物居住至少滿兩年及於接近清拆前仍在受清拆影響的構築物居住，並符合入住房委會公屋的相關資格，便可獲安排入住公屋；及
- (2) 有關從事商業經營，如在政府清拆前登記時已於1982年寮屋登記或1982年前發

出牌照登記其從事業務，可符合資格獲發這類特惠津貼。不過，若這等構築物的牌照在1982年6月1日後發出，但有關構築物的牌照是源自1982年前發出的牌照，而該牌照的條件沒有實質改動，他們可合資格獲發這類特惠津貼。特惠津貼的金額會根據業務種類和受影響構築物的面積而有所不同。構築物面積會按照1982年登記或清拆前登記的記錄計算，以較小者為準。

18. 召集人總結，局方應重新檢討收回新界農地不合時宜的補償方案，例如會否因應發展新市鎮另外增設補償級數。根據政府提供資料，擬議洪水橋新發展區內只有300多個經營者，政府應提出有共識的及實際的方案。棕地營運補償政策上有不少地方不設實際，未能對對現有經營者有幫助，需要作出修訂，其中要重新研究的包括需要連續滿10年經營期及沒有違反土地契約的限制等，希望當局方聽取區議會的意見及在立法會聽證會聆聽業界意見後，再提出妥善的方案。在住戶拆遷問題上，應考慮取消入息及資產審查以分配公屋，合理地補償受發展影響的1600個住戶。由於發展計劃是要求1,600住戶遷出居所而讓出土地供發展61,000個住宅單位及其他用途，所以政府應考慮對受影響的住戶作出更寬鬆的處理，讓現時受影響的1,600戶居民樂意遷出，令發展計劃能順利進行。

#### 議程第四項：其他事項

19. 議事完畢，會議於下午五時二十分結束。

元朗區議會秘書處  
二零一七年六月

元朗區議會  
元朗橋樂坊 2 號  
元朗政府合署十三樓



**Annex IIb 附錄IIb**  
**of TPB Paper No. 10378**  
**城市規劃委員會文件第10378號**  
**YUEN LONG DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
13/F., Yuen Long Government Offices,  
No. 2, Kiu Lok Square,  
Yuen Long, N.T.

檔號： HAD YLDC 13/35/37

電話： 3426 2732

傳真： 2478 7334

傳真文件（共 9 頁）  
（傳真號碼： 2877 0245）

城市規劃委員會主席  
甯漢豪女士, JP

甯主席：

元朗區議會城鄉規劃及發展委員會  
洪水橋新發展區工作小組  
綜合報告

元朗區議會城鄉規劃及發展委員會轄下的洪水橋新發展區工作小組（工作小組）於二零一六及二零一七年召開的六次會議上，分別就四個不同專題作出詳細討論和表達意見，並與相關規劃及工程部門跟進洪水橋新發展區的規劃事宜。工作小組於六次會議中表達的意見已整理為綜合報告(見附件)，以作為規劃洪水橋新發展區的參考。

請閣下在有關規劃《洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱草圖》的聆訊中，向各城市規劃委員會委員表達相關意見，並作出考慮及加以接納。如有任何查詢，請致電 3426 2732 與本工作小組秘書陳晞旻女士聯絡。

洪水橋新發展區工作小組召集人 湛家雄

副本送

元朗民政事務處元朗民政事務助理專員（一）

元朗民政事務處高級聯絡主任（鄉郊）

洪水橋新發展區工作小組成員

二零一七年十一月十五日

元朗區議會城鄉規劃及發展委員會  
洪水橋新發展區工作小組  
綜合報告

背景

1. 元朗區議會於二零一六年十月二十五日召開二零一六年度第七次會議，規劃署及土木工程拓展署的代表向議員介紹洪水橋新發展區經修訂的建議發展大綱圖。元朗區議會對洪水橋新發展區計劃的細節，包括對元朗區交通帶來的重大影響、現階段提出安置棕地作業的方案不切合棕地作業者的實際運作需要、住宅發展密度過高等表示關注，並交由城鄉規劃及發展委員會成立工作小組，與相關部門進一步討論發展計劃的細節。城鄉規劃及發展委員會於二零一六年十一月十六日召開二零一六年度第六次會議，通過成立「洪水橋新發展區工作小組」，跟進有關洪水橋新發展區的規劃及發展事宜。

2. 元朗區議會洪水橋新發展區工作小組共有二十九名成員。工作小組在二零一六年十二月十四日的第一次會議上同意以專題形式進行討論，並設定四個專題，包括(1)「新發展區土地收回、補償及安置的安排」、(2)「企業和科技園、物流設施、工業區、港口後勤、貯物及工場的土地用途和設計；新發展區的可持續發展及藍綠網絡設計」、(3)「新發展區的交通運輸基建系統設計」及(4)「新發展區的教育、福利、體育、文化及康樂設施、商業及住宅發展土地用途」，分別於五次會議討論。

3. 工作小組的意見綜合如下：

## 《洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱草圖》及擬議修訂相關的圖則

4. 工作小組反對及不滿當局在諮詢工作小組前將《洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱草圖》（《大綱草圖》）刊登憲報，展開有關的法定程序，有別於過往類似發展項目的諮詢程序，要求部門解釋；並表示工作小組是收集及整合不同意見的平台，現時政府把《大綱草圖》刊登憲報展開有關的法定程序後才諮詢工作小組，令工作小組未能發揮反映居民意見的功能，亦未能吸納及考慮工作小組在其後專題會議中提出的意見。同時，城市規劃委員會（城規會）沒有把過往在諮詢中居民及區議會提出的意見納入《大綱草圖》，包括反對取消天影路、主要道路與鄉村重疊問題及反對厦村與天水圍中間的土地擬發展高密度的多層式大廈等，避免造成屏風效應及加重屏廈路的交通負荷。

5. 工作小組通過以下動議：

「強烈反對《洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱草圖編號S/HSK/1》及擬議修訂刊憲，並要求有關修訂在充份諮詢元朗區議會後才重新啟動刊憲程序，在此之前，本會堅決反對擬議之一切修訂。」

6. 工作小組表示在第一次會議上已經為每次會議訂立一個專題以收集意見，而分區計劃大綱草圖應在最後一次專題會議後才商討，目的是希望工作小組在各專題都作詳細諮詢及討論，盡可能達致某程度的共識後才討論有關《大綱草圖》的修訂。

7. 現時《大綱草圖》於工作小組二零一七年度第三次會議前，即二零一七年五月尾已經刊登憲報。在餘下三次會議中，工作小組就各專題所提出的意見能夠在《大綱草圖》上反映的空間相對狹窄，較難達成共識。因此，預計將來在落實規劃建議及發展的過程中，政府會遇到不少困難和阻

力。

## 新發展區土地收回、補償及安置的安排

8. 工作小組指出，為受政府發展影響的業務經營者而設的特惠津貼條款在調整後，部分條款仍待商榷。例如，要求業務經營者需要營運十年才可獲得津貼並不合理，時間過長令大部分經營者未能受惠。另外，要完全沒有違反土地契約才能獲得津貼的條件嚴苛，建議當局以業務經營者在營運棕地作業包括持有短期租約的時間，作為衡量獲得津貼的基本資格。工作小組更指出發展局提出針對受影響業務經營者而訂立的措施未能適切地提供幫助，建議當局應考慮原區安置被收回土地影響的業務經營者，及與業界商討有關補償金額及補償面積的上限。

9. 工作小組關注受影響的寮屋及牌照屋居民的搬遷安排，擔心部分居民未能符合入住公共租住房屋（公屋）的資格，亦無能力購買居者有其屋計劃的樓宇（居屋）。認為由於現時受影響居民的租金負擔能力有限，他們亦累積一定資產，如因發展而被收回土地，未必能夠通過入息審查，從而被剝奪獲分配公共房屋的機會，對他們並不公平。而特惠津貼金額有限，即使居民可購買特設安置的居屋，仍未能解決居民的住屋問題。同時，工作小組擔心收回涉及鄉村祖堂的土地，故建議擴展鄉村用途地帶的範圍。

10. 總結而言，在新發展區的土地收回、補償及安置的安排上，工作小組要求政府應重新檢討收回新界農地不合時宜的補償方案，例如因應發展新市鎮另外增設補償級數。根據政府的資料，擬議洪水橋新發展區內只有 300 多個棕地作業經營者，政府應提出有共識及實際的方案。棕地營運補償政策上有不少地方不設實際，未能幫助現有經營者，需要作出修訂，和重新研究的包括需要連續滿 10 年經營期及沒有

違反土地契約的限制等，希望政府在聽取區議會的意見及在立法會聽證會聆聽業界的意見後，再提出妥善的方案。在住戶拆遷問題上，應考慮取消入息及資產審查以分配公屋，合理地補償受發展影響的 1 600 個住戶。由於發展計劃是要求 1 600 住戶遷出居所而騰出土地供發展 61 000 個住宅單位及其他用途，所以政府應考慮對受影響住戶作出更寬鬆的處理，讓現時受影響的 1 600 戶居民樂意遷出，令發展計劃能順利進行。

### 企業和科技園、物流設施、工業區、港口後勤、貯物及工場的土地用途和設計；新發展區的可持續發展及藍綠網絡設計

11. 工作小組擔心多層樓宇的收費高，增加業界營運成本，促請當局進行規劃時考慮營運需要，保障中小型企業的競爭力，避免壟斷並協助業界轉型以配合發展方向。另外，新界棕地作業的投資及經營成本較低，符合市場需要。多層樓宇卻會增加經營者負擔，建議重發牌照讓有意者另覓土地繼續經營。同時，工作小組促請當局活化天水圍的明渠及改善河道的水質。

12. 整體而言，工作小組促請部門考慮原區安置物流業的訴求。

### 新發展區的交通運輸基建系統設計

13. 工作小組反對取消天影路。洪水橋新發展區的居民最快可於 2024 年入伙，但環保運輸系統於 2019 年才完成研究。環保運輸系統是一個對內的交通系統。然而，現時天影路是天水圍、流浮山及厦村對外的主要道路，具有分散車輛流量的作用，亦是天水圍北連接高速公路最便捷的路線。在部門提出完整的方案以替代天影路的交通措施前，貿然取消



天影路並不妥當，難以得到區議會的支持。如天影路必須改建為環保運輸走廊，政府應積極考慮興建地下道路替代天影路，既保持天影路的功能，同時亦可美化天水圍南的環境。地下隧道可建於天影路或屏廈路，以確保天水圍的交通不會因洪水橋的發展而受到負面影響。

14. 取消天影路亦會加重周圍連接高速公路的道路的負擔，包括朗天路及唐人新村交匯處，如部門不解決現時的問題，不但未能滿足天水圍居民的乘車需要，更會加重交匯處的交通負荷，因此工作小組不支持現時部門提出的發展方案。

15. 工作小組亦認為以西鐵作為公共運輸的骨幹並不足夠。洪水橋新發展區的人口為 218 000 人，加上未來元朗南及錦田南兩個新發展區約 20 萬人口，即使西鐵全面增至八卡車廂及加密班次仍會不勝負荷。在港珠澳大橋通車後，新界西北部的乘客量及交通流量會進一步上升，政府應評估西鐵未來的負荷能力。工作小組認為過於依賴西鐵並不可行，必需興建新的鐵路才能解決未來洪水橋甚至整個新界西北對外交通問題。並強調政府承諾興建十一號幹線及新的鐵路網絡，是獲得區議會支持洪水橋新發展區發展方案的其中一個條件。同時，工作小組建議新的鐵路網絡以天水圍北為起點，途經天水圍南及洪水橋新發展區，接駁新界西北及市區，分流來往市區的市民，以減輕西鐵的負擔。

16. 工作小組對擴闊屏廈路的成效有所保留，屏廈路目前已不勝應付附近地區的需要。政府提出以屏廈路替代天影路的方案，卻把天影路的車流量加諸屏廈路上，加上新增人口引致的交通流量，由於屏廈路容量不變，交通擠塞不能避免。在道路上增設交匯處會影響交通流量，若廈村居民要到元朗、屏山及天水圍西鐵站一帶，需先北行往流浮山方向，再經交匯處南行折返天水圍市中心，路程迂迴，十分不便。

17. 總結而言，在洪水橋新發展區的交通運輸基建系統設計上，工作小組普遍不滿規劃署及土木工程拓展署在洪水橋新發展區的整體交通規劃。目前仍有多個相關研究處於未完成或未開展的階段，例如十一號幹線的研究、多層樓宇容納棕地作業的可行性研究及環保運輸系統的研究。部門應在相關研究完成及訂立確實方案後，才訂立《大綱草圖》。現時《大綱草圖》已呈交城規會，在交通或其他方面可修改的空間相對較少。另外，西鐵現時已處於飽和階段，土木工程拓展署表示將於洪水橋新發展區落成後每小時增加八班車，即使可消化洪水橋新發展區新增的人口，亦不能消化元朗南或錦田南因發展帶來接近二十萬的新增人口，以及其他個別規劃如丹桂村及朗邊的公屋、橫洲公屋發展、東頭工業邨新住宅等項目的新增人口。因此，現時西鐵的載客量絕不足以應付整個元朗區的人口。新的鐵路及十一號幹線是未來元朗區交通發展的必要配套。再者，工作小組不同意取消天影路，因為部門所提交的方案及回應未能釋除工作小組的疑慮，特別是屏廈路的汽車流量增加及多盞交通燈使行車時間延長，為天水圍居民帶來不便。除了交通問題，噪音問題對鄉村的影響十分大。部門可能擔心如果不取消天影路，車輛流量會影響環境評估的評級，令河畔發展區的房屋供應減少。但政府在落實道路系統的詳細設計時，須考慮天水圍和厦村居民的訴求，以及積極考慮保留天影路。

### 新發展區的教育、福利、體育、文化及康樂設施、商業及住宅發展土地用途

18. 工作小組對洪水橋新發展區未能提供圖書館、泳池及劇院等康文設施表示不滿，缺乏有關設施是違反新發展區的定位及主題 - 『區域經濟及文娛樞紐』。《香港規劃標準及準則》指出，每 20 萬人口應設一間分區圖書館，洪水橋新發展區預計人口約 218 000，理應設置一個圖書館，但現時部門卻未有此規劃，令工作小組不滿。《香港規劃標準及

準則》亦指出每 287 000 人可建一個標準游泳池場館，雖然洪水橋新發展區的預計人口不足 28 萬，然而加上相鄰天水圍的 32 萬人口，居住人口接近 60 萬，足以達到香港規劃標準的要求，故此部門應在新發展區內規劃標準游泳池場館。工作小組強烈要求康樂及文化事務署以及規劃署認真檢討是次規劃內容。假如洪水橋新發展區的基本設施不足，區內居民須使用鄰近地區的設施，增加附近地區的負擔，特別是已飽和的天水圍及元朗市區，變相剝奪天水圍及元朗市區居民享用設施的機會。

19. 工作小組認為當局規劃於洪水橋新發展區設置的安老設施並不足夠，區議員曾向勞工及福利局局長羅致光先生，**GBS, JP** 反映洪水橋新發展區需要規劃一定數量的安老設施，而局長亦回應會預留土地興建設施以解決元朗區內安老設施不足的問題。工作小組亦認為市民對國際學校及私家醫院有一定的需求，要求在洪水橋新發展區內增設有關設施，並要求規劃中的專上院校應與大學的規模相若。

20. 工作小組反對天水圍與厦村之間住宅用地的地積比率過高，造成屏風效應。並認為合適的地積比率應在五倍以下，與天水圍相若。

21. 工作小組認為洪水橋新發展區處於香港和內地的策略性位置，加上商業面積達 200 萬平方米。故建議政策上政制及內地事務局及發展局可互相協調，令洪水橋新發展區成為香港與內地的主要門廊，以配合粵港澳大灣區的發展。有關意見亦已經在政制及內地事務局局長聶德權先生，**JP** 與元朗區議會議員會面時作出反映。

22. 總括而言，工作小組在二零一七年內舉行五次會議，亦針對現時的規劃表達不少意見，即使有些意見未必能在規劃階段落實，但部門應加以研究，慎重考慮工作小組的建議。工作小組預計如部門選擇不聽取他們及地區人士提出的意

見，當洪水橋新發展區落實推行發展需要收回土地時，政府將面對很大的阻力。

23. 政府現正進行全港棕地普查及環保運輸系統的研究，待相關部門提交文件後，工作小組將在有關研究展開或完成前召開兩次會議，分別討論因發展引致的棕地遷拆與安置問題及環保運輸系統問題，以向部門反映工作小組的意見。

元朗區議會秘書處

2017年11月

**屯門區議會第十一次會議**  
**會議記錄**

日期：2017年7月4日（星期二）

時間：上午9時30分

地點：屯門區議會會議室

<u>出席者：</u>	<u>出席時間</u>	<u>離席時間</u>
梁健文先生，BBS，MH，JP (主席)	上午 9:30	會議結束
李洪森先生，BBS，MH (副主席)	上午 9:30	下午 2:46
蘇紹成先生	上午 9:30	會議結束
古漢強先生	上午 9:47	下午 1:28
陶錫源先生，MH	上午 9:30	會議結束
江鳳儀女士	上午 9:30	會議結束
吳觀鴻先生	上午 9:43	上午 11:35
陳有海先生，BBS，MH，JP	上午 9:31	下午 3:57
黃麗嫦女士	上午 9:30	會議結束
歐志遠先生	上午 9:32	會議結束
何杏梅女士	上午 9:34	會議結束
林頌鎧先生	上午 9:31	會議結束
徐帆先生，MH	上午 9:30	會議結束
程志紅女士	上午 9:30	下午 1:28
龍瑞卿女士，MH	上午 9:30	會議結束
陳文華先生，MH	上午 9:30	會議結束
陳文偉先生	上午 9:35	會議結束
張恒輝先生	上午 9:30	會議結束
何君堯議員，JP	上午 9:30	下午 12:38
朱順雅女士	上午 9:30	會議結束
曾憲康先生	上午 9:30	會議結束
蘇嘉雯女士	上午 9:30	會議結束
甘文鋒先生	上午 9:30	下午 3:30
巫成鋒先生	上午 10:07	會議結束
葉文斌先生	上午 9:30	會議結束
楊智恒先生	上午 9:30	會議結束
甄紹南先生	上午 9:30	會議結束
譚駿賢先生	上午 9:30	會議結束
劉振輝先生(秘書)	民政事務總署屯門民政事務處高級行政主任(區議會)	

缺席者：

朱耀華先生

劉業強議員，BBS，MH，JP

應邀嘉賓：

張天祥博士	屋宇署署長
黃鳳笙女士	屋宇署署長行政助理
蔡志民先生	屋宇署高級屋宇測量師/E5
鍾文傑先生	發展局首席助理秘書長(規劃及地政)5
黃立基先生	發展局助理秘書長(規劃)6
吳育民先生	規劃署高級城市規劃師/洪水橋新發展區
李杏儀女士	土木工程拓展署高級工程師/5(新界西)
任世寧先生	地政總署首席地政主任/特別工程
吳美球先生	地政總署總地政主任/特別工程
胡栢霖先生	地政總署高級經理/清拆
左國榮先生	地政總署經理/清拆(三)
趙坤宣先生	領展資產管理有限公司高級社區關係經理
王惠芳女士	領展資產管理有限公司社區關係經理

列席者：

馮雅慧女士	民政事務總署屯門民政事務專員
陳凱庭女士	民政事務總署署理屯門民政事務助理專員(一)
古潔儀女士	民政事務總署屯門民政事務處高級聯絡主任(一)
周嘉年先生	民政事務總署屯門民政事務處高級聯絡主任(二)
劉子豐先生	土木工程拓展署署理總工程師/新界西 3
鄭國仁先生	教育局總學校發展主任(屯門)
李錦浩先生	食物環境衛生署屯門區環境衛生總監
曾淑兒女士	房屋署房屋事務經理(屯門三)
范敏成先生	香港警務處署理屯門區指揮官
蔡秀娟女士	香港警務處警民關係主任(屯門區)
黎啟泰先生	地政總署屯門地政專員
莫慶祥先生	地政總署屯門地政處行政助理(地政)
黃樹恩先生	康樂及文化事務署總康樂事務經理(新界北)
黃應鳴先生	康樂及文化事務署屯門區康樂事務經理
林智文先生	規劃署屯門及元朗西規劃專員
陳德義先生	社會福利署屯門區福利專員
許家耀先生	運輸署總運輸主任/新界西北
余芷茵女士(助理秘書)	民政事務總署屯門民政事務處一級行政主任(區議會)一

(A) 《洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱草圖》及擬議修訂相關的圖則

(B) 洪水橋新發展區計劃的實施安排

(屯門區議會文件 2017 年第 21 至 23 號)

35. 主席表示，由於討論事項 (A)「《洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱草圖》及擬議修訂相關的圖則」與 (B)「洪水橋新發展區計劃的實施安排」相關，建議把兩者合併討論。屯門區議會同意是項安排。

36. 主席接着歡迎發展局首席助理秘書長(規劃及地政)5 鍾文傑先生、發展局助理秘書長(規劃)6 黃立基先生、規劃署屯門及元朗西規劃專員林智文先生、高級城市規劃師/洪水橋新發展區吳育民先生、土木工程拓展署高級工程師/5(新界西)李杏儀女士、地政總署首席地政主任/特別工程任世寧先生、總地政主任/特別工程吳美球先生、高級經理/清拆胡栢霖先生及經理/清拆(三)左國榮先生出席是次會議。

37. 規劃署吳先生透過投影片 (附件二) 介紹新擬備的洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱草圖。

38. 發展局黃先生透過投影片 (附件三) 介紹洪水橋新發展區計劃的實施安排。

39. 陶錫源議員申報自己是陶嘉儀祖子孫，並獲主席同意可就此議題提出意見。他表示是份分區計劃大綱草圖經過數次修改，如今快將落實，故他十分關注是項計劃的發展對亦園村村民帶來的影響。他指出，政府自重提多年前被擱置的環保城計劃後，曾於 2010 年 12 月 30 日、2013 年 8 月 23 日及 2015 年 6 月 22 日諮詢屯門鄉事委員會。當局去年公布洪水橋新發展區計劃時，他亦曾多次要求政府部門關注亦園村的發展，千萬不要將該村解體。現時香港房屋協會（下稱「房協」）將發展安置項目以安排村民於 2024 年入住，然而亦園村發展逾 50 年，村內生活自給自足，村民對亦園村存有歸屬感。他期望當局可擴大已規劃遷置區的面積，並將亦園村臨時屋一併遷置在內。他亦希望局方可向新任行政長官反映其意見，妥善安排亦園村，於原村興建房屋予村民居住。

40. 有議員表示十分期待洪水橋新發展區計劃落成，但希望政府部門推動洪水橋發展的同時，應藉此機會檢視屯門、元朗及洪水橋一帶的運輸網絡，並持續發展土地（尤其是住宅用地）。除賣地用以支持商業營運，他希望當中亦可安排「港人首置上車盤」的地方，但需避免啟德地價樓價高昂的情況。此外，他希望當局可妥善安置原居民，重視他們的權益，並依法辦事，不要重蹈古洞的覆轍。

41. 有議員希望相關部門參考竹園村的例子，解決原居民遷置的問題。他認為署方的簡介十分美滿，但能否達成目標才最重要。街道規劃方面，他認為如可將青山公路伸延至元朗大馬路，才可凸顯整體規劃的成效。交通方面，他認為關鍵在於輕鐵的發展，現時輕鐵在屯門及元朗佔地很多，如能以架空形式興建輕鐵便可善用土地資源。此外，區內將來會容納數十萬居民，如路面通道仍然如此狹窄，將應付不了屆時的交通流量，故他希望局方可完善未來新市鎮的交通規劃。

42. 有議員表示洪水橋位於屯門及天水圍之間，新增人口預算達 16 萬，連同原有的居民，將來該區人口達 21 萬。她指出，是項計劃內劃有一些「政府、機構及社區」用地，計劃亦預算居民可於 2024 年開始入住該區。屯門區開展多年，很多社區設施的數目仍未符合人口標準，她不希望洪水橋將來面對同樣情況。再者，如洪水橋區沒有足夠的社區設施，該區居民便會前往屯門或天水圍。因此，她欲知悉這些「政府、機構及社區」用地內將包括哪些設施，以及有關設施的落成時間表。

43. 有議員指出，有些發展商因知悉政府發展洪水橋，便陸續買入洪水橋附近的土地，並與居民簽訂租約，讓他們可居住於原址直至政府收地，而屆時發展商亦不會作出賠償。根據局方的文件，政府將為受影響的居民作出各項賠償安排，但上述租客卻不會獲得任何賠償，或未必能獲得政府撥出的特惠津貼，故她希望政府可為這批租客作出



妥善安排，使他們不至流離失所。

44. 有議員表示自己當年亦是受遷拆影響的居民，故欣悉當局尋求房協在安置村民事宜上提供協助。整體而言，他較為擔心亦園村村民的安置問題。他指出，該村部分土地屬順風圍及鍾屋村，當中的居民由當年遷拆前的三百多戶，只剩如今十戶左右。根據計劃最新的安排，原居民的居所可獲重建，但他卻不知悉局方是否會重建上述已發展逾四、五十年的村屋，他希望局方考慮重建這些村屋。此外，他認為商業樓宇的編排恰當，使小型發展商可在此發展，而租戶及市民亦分別可在繳付租金及購買力方面作支持，故他對是項計劃表示贊同。此外，他在去年曾就洪水橋的地理位置作出查詢，由於洪水橋涉及屯門和元朗地域，故他欲知悉洪水橋將來會否以獨立區域運作，並認為相關部門應考慮是否需重新劃分有關地點的行政區。

45. 有議員表示因應時代進步，計劃由當初的無煙城計劃演變成今天的洪水橋新發展區計劃，然而她擔心交通問題。她指出，當日發展天水圍時想法亦十分美滿，但最終因街道的貫穿並不方便以致發展成效未如理想。現時以巴士貫穿天水圍的南北兩端，需時半小時，若以同樣的模式發展洪水橋，她擔心居民會面對相同情況，故她認為必須以道路的發展為主，配合完善的交通配套。此外，她亦關注村民的賠償問題，並指出當中有些長者或需將積蓄留待養老之用，因此他們的存款超過資產審查限額，她查詢當局會如何安置並幫助他們。

46. 有議員表示並不反對洪水橋新發展區計劃，但希望提出以下的查詢。交通硬件配套方面，連同洪水橋新發展區的人口計算，屯門的人口將不斷增加，他欲查詢道路或鐵路等交通配套是否能配合發展，以及政府將如何改善屯門區現時的交通情況。軟件方面，輕鐵及西鐵現時已經飽和，他關注政府如何在人口增加的同時可確保屯門的交通不受影響。此外，新發展區內新增不少物業的供應，他欲知悉這些發展機遇可如何協助港人置業。他另表示，有受影響的居民向他反映將來未能原村安置，故他查詢政府是否有既定政策可協助此類受影響的居民（如擴大一些用地以協助原村安置，或放寬資產審查以協助他們解決住屋困難）。他希望政府有劃一的準則協助這類村民。

47. 有議員認為洪水橋發展計劃是可行的，但首先要處理現有居民的問題，並支持原村安置，而提供一些物業予受影響居民購買或租住是合適的安排。他另對區內的供電系統表示關注，並希望能以隧道形式鋪設供電系統，以節省空間及減少對人類健康的影響，並希望屯門區內現有的供電系統將來陸續改以隧道形式興建。此外，他亦要求以地下形式輸送垃圾至垃圾壓縮站，以及以架空形式發展藍地與洪水橋的輕鐵。

48. 有議員表示，按照現時計劃，洪水橋新發展區的新增人口達 17 萬，將對整個新界西的交通帶來重大負荷，故認為能否做到原區就業十分重要。根據部門兩次向屯門區議會的介紹，創造就業機會方面的規劃並不具體。他指出，將來有 21,000 個職位來自特殊工業，這些職位屬高端科技及物流項目而非勞動密集的行業，他懷疑人手供應是否能達到這數目。他希望相關部門製造穩定的就業機會（如增加政府職位的比例），以避免因新增人口需前往其他地區工作而導致交通負荷過大。

49. 有議員建議署方將已規劃的遷置區面積擴大，並將亦園村臨時屋一併遷置在內。此外，他支持以架空形式興建輕鐵路軌，以及以地下形式興建供電系統。

50. 發展局鍾先生就議員的意見及查詢作出以下的綜合回應：

- ( i ) 表示洪水橋新發展區對中、長期的房屋供應十分重要，因此政府提出的方案亦希望可滿足區內的需要。政府亦會根據現有政策為合資格的居民提供一般的安置安排，並向他們提供特設安排，希望透過房協較寬鬆的人息審查，甚或免除入息及資產審查向合資格的居民提供資助出售單位。上述安排是為洪水橋新發展區計劃特設的，使合資格的居民可選擇在區內繼續生活；
- ( ii ) 指出竹園村本身是位於禁區的鄉村，當中包括原居民鄉村及非原居民鄉村，兩者因歷史緣故而並存，所以政府當日在竹園村方案中，提供認可鄉村供他們選擇入住。他會將議員有關安置村民的意見向局方反映；
- ( iii ) 指出政府現時就搬村安排有一貫政策，向一些認可鄉村就屋地等問題作出賠償，而地政總署亦會根據這些政策跟進賠償問題；
- ( iv ) 指出在大綱草圖內用地預留的規劃已經歷三次公眾諮詢，並已諮詢不同部門對「政府、機構及社區」用地的需求；
- ( v ) 理解議員就新發展區內新增 61,000 個單位後對交通需求的關注，故政府會於現時西鐵線增設洪水橋站以配合居民的需要。對外道路交通方面，政府正計劃提供策略性公路。對內交通方面，區內將設有完善的交通網絡及環保運輸服務，以貫穿新發展區及延伸至鄰近擬議發展；
- ( vi ) 指出區內新增 61,000 個單位中，超過一半為公營房屋單位，而餘下的單位則用作私營房屋發展，就此，局方會以合適的措施落實發展；以及
- ( vii ) 希望透過新發展區提供的 15 萬個職位予洪水橋及周邊地區居民原區就業的機會，並指出現時有關數字及職位種類屬初步估算。局方備悉有關提供勞動密集職位的意

見，並會研究以合適的方案跟進。

51. 屯門及元朗西規劃專員就議員的意見及查詢作出以下的綜合回應：

- ( i ) 指出署方在設計街道時，除會考慮提供舒適及方便的行人環境外，亦建議設立商店街，為街道添加活力和吸引力，以及提升地區經濟；
- ( ii ) 表示大綱草圖顯示概括的土地用途地帶的框架，署方下一步會就一些主要地點進行詳細的城市設計研究，並會參考議員所提出的相關意見；
- ( iii ) 指出新發展區將提供政府、機構及社區配套設施，其中包括中學、小學、醫院、診所、社區會堂、運動場、體育中心及圖書館等；
- ( iv ) 就新發展區的發展時間表，表示土木工程拓展署將制定詳細的時間表，分階段進行土地平整及基建工程，而各相關部門亦會配合主導政策局的帶領，適時提供相關社區設施；
- ( v ) 指出除特殊工業，區內的發展亦着重商業設施，區內的職位預算超過一半與零售及商業有關。由於整體新發展區的發展時間長遠，相關部門有需要時會就區內經濟活動的規劃作出檢視；
- ( vi ) 指出署方未有計劃在新發展區內興建新的電塔，而較早前環境局亦已就屯門區議會的相關要求作出解釋，指興建地下高壓輸電系統或會對現有使用者帶來影響，故局方當時已建議保留現有的高壓輸電系統；
- ( vii ) 指出輕鐵是現有交通運輸設施，有關改動建議須由運輸及房屋局（下稱「運房局」）考慮；以及
- ( viii ) 提醒議員可於 7 月 26 日前向城市規劃委員會（下稱「城規會」）提交申述意見，而署方亦會將是次會議收集到的意見向城規會反映。

52. 土木工程拓展署李女士就議員的意見及查詢作出以下的綜合回應：

- ( i ) 表示新發展區內將設有一條主要幹道、八條地區幹道，及多條地方道路，以提供便捷的東西及南北方向的交通網絡，而主要幹道將連接港深西部公路，方便天水圍及新發展區居民往返區外；
- ( ii ) 指出新發展區內將設有四個公共運輸交匯處，當中有三個是新建議的；以及
- ( iii ) 指出環保運輸走廊將貫穿新發展區的主要發展位置，包括商業、住宅、物流、企業和科技區及連接擬建的洪水橋站和現時的西鐵天水圍站。走廊內將預留足夠空間興建單車徑及行人道，而走廊與其他道路交疊的位置將以

不同的高低水平作為分隔。此外，署方現正進行「洪水橋新發展區與鄰近地區環保運輸服務可行性研究，當中會研究環保運輸服務與輕鐵車站的接駁，署方日後會就研究結果諮詢公眾及屯門區議會。

53. 有議員就環保運輸走廊的方案，表示當局或會以發展環保城市為地產商包裝，最終使區內的樓價變得昂貴。他認為輕鐵亦是環保的交通工具，冀署方可將輕鐵的發展納入計劃的整體發展內。

54. 有議員認為署方並沒有提供足夠數據支持其交通規劃方案，認為署方需提供資料以解釋西鐵系統將來如何可疏導由 21 萬居民及 15 萬就業人士為交通系統所帶來的負荷。此外，新發展區並未於流浮山一帶與海岸相連，這從規劃角度來說並非一個理想的安排，故欲知箇中原因。

55. 屯門及元朗西規劃專員回應表示，環保運輸服務的運作模式在現階段尚未定案，當中不會排除以軌道行駛形式發展該服務的可能，而該服務將貫穿整個新發展區，包括公營及私營房屋。此外，由於新發展區西北面近流浮山交界現時主要為鄉郊地區，如在該區大興土木或會對該區及沿后海灣海岸生態造成影響，因此署方並沒有將新發展區於流浮山一帶與海岸相連。

56. 主席感謝局方及部門代表的回應，並請他們考慮議員提出的意見。

**Summary of Representations, Comments and PlanD's Responses**  
**Draft Hung Shui Kiu and Ha Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/HSK/1**

**List 1: Summary grounds and proposals of Representations and PlanD's Response**

Major Grounds (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		PlanD's Responses
<b>(I) Representations on general issues of HSK NDA</b>		
S	<b>Supportive Representation</b> R1 and R3 support the new draft OZP to guide the implementation of HSK NDA, and R2 supports having logistics land use on the OZP and the proposed Logistics Park.	See TPB paper para. 6.8
<b>Adverse Representations and Representations Providing Views</b>		
<b><u>A – Role and Positioning of HSK NDA</u></b>		
A-G1	There is a need to clarify the role and positioning of HSK NDA in the long-term development of Hong Kong and Pearl River Delta Greater Bay Area. Also, there is doubt whether the NDA would become the “Regional Economic and Civic Hub” when compared its development area and planned population with those of other new towns (R6).	See TPB paper paras. 6.9 and 6.10
<b><u>B – Economic Development and Employment Opportunity</u></b>		
B-G1	To maximise the land utility (with ramps on each floor) and generate the highest return rate and highest profit, 4ha in size for logistic land is the most cost-effective for the Multi-Storey Building (MSB). Besides, the minimum size of the single-storey/ MSB should be not less than 1 ha. Hence, the land parcel should range from 1ha to 4ha (R2).	See TPB paper paras. 6.11 and 6.12
B-G2	There is query on the development of logistics operations, port back-up and Enterprise and Technology Park as Kong Sham Western Highway (KSWH) is the only infrastructural link between Shenzhen and Hong Kong. The possible changes in logistics and port back-up operation due to the “One Belt, One Road” initiatives of Mainland China and “Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macau Greater Bay Area” should be assessed (R6).	See TPB paper para. 6.13
B-G3	There is a need to ensure that the land reserved for “OU(Enterprise and Technology Park)” is a suitable development strategy and how to complement with Shenzhen (R6). HSK is not considered as a strategic location for Enterprise and Technology Park, noting that there are similar uses, such as Science Park, in the Territories. Hence, Enterprise and Technology Park does not necessary to be built in HSK NDA (R30).	See TPB paper para. 6.13
B-G4	The development intensity for Logistics Facilities, and Enterprise and Technology Park is unnecessary low when compared with the similar Port Back-up, Storage and Workshop uses. In relaxing the development parameters in Logistics Facilities and Enterprise and Technology Quarter, some of the land on the periphery could be released for housing and other appropriate uses (R7).	See TPB paper para. 6.15
B-G5	There are queries on the estimation of the 150,000 new employment opportunities as the employment figure in the consultancy report is inaccurate and unreliable and there is no detail on how to estimate this figure (R19, R22, R26, R29, R31 and R117).	See TPB paper para. 6.14

<b>Major Grounds</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
<b>C – Development Intensity</b>		
C-G1	Development density and building height should be optimised to better utilise land resources. In particular, taking the transit-oriented development approach, high density development should be within 500m radius from the railway stations to maximise the development potential. Also, an increase in residential PR of all residential zones and “OU” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(Mixed Use)”) zone would help to meet the continual housing need of Hong Kong ( <b>R1, R3, R7 and R108</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.19 to 6.21
<b>D – Urban Design and Land Use Issues</b>		
D-G1	<u>Pedestrian walkway network</u> The framework of the NDA is fragmented. The eastern node which would be the extension of Tin Shui Wai (TSW) new town, and the Regional Plaza in the west are separated by “V” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Logistics Facility” (“OU(Logistics Facility)”) in the middle ( <b>R6</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.28
D-G2	The pedestrian linkage within the HSK Regional Centre is not well-planned. Except for the Regional Plaza and the shopping streets, there are no further proposals for pedestrian linkages to extend to other commercial and mixed uses areas ( <b>R5</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.29
D-G3	The pedestrian walkways serve to connect the open space to the north, and that between Planning Areas 59 and 60, and the regional park and sports ground. However, it is considered excessive, diverting pedestrians to the various routes and preventing the network from achieving a sense of vibrancy ( <b>R7</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.30
D-G4	There is need for a more comprehensive pedestrian walkway network connecting TSW Locwood Court and HSK shopping street so as to create an accessible and walkable neighborhood ( <b>R118</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.31
D-G5	<u>Preservation of Existing Non-indigenous Villages</u> Non-indigenous village should not be sacrificed because of an over-provision of hotels, commercial land and private housing sites. Yuen Long and Tuen Mun is already overcrowded and there is abundant supply of commercial land in Kowloon East. The six proposed hotels in the HSK town centre are considered excessive ( <b>R15 and R16</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.34
D-G6	It is not fair to the non-indigenous villagers, given that all indigenous villages would be retained while the five non-indigenous villages have to be removed ( <b>R19, R20, R24–R27, R30 and R31</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.34
D-G7	<u>Integration with existing villages</u> There is concern on the adverse air ventilation impact on Ha Tsuen area caused by the NDA development. The surrounding highrise buildings (about 40 to 60 storeys) would affect the breezeways/wind corridors, rural landscape and ‘fung shui’ of Ha Tsuen villages. Land resumption process will result in the loss of graves for the villagers ( <b>R34</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.36
D-G8	The proposed high-density developments in Planning Area 19B to the north and west of Kiu Tau Wai with BHR of 160mPD is too close to the villages, affecting the rural landscape and environment ( <b>R84 and R85</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.36

<b>Major Grounds</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
<b><u>E – Traffic and Transportation</u></b>		
E-G1	<u>Internal road layout</u> The road network in the Regional Centre is not comprehensive and lacks subdivided roads to divert the traffic. The Regional Centre relies only on Road D7 to connect with the Kong Sham Highway. Such road layout would lead to traffic congestion due to limited capacity of Road D7. More, the risk of single entry point at Road D7 for the Regional Centre should be avoided ( <b>R1, R3 and R5</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.38 and 6.39
E-G2	The cul-de-sac road connecting to district distributor roads, where vehicular speed is high, could be dangerous. The design of the cul-de-sac roads in the NDA need to be reviewed ( <b>R6</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.41
E-G3	<u>Opposition to the deletion of Tin Ying Road</u> Tin Ying Road is one of the major access roads to the northern part of TSW. With the expected increase in population in the area, deletion of Tin Ying Road would bring adverse traffic impact to the already congested road network in the area and hence Tin Ying Road should be retained ( <b>R34, R84 and R87</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.42 and 6.43
E-G4	<u>Provision of Environmentally Friendly Transport Services (EFTS)</u> Whilst EFTS is supported, it is necessary that the EFTS should be made available concurrent to the population intake of the NDA and should serve the four public transport interchanges and West Rail (WR) Stations and the northern part of the NDA. It should be in the form of Light Rail Transit, so as to enable extension beyond HSK, and connect with the TSW and future Yuen Long South and the rest of existing network ( <b>R7</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.44 and 6.45
E-G5	There is reservation on the EFTS as its passenger capacity is limited. Also, elevated design would have implication in maintenance cost while at-grade design would occupy road space. Noise impact of the EFTS and visual impact of the elevated electricity cable should be considered ( <b>R6</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.44 and 6.45
E-G6	There should be public consultation on the EFTS prior to implementation. No vehicular roads should be deleted because of the EFTS ( <b>R15 and R16</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.45
E-G7	<u>External road network and capacity of the West Rail</u> The external transport of HSK NDA and the whole Northwest New Territories (NWNT) depend on the WR. According to the statistics, the WR currently exceeds its capacity by 104% during the peak hours. There is insufficient capacity to cope with any additional population, not to mention the cross-district population. Even with the increase in the frequency of WR (to 28 times per hour), the WR could still not meet the traffic demand between Kam Sheung Road and Tsuen Wan West ( <b>R5, R15, R16, R19–R29, R34 and R117</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.46 and 6.47
<b><u>F – Provision of “G/IC” Facilities</u></b>		
F-G1	The increase in population will have more demand on the public services e.g. medical services, fire, police, elderly and youth needs, and basic community facilities should be particularly provided for Ha Tsuen Heung ( <b>R87</b> ). Residential developments in the NDA would aggravate the existing shortfall in medical services ( <b>R30</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.51 to 6.54
<b><u>G – Environment and Ecological Considerations</u></b>		
G-G1	<u>Protection of flight corridor for the San Sang Sun Tsuen egretty in Planning Area 45</u>	See TPB paper paras. 6.57 and

<b>Major Grounds</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
	A flight corridor is likely to be established as the egretty is connected with the proposed "O" to its south and another "Green Belt" ("GB") to its northeast ranging from 100m to 160m in width in Planning Area 45. However, tall buildings in close vicinity to the nesting colony may discourage the ardeids from attempting to nest and potentially blocking the flights paths for the ardeids to fly to the feeding grounds in the eastern side of the development areas ( <b>R8</b> ).	6.58
G-G2	The egretty will be surrounded by high-rise buildings and the nearby open space might attract human activities. Since there are some agricultural lands to the south of San Sang Tsuen and to the north of Tsing Chuen Wai and an egretty in San Sang San Tsuen near Yuen Tau Shan, these areas are not suitable for large scale residential development and should be reserved as buffer zone from the Town Centre. Besides, these agricultural lands serve as the feeding ground and should be retained as one of the flight path for the egretty ( <b>R117</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.57
G-G3	<u>Protection of surrounding farmland and environment</u> Without local provisioning for brownfield operators, it is possible that the brownfield operators would spread to the nearby farmland and result in damages to the rural environment ( <b>R15, R16, R17 and R117</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.59
<b>H – Coverage and Naming of OZP</b>		
---	---	---
<b>I – Miscellaneous</b>		
I-G1	There is opposition to the lack of social, environmental and economic impact assessments in the preparation of the OZP ( <b>R17</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.62
<b>Representations in respect of specific land use proposals</b>		
<b>J – Location of RCP between Hung Yuen Road and Hung Ping Road</b>		
J-G1	<b>Supportive Representations</b> <b>R4 and R9</b> support the proposed location of the RCP near Hung Fuk Estate. ( <b>R4 and R9</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.65 (a)
J-G2	<b>Adverse Representations</b> There are concerns on the visual impact of the RCP, short distance to Hung Fuk Estate, air pollution, odor and insect, health, hygiene and environmental problems ( <b>R95–R101</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.65 (b) and (c)
J-G3	Planning Area 8 is designated for RCP without sufficient public consultation with the affected residents, particularly residents of Hung Fuk Estate ( <b>R95, R96 and R98</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.65 (d)
<b>K – Expansion of "V" zone</b>		
K-G1	There is insufficient land in the "V" zone for Small House development and the "V" zone could not satisfy the future demand for Small House development of indigenous villagers and their right/views have not been respected ( <b>R84, R85, R87 and R88</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.66
K-G2	Oppose the land use in Planning Areas 27C and 28B as there is a large portion of land owned by indigenous villagers ( <b>R92</b> ) and the 'VE' of Tin Sam Tsuen in Planning Area 29 ( <b>R89 and R92</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.66
<b>L – Individual Sites</b>		
L-G1	Oppose the "R(A)2" zoning of the site at Lot 2842 S.A, 2846, 2851 RP, 2852 RP and 2943 in D.D.124 in Planning Area 27A for Public Rental Housing (PRH) or Subsidised Sale Flats (SSF) ( <b>R103</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.70
L-G2	Oppose the boundary of the "C(2)" zone in Planning Area 17B and	See TPB paper



<b>Major Grounds</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
	“OU(Mixed Use)” zone in Planning Area 19C (existing Kiu Tau Wai industrial area) for unnecessarily cutting the representer’s site at Lot 423 in D.D. 127 (Site K) ( <b>Plan H-13a</b> ) into two and not respecting private land ownership rights ( <b>R104</b> ).	para. 6.71
L-G3	Oppose the phasing plan demarcation for the advanced works and stage 3 areas passing through Site K. Propose to remove the small portion of Advanced Works from the Site K; and include as part of the Stage 3 works ( <b>R104</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.71
L-G4	Oppose the PR of 3 and BHR of 80mPD for the “I” zone at the representer’s site at Lot 1308RP, 1510RP, 1511, 1513, 1514, 1515, 1521, 1524, 3937 and 3938 in D.D. 124 in Planning Area 36 (San Sang San Tsuen) (Site S) ( <b>R104</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.72
L-G5	Oppose “G/IC” zoning for the representer’s sites (Lots 2353 RP, 2354 RP, 2363, 2364, 2366 RP, 2367, 2368 and 2373 RP in D.D. 124 in Planning Area 8) ( <b>R107</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.73
L-G6	Oppose “G/IC” site at Lot 793 in D.D. 124, and Lots 70, 71, 72(Part), 73 to 76, 77 (Part) and 216 (Part) in D.D. 127 in Planning Area 20 in Kiu Tau Wai for hospital development ( <b>R113</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.74
L-G7	<u>Other specific land use proposals opposing the removal of existing structures/change of land use affecting the followings:</u> (a) Hung Shui Kiu Merchants’ Association 洪水橋商會 in Planning Area 6A is rezoned to “G/IC” for government reserve ( <b>R10</b> ). (b) Tin Sam San Tsuen No. 1A in Planning Area 27B ( <b>R11</b> ) (c) CNEC Good Tidings Church in Shun Fung Wai, Tuen Mun ( <b>R112</b> ). (d) Residence at 110-A, East District, Ha Tsuen San Sang Tsuen by extending “CA” zone to cover the representation site ( <b>R116</b> ). (e) Village office, archway and pavilion of Yick Yuen Tsuen ( <b>R32 and R33</b> ). (f) Village houses, temporary houses, ancestral halls, Well God and shrines, village landscape and ‘fung shui’ in Sun Fung Wai ( <b>R32 and R33</b> ). (g) Ancestral houses and Small Houses, Well God and shrine, removal of ‘fung shui woodland’ in Tin Sam Tsuen in Planning Area 34C ( <b>R93</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.75 (a) and (b)
L-G8	<u>Oppose the change of land use zoning</u> Oppose the change of land use zoning that would affect the future business expansion plan of the land owner of Lot 32 S.A RP (Part) in D.D. 127 in Planning Area 20 ( <b>R110</b> ).  Oppose the rezoning of the representer’s lands to “O” in the northern part of the HSK NDA which would lower the land value and affect the existing brownfield operations and the representers’ livelihood ( <b>R114 and R115</b> ).  Oppose the zonings of the representers’ sites (Lot 1456 and 1660 in D.D. 124 in Planning Area 34C and Lot 2035 in D.D. 124 in Planning Area 29) which will affect land resumption of their lots ( <b>R89, R90 and R91</b> ) and the ‘fung shui woodland’ in Planning Area 34C ( <b>R93</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.75 (c) to (f)

<b>Major Grounds</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
<b>Other Views/Proposals not directly related to the OZP</b>		
<b>M – Concerns on the land exchange criteria under the ECNTA for the HSK NDA</b>		
M-G1	There is concern on the stringent requirement for in-situ land exchange under the ECNTA which requires the future project proponent to acquire all land for developing commercial and commercial residential development. Besides, the sizes of most of such sites are too large for one single development. There is no reason why a small size development cannot fit into the development site of layout should no adverse impacts be demonstrated. Hence, owners of smaller parcels should not be barred from developing their land ( <b>R1, R3, R5, R6, R7, R34, R108 and R109</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.76 and 6.77
M-G2	The general criteria prohibit land application from current land owners in many of the zones and land parcels. It is considered that the criteria is overly stringent, stifling land applications and precluding involvement of the private sector, which affects the land owner's right. Land owners should have the priority to develop their lots and public-private participation should be encouraged for early implementation of the OZP ( <b>R1, R3, R6, R7, R34, R87, R108 and R109</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.76 and 6.77
<b>N – Compensation package and relocation of affected brownfield / industrial operators, villagers and land owners</b>		
N-G1	<u>Brownfield / industrial operators</u> Some brownfield operators consider that the 24 ha of land designated for open storage and port back-up uses would not be sufficient for accommodating the over 190 ha of affected brownfield sites in HSK. They also request for identification of alternative relocation sites since most of them could not be accommodated in MSBs and they are concerned about the implementation and management mode of the proposed MSBs ( <b>R6, R34 – R83</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.78 and 6.79
N-G2	There is also request for reasonable compensation for the brownfield operators before land resumption and the prevailing ex-gratia allowance compensation package for brownfield operators should be reviewed ( <b>R6, R34 – R83</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.78 and 6.79
N-G3	Some operators in Hung Uk Tsuen concerns that removal expenses are high and it will incur substantial costs to re-establish or rebuild the fixtures and equipment in the new premises. Besides, application for the relevant licenses and permits would require a long time and they will not be able to apply for a new license to operate their business after relocation. The affected owners and tenants should be entitled to receive compensation in market value as well as compensation for loss of fixtures and equipment and removal expenses ( <b>R106 and R111</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.78 and 6.79
N-G4	<u>Villagers / Residents/ land owners</u> Villagers of the affected non-indigenous village, Yick Yuen Tsuen, oppose the unjust land resumption and request proper compensation and rehousing and indicate their preference for 'house for 'house' ( <b>R94</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.78 and 6.80
N-G5	The land resumption process will demolish a number of villages. However, the compensation scheme is not reasonable to many villagers who lose their homes. They request, inter alia, proper compensation and rehousing and exemption of means test ( <b>R34 and R87</b> ). Besides, more compensation should be provided to the owners	See TPB paper paras. 6.78 and 6.79

<b>Major Grounds</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
	of those private lands that were already resumed for expansion of San Wai Sewage Treatment Plant (SWSTP) and Letter A/B scheme in land exchange should be re-introduced ( <b>R34</b> ).	
N-G6	It is not fair to deprive the development right of the non-indigenous villagers, which is against their fundamental rights under the Basic Law (R19, R20, R24-R27, R30 and R31).	See TPB paper para. 6.80
<b>O – Other Issues on Implementation Arrangement</b>		
---	---	---

<b>Major Proposals</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
<b>Representations on general issues of HSK NDA</b>		
<b>A – Role and Positioning of HSK NDA</b>		
---	---	---
<b>B – Economic Development and Employment Opportunity</b>		
B-P1	Increase the PRs for “OU(Logistics Facility)” and “OU(Enterprise and Technology Park)” from 5 to 8 ( <b>R2 and R108</b> ) and “Industrial” (“I”) from 3 to 7 ( <b>R7</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.15
B-P2	Relax the building height restriction (BHR) for “OU(Logistics Facility)” from 110mPD to 140mPD and “OU(Enterprise and Technology Park)” from 90mPD to 140mPD ( <b>R7</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.15
B-P3	Rezone “OU(Logistics Facility)”, “OU(Enterprise and Technology Park)” and “OU(Port Back-up, Storage and Workshop Uses)” to “OU(Business)” with a PR of 7 to better capitalise the land resources in the NDA ( <b>R7</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.16
B-P4	The “OU” zones are overly deterministic and will interfere with the market mechanism in responding to changing economic needs. More uses should be always permitted in the Logistics, Enterprise and Technology Quarter. The potentially offensive uses, such as asphalt plant/ concrete batching plant, dangerous goods godown; open storage of cement/ sand/ chemical products/ dangerous goods, should always require Section 16 application. Some unsuitable and uneconomic uses like library, place of entertainment, place of recreation, sports or culture, private club, public clinic, religious institution, school and the like, should not be permissible in the Logistics, Enterprise and Technology Quarter ( <b>R7</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.17
B-P5	Move ‘Petrol Filling Station’ and ‘Social Welfare Facilities’ uses from Column 2 to Column 1 in the Notes of “OU(Logistics Facility)”( <b>R2</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.18
<b>C – Development Intensity</b>		
C-P1	<u>Increase PR and BHR</u> Increase the PRs of all residential and commercial sites in the NDA by 20% ( <b>R108</b> );	See TPB paper paras. 6.19 to 6.22
C-P2	Increase the PRs and building height restriction (BHR) of those sites within 250m radius of the HSK Station by 20% ( <b>R3</b> );	See TPB paper paras. 6.19 to 6.22
C-P3	Increase the PRs of the HSK Regional Centre. Increase PR of the commercial sites on the western side of the Regional Centre closest to the HSK Station from 8 / 9.5 to 10 with a BHR of 200mPD; increase PR of the two prime locations from 9.5 to 12 and increase BHR from 200mPD to 250mPD for iconic buildings; increase PR of other commercial sites further away from the HSK Station from 8 /	See TPB paper paras. 6.19 to 6.23

<b>Major Proposals</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
	9.5 to 9.5; and increase the PR of the "OU(Mixed Uses)" on the eastern side of the Regional Centre from 7 to 9.5 ( <b>R1</b> );	
C-P4	Relax the BHR of "Commercial (1)" ("C(1)") and "Commercial (2)"("C(2)") zones in Planning Areas 32A, 32B and 32D from 200mPD to 'not more than 300mPD' ( <b>R109</b> );	See TPB paper paras. 6.19 to 6.23
C-P5	Rezone "C(2)" in Planning Area 17A to "C(1)" and "C(3)" in Planning Area 16C to "C(2)" (with a higher PR and BH) ( <b>R7</b> );	See TPB paper paras. 6.19 to 6.23
C-P6	Increase the PRs of "C(3)" from 5 to 6.5, "C(4)" from 3.5 to 5, "C(5)" from 1.5 to 3.5; "Residential (Group A)5" ("R(A)5") from 3.8 to 4.5, "Residential (Group B)1" ("R(B)1") from 3.5 to 4, "R(B)2" from 2.5 to 3.5, "R(B)3" from 1.26 to 3, and "Residential (Group C)" ("R(C)") from 0.4 to 2.5 ( <b>R7</b> ); and	See TPB paper paras. 6.19 to 6.22 and 6.24
C-P7	Amend development density to accord with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the mixed use intensity to follow the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) composite building formula without any cap on the domestic PR ( <b>R7 and R108</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.25
C-P8	<u>Zoning amendments for optimising the development opportunities</u> Rezone "Open Space" ("O") in Planning Area 34C to Residential, Commercial or "OU(Mixed Uses)" ( <b>R7</b> );	See TPB paper para. 6.26 (a)
C-P9	Co-locate the proposed youth facilities in Planning Area 31B with the Regional Government Complex in "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zone in Planning Area 26A and rezone the "G/IC" site in Planning Area 31B to "C(2)" for retail/office/hotel development ( <b>R109</b> ); and	See TPB paper para. 6.26 (b)
C-P10	Relocate the proposed tertiary education and related uses from Planning Area 31A to "OU(Enterprise and Technology Park)" in Planning Areas 44A, 44B and 46 and revise the zoning to "OU(Education, Enterprise and Technology Park)". Moreover, to rezone the "G/IC" site in Planning Area 31A to " R(A)1" ( <b>R109</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.26(c)
<b><u>D – Urban Design and Land Use Issues</u></b>		
D-P1	<u>Housing mix</u> More land should be provided for private housing so as to achieve a ratio of 63:37, or 60:40 when taking into account TSW ( <b>R7</b> ). All residential developments should be designated for affordable housing including public housing, Home Ownership Scheme, social housing and co-opt housing ( <b>R15 and R16</b> ). More land should be reserved for subsidised housing and to specify the provision of elderly housing in planning documents to facilitate aging in place ( <b>R6</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.27
D-P2	<u>Pedestrian walkway network</u> Construct east-west pedestrian corridors, shopping streets and green paths connecting the Regional Plaza and the commercial/mixed use developments, to form different nodes and create a vibrant neighborhood in the Regional Centre ( <b>R5</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.29
D-P3	Provide sufficient cycle tracks connecting major trunk roads and linking up the heritage trail in the area ( <b>R34</b> ). Construct elevated green deck that consist of jogging trail and pedestrian walkway connecting TSW Locwood Court and HSK shopping street, so as to provide a walkable neighborhood ( <b>R118</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.31 and 6.32
D-P4	Reserve the area around the pedestrian street connecting LRT Chung Uk Tsuen station and HSK Station as commercial area ( <b>R29</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.33

<b>Major Proposals</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
D-P5	<u>Preservation of Existing Non-indigenous Villages</u> Reduce the land planned for commercial and private residential developments in order to preserve the existing five non-indigenous villages <b>(R15 and R16)</b> .	See TPB paper para. 6.34
D-P6	Retain the Sha Chau Lei Tsuen (II) <b>(R25)</b> .	See TPB paper para. 6.34
D-P7	“Village Type Development (1)” (“V(1)”) zone should be extended to accommodate the village houses and temporary structures to be resumed in Yick Yuen Tsuen <b>(R32 and R33)</b> .	See TPB paper para. 6.35
D-P8	<u>Integration with existing villages</u> Widen the district open space, local open space and amenity areas around Ha Tsuen village and adopt a stepped building height profile ascending away from the villages <b>(R34)</b> .	See TPB paper para. 6.37 (a)
D-P9	Only low-density residential development of 3-storey high would be acceptable in Planning Area 19B <b>(R85)</b> .	See TPB paper para. 6.37 (b)
D-P10	Swap the Regional Park in Planning Area 49 with the residential, open space and “G/IC” sites in Planning Areas 57B, 58A, 58B, 58C, 59A, 59B, 59C and 59D to maintain the Ha Tsuen view corridor (‘fung shui lane’) <b>(R34)</b> .	See TPB paper para. 6.37 (c)
D-P11	Preserve the Ping Shan view corridor (‘fung shui lane’) extending to the Tang’s Ancestral Hall in Ping Shan and rezone “OU(Mixed Uses)” in Planning Area 19A to “O” <b>(R84)</b> .	See TPB paper paras. 6.37 (d) and (e)
D-P12	Preserve road access leading to the burial ground of Kiu Tau Wai <b>(R84 and R85)</b> and the burial ground of Hung Uk Tsuen <sup>1</sup> should not be affected <b>(R86)</b> , and preserve all the graves at the knoll to the southeast of San Wai Water Treatment Plan (Lot 1245RP in DD 125) <b>(R34)</b> .	See TPB paper para. 6.367(f)
D-P13	Allowing car park use by villagers of Tsing Chuen Wai and Fung Kong Tsuen in “V(1)” zone in Planning Areas 24A and 63 for <b>(R12)</b> .	See TPB paper para. 6.37 (g)
<b>E – Traffic and Transportation</b>		
E-P1	<u>Internal road layout</u> An additional access in Planning Area 32C connecting the internal road to Road P1 (only left in/out turning) to address single entry concern <b>(R1 and R3)</b> ;	See TPB paper para. 6.40 (a)
E-P2	A new road to connect Roads D7 and D6 underneath the Regional Plaza to enhance the accessibility of the commercial district and relieve the traffic congestion <b>(R5 and R109)</b> ;	See TPB paper para. 6.40 (b)
E-P3	A new road to connect Roads D7 and D8 <b>(R5 and R109)</b> ; and	See TPB paper para. 6.40 (c)
E-P4	Additional roads and junctions to the east of HSK Station <b>(R1)</b> .	See TPB paper para. 6.40 (d)
E-P5	The transport infrastructure, such as car park and road network for the NDA, should be comprehensively planned <b>(R87)</b> .	See TPB paper para. 6.37
E-P6	The proposed HSK station should be deleted and the railway stations in the NWNT should be re-planned by reducing the planned population in the NDA, redistributing the planned new jobs in HSK NDA to other new residential development areas in Tuen Mun, Yuen Long South and Kam Tin South <b>(R19)</b> . Resolve the traffic issues before implementing any new plans <b>(R29)</b> ; and not to continue the	See TPB paper paras. 6.48 and 6.49

<b>Major Proposals</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
	HSK NDA project ( <b>R20</b> ).	
E-P7	It is proposed to develop a new mass transit system to connect HSK with other districts and to construct the Tuen Mun-Tsuen Wan Railway and Tuen Mun-Ting Kau Railway ( <b>R22 and R84</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.50
<b><u>F – Provision of “G/IC” Facilities</u></b>		
F-P1	Since there are many “G/IC” sites in HSK NDA, specific uses of some undesignated “G/IC” site should be indicated ( <b>R32 and R33</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.55
F-P2	The location of the proposed market in Planning Area 26A is not supported as it is located at the south of HSK and cannot serve the residents in northern part of TSW. Besides, there is concern on the management of the markets in the proposed public housing developments in Planning Areas 16B and 52B. Hence, it is considered necessary to identify a market site in TSW area and the proposed markets in the public housing developments in HSK should be managed by the Housing Department ( <b>R102</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.56
<b><u>G – Environment and Ecological Considerations</u></b>		
G-P1	<u>Protection of flight corridor for the San Sang Sun Tsuen egret in Planning Area 45</u> It is proposed to adopt a stepped building height and retain agricultural lands in Planning Areas 44A, 44B and 46 to protect San Sang San Tsuen egret ( <b>R8 and R117</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.57 and 6.58
G-P2	<u>Protection of surrounding farmland and environment</u> Without local re-provisioning for brownfield operators, it is possible that the brownfield operators would spread to the nearby farmland and result in damages to the rural environment ( <b>R15, R16, R17 and R117</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.60
<b><u>H – Coverage and Naming of OZP</u></b>		
H-P1	Include areas between Castle Peak Road and Yuen Long Highway in order to maximise the development potential of land around the railway station ( <b>R6</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.61 (a)
H-P2	Include Ngau Hom Shek, Sha Kong Tsuen, Hang Tau Tsuen and Deep Bay Grove into the OZP and to review the land use of the local area so as to safeguard the conservation and agriculture areas from brownfield operations ( <b>R17</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.61 (b)
H-P3	Incorporate the area covered by Ha Tsuen Fringe OZP into the planning scheme area of the HSK and Ha Tsuen OZP, and adopt uniform compensation rate in land resumption ( <b>R34</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.61 (c)
H-P4	Rename the OZP as “Ha Tsuen OZP” to reflect its geographical location, given that 80% of the land covered by the OZP falls within the area of Ha Tsuen Heung ( <b>R34</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.61 (d)
<b><u>I – Miscellaneous</u></b>		
I-P1	Relax the development restrictions for areas surrounding the NDA such as Ha Pak Nai and Deep Bay to provide development sites for the brownfield operators in the interim ( <b>R34–R83</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.63
I-P2	The consultant of HSK NDA Study received the Hong Kong Institute of Planners award, which enables it to gain more government consultancy contracts. The representer states that it has reported the case to the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) and proposes that prior to the outcome of such investigation, the Board should stop processing the OZP immediately ( <b>R18</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.64

<b>Major Proposals</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
<b>Representations in respect of specific land use proposals</b>		
<b>J – Location of RCP between Hung Yuen Road and Hung Ping Road</b>		
J-P1	Planning Area 8 is designated for RCP without sufficient public consultation with the affected residents, particularly residents of Hung Fuk Estate ( <b>R95, R96 and R98</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.65(d)
J-P2	The location of RCP should be reconsidered or swapped with the planned school adjacent to Shek Po Tsuen in Planning Area 15 ( <b>R95 and R100</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.65 (e)
<b>K – Expansion of “V” zone</b>		
K-P1	More land should be provided for Small House development by indigenous villagers ( <b>R89</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.66
K-P2	Rezone an area to the west of Hung Uk Tsuen from “O” and “G/IC” (including the site of 美珍醬園) to “V”/ “V(1)” or partly for car parking purpose; with shifting the proposed road to the west of Hung Uk Tsuen to further west with a connection to Kiu Fat Street and constructing a new road connecting Hung Chi Road and Ping Kwai Road; and also rezone an area from “G/IC” zone and shown as “Road” in Planning Area 20 to “O”; and ( <b>R84 - R86</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.67 (a)
K-P3	Rezone part of Shek Po Tsuen from “O”, “G/IC”, “OU(WR Line Emergency Access Point)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “V” zone ( <b>R88</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.67 (b)
K-P4	Rezone a government (reserve) site near San Sang Tsuen and an area designated as “OU(Logistics Facility)” to the west of Sik Kong Wai and San Uk Tsuen to “V” ( <b>R87</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.67 (c)
K-P5	Extend the ‘Village Environs’ (‘VE’)/“V” of Tin Sam Tsuen to the south by 50m since many lands in the north of Planning Areas 27C and 28B are owned by indigenous villagers ( <b>R92</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.67 (d)
K-P6	Extend the ‘VE’/ “V” of Tin Sam Tsuen, preferably to government land in Planning Area 27C, and to relocate the ancestral houses and Small Houses in Planning Area 34C to the extended ‘VE’/ “V” ( <b>R93</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.67 (d)
<b>L – Individual Sites</b>		
L-P1	Swap the Regional Park in Planning Area 49 with the logistics sites in Planning Areas 42 and 43B to provide a wider buffer for Ha Tsuen area; and rezone the Regional Park site into a number of smaller “Commercial” (“C”) or “OU(Mixed Use)” to facilitate their development ( <b>R6</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.69
L-P2	Propose to either designate a new sub-area (Planning Area 27D) in the “R(A)2” for SSF/ private residential development with a PR of 6 and BHR of 160mPD ; or designate the “OU(Mixed Use)2” sub-zone in Planning Area 27D with a PR of 6 and BHR of 160mPD ( <b>R103</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.70
L-P3	Propose to shift the EFTS alignment to the west to avoid Site K and to adjust the zoning boundaries such that Site K will be covered by a single land use zoning (either “C” or “OU (Mixed Use)”) ( <b>R104</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.71
L-P4	Propose to remove the small portion of Advanced Works from the Site K; and include as part of the Stage 3 works ( <b>R104</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.71
L-P5	Propose to rezone the site from “I” to “I(1)” subject to a maximum PR of 5 and a BHR of 100mPD ( <b>R104</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.72
L-P6	Propose to rezone the “G/IC” portion of the site to “G/IC(1)” with corresponding amendments to the Notes of the OZP (proposed Notes of “G/IC” zone at <b>Annex VIa</b> ) to facilitate provision of Residential	See TPB paper para. 6.73

<b>Major Proposals</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
	Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE) development under private initiatives. In addition, propose to delineate the site in Planning Area 10 from "R(A)2" into ("R(A)2(a)") and ("R(A)2(b)") zone with a maximum PR of 6, and amend the Notes and ES of the OZP to specify local rehousing through private sector participation in "R(A)2(b)" ( <b>R107</b> ).	
L-P7	Propose to rezone the site to "G/IC(1)" for development of a private RCHE cum senior citizen housing (about 180-200 elderly in the elderly homes on lower floors and about 50-80 self-contained units on upper floors). Such proposal would only reduce the proposed hospital site from 7.3 ha to 7.1 ha and would not have significant implications to the proposed hospital with specialist clinic/ polyclinic ( <b>R113</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.74
<b>Other Views/Proposals not directly related to the OZP</b>		
<b>M – Concerns on the land exchange criteria under the ECNTA for the HSK NDA</b>		
M-P1	They propose to reduce the block size in the Hung Shui Kiu and Ha Tsuen Outline Development Plan (ODP) so as to facilitate public-private participation and amend the criteria for considering lease modification, including, inter alia, permitting land exchange application for other uses, in addition to private residential uses, mixed residential and commercial or commercial uses ( <b>R1, R3, R5, R6, R7, R34, R108 and R109</b> ).	See TPB paper paras. 6.76 and 6.77
<b>N – Compensation package and relocation for affected brownfield / industrial operators, villagers and land owners</b>		
---	---	---
<b>O – Other Issues on Implementation Arrangement</b>		
O-P1	A coordinated development office should be established to implement the NDA project, and the land exchange system should be streamlined ( <b>R7</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.81
O-P2	More flexibility of implementation phasing should be allowed. If infrastructural facilities to serve some sites are available or can be provided by the developer, development should be allowed to go ahead to enable timely development ( <b>R1 and R108</b> ). The proposed developments should be implemented at the same time instead of separating into phases ( <b>R32 and R33</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.81
O-P3	More public consultation on the NDA development and appropriate compensation and reprovisioning proposals (e.g. MSBs) should be conducted before implementation of the NDA and resumption of brownfield sites ( <b>R6, R31, R34-R83 and R87</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.82
O-P4	Conduct a detailed noise review and implement appropriate mitigation measures where necessary for sites in close proximity to the rail lines and conduct supplementary reviews and assessments on potential noise impacts should there be a mismatch in the programme implementation ( <b>R14</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.81
O-P5	Since the level of details in the urban design studies have not been specified and the mechanism is unclear, which may inhibit imagination, innovation and creativity, the requirement of urban design study for the Regional Centre should be deleted ( <b>R1</b> ). Detailed urban design studies should be commissioned as soon as possible to ensure timely commencement of construction work at the NDA to serve its population intake ( <b>R7</b> ). When preparing the urban design	See TPB paper para. 6.83



<b>Major Proposals</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 2.3 to 2.80)		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
	studies in future, it should provide more pedestrian streets to promote walkability and connectivity, secondary commercial alleyways and green linkages within Planning Areas 28A and 32A ( <b>R109</b> ).	
O-P6	A refuse collection tunnel from HSK NDA to the NWNT Refuse Transfer Station should be built ( <b>R32 and R33</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.81
O-P7	The 400kV overhead cables should be converted into underground cables ( <b>R32 and R33</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.85
O-P8	Part of the LRT from Lam Tei LRT station to HSK LRT station should be elevated ( <b>R32 and R33</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.84
O-P9	The existing Sik Kong Wai Road should be widened ( <b>R34</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.81
O-P10	Construct another heritage trail connecting Tin Sam Tsuen and San Lei Uk Tsuen; and construct a museum of squatters to the east of Planning Area 27C, preserve the squatters in the southwestern portion of the Planning Area for exhibition, and the area in the northern portion should be for exhibition of squatters ( <b>R92</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.81
O-P11	The relocation of residents would cause abandon of animals. There is a need to review the treatment of abandoned animals ( <b>R15 and R16</b> ).	See TPB paper para. 6.86

**List 2: Summary grounds and proposals of Comments and PlanD's Responses**

<b>Major Grounds</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 3.1 )		<b>PlanD's Responses</b>
Q-G1	Better utilisation of land resources	See TPB paper paras. 6.19 to 6.22
Q-G2	Traffic and infrastructural concern to cope with the increasing population. Insufficient external transport and capacity of the West Rail.	See TPB paper paras. 6.46
Q-G3	Concern on traffic arrangements and road layout in the Town Centre	See TPB paper paras. 6.38 to 6.39
Q-G4	Concern on the proposed RCP near Hung Fuk Estate which may adversely affect the living environment and resident around Hung Fuk Estate.	See TPB paper para. 6.65
Q-G5	The need to preserve an unobstructed flight corridor for the ardeids of the San Sang San Tsuen egretty.	See TPB paper paras. 6.56 and 6.57
Q-G6	Support the local recycling industries.	See TPB paper para. 6.88
Q-G7	Concern on housing mix.	See TPB paper para. 6.27
Q-G8	Insufficient public consultation with the affected residents.	See TPB paper paras. 6.45 and 6.82
Q-G9	Retain/preserve the non-indigenous villages, permanent and temporary houses, earth god and shrine. Remove the non-indigenous village may against the basic law and fundamental right.	See TPB paper para. 6.34
Q-G10	Concern on the provision of GIC facilities and public services.	See TPB paper paras. 6.51 to 6.54
Q-G11	Concern on the technical assessment/ analysis, there is query on the figures and information in the consultancy report, which is inaccurate and unreliable.	See TPB paper para. 6.62
Q-G12	Concern on the compensation package and relocation for affected brownfield operators villagers and land owners.	See TPB paper paras. 6.78 to 6.79
Q-G13	Concern on environmental impact due to relocations of brownfield operators.	See TPB paper para. 6.60
Q-G14	Insufficient land in the "V" zone for village or small house development and the "V" zone could not satisfy the future demand for Small House development of indigenous villagers	See TPB paper para. 6.66
Q-G15	Concern on the over provision of hotels, commercial land.	See TPB paper para. 6.34
Q-G16	Concern on the relocation of residents would cause abandon of animals.	See TPB paper para. 6.86
Q-G17	Concern on the high rise development in the NDA	See TPB paper paras. 6.19 to 6.21
<b>Major Proposals</b> (see TPB paper paragraphs 3.2)		<b>PlanD's Response</b>
Q-P1	To encourage private and public participation to facilitate implementation of the NDA.	See TPB paper paras. 6.76 and

		6.77
Q-P2	To protect flight corridor for the San Sang Sun Tsuen egretty.	See TPB paper paras. 6.56 and 6.57
Q-P3	The proposed RCP site should remain as GIC facilities and provide public/ community services to HSK residents. Some recycling facilities should be provided.	See TPB paper para. 6.65
Q-P4	To relocate the proposed RCP to other locations.	See TPB paper para. 6.65
Q-P5	To reserve land in HSK NDA for recycling industries.	See TPB paper para. 6.88
Q-P6	All residential development should be for affordable housing.	See TPB paper para. 6.27
Q-P7	To properly relocate the Yick Yuen Tsuen.	See TPB paper para. 6.81
Q-P8	More public engagement is needed for HSK NDA and EFTS.	See TPB paper paras. 6.45 and 6.82
Q-P9	Not to proceed the HSK NDA project prior to the outcome of ICAC investigation.	See TPB paper Para. 6.64
Q-P10	Require the reasonable compensation package and implementation programme (eg. House for house), the ex-gratia allowance compensation package need to be revised.	See TPB paper paras. 6.78 and 6.79
Q-P11	A refuse collection tunnel from HSK NDA to NWNT RCP should be built.	See TPB paper para. 6.81
Q-P12	The 400Kv powerlines should be converted into underground infrastructure	See TPB paper para. 6.85
Q-P13	Specific uses of some undesigned “G/IC” site should be indicated.	See TPB paper para. 6.55
Q-P14	Lower PR should be imposed around Kiu Tau Wai to minimise the adverse impact to the village setting and the residents.	See TPB paper para. 6.36
Q-P15	To preserve some agricultural land in HSK NDA.	See TPB paper para. 6.90
Q-P16	To rezone “OU” site for conservation purpose to compensate the loss of wetland for developments in Deep Bay area.	See TPB paper para. 6.89
Q-P17	Comprehensive cycle network in HSK NDA.	See TPB paper paras. 6.28 to 6.32
Q-P18 (para. 3.2)	To provide more open space and education uses around Kiu Tau Wai	See TPB paper para. 6.91
Q-P19	To realign the proposed road and provide more roads to the villages around Kiu Tau Wai	See TPB paper para. 6.67 (a)
Q-P20	Protection of graves.	See TPB paper para. 6.37(f)

**List 3: Major Grounds and Proposals of Individual Representations/Comments**

Representation		
Representations No.	Grounds (see List 1 above)	Proposals (see List 1 above)
---	S	---
R1	C-G1,E-G1,M-G1,M-G2	C-P3,E-P1,E-P4,M-P1,O-P2,O-P5
R2	B-G1	B-P1,B-P5
R3	C-G1,E-G1,M-G1,M-G2	C-P2,E-P1,M-P1
R4	J-G1	---
R5	D-G2,E-G1,E-G7,M-G1	D-P2,E-P2,E-P3,M-P1
R6	A-G1,B-G2,B-G3,D-G1,E-G2,E-G5 M-G1,M-G2,N-G1,N-G2	D-P1,H-P1,M-P1,O-P3,L-P1
R7	B-G4,C-G1,D-G3,D-G4,E-G4,M-G1, M-G2	B-P1,B-P2,B-P3,B-P4,C-P5,C-P6,C-P7,C-P8,D-P1, M-P1,O-P1,O-P5
R8	G-G1	G-P1
R9	J-G1	---
R10	L-G7	---
R11	L-G7	---
R12	---	D-P13
R13	---	---
R14	---	O-P4
R15 and R16	D-G5,E-G6,E-G7,G-G3	D-P1,D-P5,G-P2,O-P11
R17	G-G3,I-G1	G-P2,H-P2
R18	---	I-P2
R19	B-G5,D-G6,E-G7,N-G6	E-P6
R20	D-G6,E-G7,N-G6	E-P6
R21	E-G7	---
R22	B-G5,E-G7	E-P7
R23	E-G7	---
R24	D-G6,E-G7,N-G6	---
R25	D-G6,E-G7,N-G6	D-P6
R26	B-G5,D-G6,E-G7,N-G6	---
R27	D-G6,E-G7,N-G6	---
R28	E-G7	---
R29	B-G5,E-G7	D-P4,E-P6,I-P3
R30	B-G3,D-G6,F-G1,N-G6	---
R31	B-G5,D-G6,N-G6	O-P3
R32 and R33	L-G7	D-P7,F-P1,O-P2,O-P6,O-P7,O-P8
R34	D-G7,E-G3,E-G7,M-G1,M-G2,N-G2 N-G5	D-P3,D-P8,D-P10,D-P12,H-P3,H-P4,M-P1,O-P3 O-P9,I-P1
R35 to R83	N-G1,N-G2	I-P1,O-P3
R84	D-G8,E-G3,K-G1	D-P11,D-P12,E-P7,K-P2
R85	D-G8,K-G1	D-P9,D-P12,K-P2
R86	K-G1	D-P12,K-P2
R87	E-G3,F-G1,K-G1,M-G2,N-G5	E-P5,K-P4,O-P3
R88	K-G1	K-P3
R89	K-G1,K-G2,L-G8	K-P1
R90 and R91	L-G8	---
R92	K-G2	K-P5,O-P10
R93	L-G7,L-G8	K-P6,K-P7
R94	N-G4	---
R95	J-G2,J-G3	J-P1,J-P2

<b>R96</b>	J-G2,J-G3	J-P1,J-P2
<b>R97</b>	J-G2	J-P1
<b>R98</b>	J-G2,J-G3	J-P1,J-P2
<b>R99</b>	J-G2	J-P1
<b>R100</b>	J-G2	J-P2
<b>R101</b>	J-G2	J-P1
<b>R102</b>	---	F-P2
<b>R103</b>	L-G1	L-P2
<b>R104</b>	L-G2,L-G3,L-G4	L-P3 L-P4 L-P5
<b>R106</b>	N-G3	---
<b>R107</b>	L-G5	L-P6
<b>R108</b>	C-G1,M-G1,M-G2	C-P1,C-P7,M-P1,O-P2,B-P1
<b>R109</b>	M-G1,M-G2	C-P4,C-P9,C-P10,E-P2,E-P3,M-P1,O-P5
<b>R110</b>	L-G8	---
<b>R111</b>	N-G3	---
<b>R112</b>	L-G7	---
<b>R113</b>	L-G6	L-P7
<b>R114 and R115</b>	L-G8	---
<b>R116</b>	L-G7	---
<b>R117</b>	B-G5,E-G7,G-G2,G-G3	G-P1 G-P2
<b>R118</b>	D-G4	D-P3

<b>Comments No.</b>		
<b>Comments No.</b>	<b>Grounds (see List 2 above)</b>	<b>Proposals (see List 2 above)</b>
<b>C1 –C4</b>	Q-G1,Q-G3	Q-P1
<b>C5</b>	Q-G2	---
<b>C6</b>	Q-G7,Q-G8	Q-P8
<b>C7</b>	Q-G1,Q-G3	Q-P1
<b>C8</b>	Q-G4	---
<b>C9</b>	Q-G5,Q-G6,Q-G9	Q-P3,Q-P6
<b>C10</b>	Q-G6,Q-G9,Q-G10,Q-G17	Q-P5 Q-P16
<b>C11</b>	Q-G5	Q-P2
<b>C12</b>	Q-G6,Q-G10,Q-G12	Q-P10
<b>C13</b>	Q-G9	---
<b>C14</b>	Q-G7,Q-G8,Q-G9	---
<b>C15</b>	Q-G9	---
<b>C16</b>	Q-G2,Q-G6,Q-G11	Q-P7
<b>C17</b>	Q-G2,Q-G9,Q-G11,Q-G12	Q-P10
<b>C18</b>	Q-G9,Q-G12	Q-P9
<b>C19</b>	Q-G9,Q-G11,Q-G12	Q-P10
<b>C20</b>	Q-G7,Q-G8,Q-G9	Q-P6,Q-P8
<b>C21</b>	---	---
<b>C22</b>	---	Q-P9
<b>C23 –C24</b>	Q-G2,Q-G11	---
<b>C25</b>	Q-G2,Q-G9,Q-G10,Q-G12	---
<b>C26</b>	Q-G2	---
<b>C27</b>	Q-G9	---
<b>C28-C29</b>	---	Q-P7,Q-P11,Q-P12,Q-P13
<b>C30</b>	---	Q-P7
<b>C31</b>	Q-G14	---

<b>C32</b>	Q-G4	---
<b>C33-C241</b>	Q-G4,Q-G7,Q-G9,Q-G12,Q-G13,Q-G15 Q-G16	Q-P3,Q-P6,Q-P15
<b>C242-C329</b>	Q-G4	Q-P3,Q-P4
<b>C330-C332</b>	---	Q-P1
<b>C380</b>	Q-G6,Q-G9,Q-G13,Q-G15,Q-G16	Q-P3,Q-P6,Q-P15
<b>C381</b>	---	Q-P14,Q-P17,Q-P18,Q-P19
<b>C382</b>	Q-G6	---
<b>C383</b>	Q-G9	Q-P12
<b>C384-C385</b>	---	Q-P19,Q-P20

GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY (Cont'd)

Remarks

- (a) 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 the maximum building height in terms of number of storey(s) or metres above Principal Datum as stipulated on the Plan, or the height of the existing building, whichever is the greater.
- (b) In determining the maximum number of storey(s) for the purposes of paragraph (a) above, any basement floor(s) may be disregarded.
- (c) Based on the individual merits of a development or redevelopment proposal, minor relaxation of the building height restriction stated in paragraph (a) above may be considered by the Town Planning Board on application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance.
- (d) *On land designated “Government, Institution or Community (1)”, development within shall be Residential Care Home for the Elderly to be constructed and operated under private initiatives.*

Schedule of Uses of “R(A)” zone proposed by R107申述人R107建議的「住宅(甲類)」地帶土地用途表

(English only 只有英文版本)

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A) (Cont'd)Planning Intention

This zone is intended primarily for high-density residential developments. Commercial uses are always permitted on the lowest two floors of a building excluding basements, or in a free-standing purpose-designed non-domestic building up to five storeys.

Remarks

- (a) Except otherwise specified, on land designated “Residential (Group A)1” to “Residential (Group 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 plot ratio specified below, or the plot ratio of the existing building, whichever is the greater:

<u>Sub-area</u>	<u>Maximum Plot Ratio</u>
R(A)1	6.5
R(A)2 Subzone (a)	6
R(A)2 Subzone (b)	6
R(A)3	5.5
R(A)4	5
R(A)5	3.8

*(c) On land designated “Residential (Group A)2 subzone (b), development of rehousing project shall be provided by way of private initiatives.*

- (b) Except otherwise specified, on land designated “Residential (Group A)1” to “Residential (Group 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 the maximum building height in terms of metres above Principal Datum as stipulated on the Plan, or the height of the existing building, whichever is the greater.

- (c) On land designated “Residential (Group A)4” in Planning Areas 1 and 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 plot ratio of 5, a maximum site coverage of 42%, and a maximum building height of 12 storeys including car park, or the plot ratio, site coverage and height of the existing building, whichever is the greater. The lowest two floors could be used for commercial and car parking purposes which could have maximum site coverage of 100%.

- (d) In determining the maximum plot ratio and site coverage for the purposes of paragraphs (a) and (c) 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. Any floor space that is constructed or intended for use solely as Government, institution or community facilities as required by the Government may also be disregarded.

- (e) Based on the individual merits of a development or redevelopment proposal, minor relaxation of the plot ratio, site coverage and/or building height restrictions stated in paragraphs (a) to (c) above may be considered by the Town Planning Board on application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance.



“Residential (Group A)1” (“R(A)1”)

- (a) A site in the eastern part of Planning Area 34B, which is within a distance of 500m to the northwest of proposed HSK Station, is zoned “R(A)1”. Development of this site is subject to a maximum PR of 6.5 (of which the domestic PR should not exceed 6) and a maximum BH of 180mPD.

“Residential (Group A)2” (“R(A)2”)

- (b) There are eight sites in Planning Areas 10, 16B, 25, 27A, 27B, 34A, 34B and 52B which are zoned “R(A)2” and subject to a maximum PR of 6 and a maximum BH ranging from 120mPD to 180mPD. Among these, the domestic PR of the six sites in Planning Areas 16B, 25, 27A, 27B, 34A and 52B should not exceed 5.5. The sites in Planning Areas 16B, 25, 27A, 34A and 52B are for PRH/SSF development while the site in Planning Area 10 near Hung Fuk Estate is reserved for local rehousing purpose. Being in close proximity to the proposed TMWB, future development in Planning Area 34A should take into account the possible constraints posed by the proposed TMWB and its slip roads connecting to KSWH. The sites in Area 27B and 34B are for private housing development.

*Within the site, portion of rehousing project shall be under private initiatives, by way of lease control mechanism.*

“Residential (Group A)3” (“R(A)3”)

- (c) Sites in Planning Areas 8, 16A, 27C, 34D, 52A, 58A, 59A, 60, 61, 62A and 62B are zoned “R(A)3”. Development within this zone is subject to a maximum PR of 5.5 (of which the domestic PR should not exceed 5, except the site in Planning Area 8) and a maximum BH ranged from 120mPD to 160mPD. Five sites in Planning Areas 16A, 27C, 34D, 52A and 62A are for SSF. The site in Planning Area 8 is reserved for local rehousing project, and is subject to a maximum domestic PR of 5.5 and a maximum BH of 120mPD.
- (d) For the site in Planning Area 60, a setback of 5m wide is required from the site boundary abutting Road D2 (**Figure 6**) in order to maintain a spacious corridor between the proposed development and existing villages.

Blocking of pedestrian connection from the surrounding areas should be avoided to enhance pedestrian network in Regional Economic and Civic Hub. To encourage cycling, cycle track(s) should be provided within the site to provide a continuous cycle track network in the Area. The site is transpassed by the 400kV overhead power lines (with pylons) in the south. Relevant guidelines in accordance with HKPSG and regulations under relevant authorities should be observed.

- 11.8.5 A GIC Complex site for community hall, clinic, refuse collection point (RCP) as well as other social welfare facilities is reserved in the Local Service Core in Planning Area 62C for serving the northern part of the Area and the neighbouring TSW New Town. Development within this site is subject to maximum BH of 50mPD. A committed RCP cum office uses (6 storeys) by FEHD is located in Planning Area 8. ~~and another~~ planned RCP is reserved in Planning Area 36.

*A private Residential Care Home for the Elderly is also located in Planning Area 8. Another*

- 11.8.6 A proposed hospital including polyclinic / specialist clinics is reserved in Planning Area 20. Development of this site is subject to a maximum BH of 80mPD to allow flexibility in the design of hospital, clinic and ancillary uses.

- 11.8.7 Planning Area 31A to the southwest of the proposed HSK Station is primarily for post-secondary educational uses, either for publicly funded or self-financing institutions. It may include academic facilities, student hostels and/or other related ancillary facilities depending on the prevailing needs and requirements by the Education Bureau (EDB). Development within this site is subject to a maximum BH of 80mPD. The site is bisected by the planned riverside promenade across from the west to east and future development should take account of the planned riverside promenade for integrated design. This site is located to the immediate north of the 400kV overhead power lines (with pylons). Relevant guidelines in accordance with HKPSG and regulations under relevant authorities should be observed and consulted.

- 11.8.8 A district police station cum police married quarters in Planning Area 26B and a divisional fire station and ambulance depot cum staff quarters in Planning Area 34E are designated "G/IC(1)". Development of these sites is subject to a maximum BH of 130mPD and 160mPD respectively. There are 400kV overhead power lines (with pylons) in the southern part of the site in Planning Area 26B. Relevant guidelines in accordance with HKPSG and regulations under relevant authorities should be observed and consulted. Being in close proximity, future development in Planning Area 34E should observe the possible constraints posed by the proposed TMWB and its slip roads connecting

**Planning intention for land use zonings of**  
**Draft Hung Shui Kiu and Ha Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/HSK/1**

1. Planning Intention

HSK NDA would be an important component in the overall development strategy for Hong Kong in the medium-to long-term. HSK NDA will be the next generation new town to house a population of about 218,000 (including 176,000 new population); and an integrated community with wide-ranging commercial, retail, community, recreational and cultural facilities providing about 150,000 employment opportunities serving the NDA as well as the adjacent areas of Tuen Mun, TSW and Yuen Long New Towns. Being strategically located in the NWNT and well connected to the Hong Kong International Airport and the Shenzhen areas, the HSK NDA will provide development spaces in the NWNT to meet the surging demand for various commercial and economic land uses and position to become the Regional Economic and Civic Hub for the whole NWNT region.

2. Individual zones

- (a) The “Commercial” (“C”) zone is intended primarily for commercial developments, which may include uses such as office, shop, services, place of entertainment, eating place and hotel, functioning as territorial business/financial centre and regional or district commercial/shopping centre. These areas are usually major employment nodes.
- (b) The “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) is intended for comprehensive development/redevelopment of the area for residential use with commercial, open space and other supporting facilities. The zoning is to facilitate appropriate planning control over the development mix, scale, design and layout of development, taking account of various environmental, traffic, infrastructure and other constraints.
- (c) The “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone is intended primarily for high-density residential developments. Commercial uses are always permitted on the lowest two floors of a building excluding basements, or in a free-standing purpose-designed non-domestic building up to five storeys.
- (d) The “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) zone is intended primarily for medium-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted with or without application to the Town Planning Board.
- (e) The “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) zone is intended primarily for low-rise,

low-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Town Planning Board.

- (f) The Village Type Development (“V”) zone is to designate both existing recognised villages and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion. Land within this zone is primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. It is also intended to concentrate village type development within this zone for a more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services. Selected commercial and community uses serving the needs of the villagers and in support of the village development are always permitted on the ground floor of a New Territories Exempted House. Other commercial, community and recreational uses may be permitted on application to the Town Planning Board. For land designated “V(1)”, the planning intention is to provide land considered suitable for reprovisioning of village houses affected by Government projects.
- (g) The “Industrial” (“I”) zone is intended primarily for general industrial uses to ensure an adequate supply of industrial floor space to meet demand from production-oriented industries. Information technology and telecommunications industries and office related to industrial use are also always permitted in this zone.
- (h) The “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone is intended primarily for the provision of Government, institution or community facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organisations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.
- (i) The “Open Space” (“O”) zone is intended primarily for the provision of outdoor open-air public space for active and/or passive recreational uses serving the needs of local residents as well as the general public.
- (j) The “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(Mixed Use)”) zone is intended primarily for high-density residential development and commercial development in close proximity to the railway stations. Flexibility for the development/redevelopment/conversion of residential or other uses, or a combination of various types of compatible uses including commercial, residential, educational, cultural, recreational and entertainment uses, either vertically within a building or horizontally over a spatial area, is allowed to meet changing market needs. Physical segregation has to be provided between the non-residential and residential portions within a new/converted building to prevent non-residential uses from causing nuisance to the residents.

- (k) The “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Enterprise and Technology Park” (“OU(Enterprise and Technology Park)”) zone is intended primarily to provide development space for accommodating a variety of innovation and technology uses, including research centre, testing and certification, data centre, modern industries and other related businesses and non-polluting industrial uses.
- (l) The “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Logistics Facility” (“OU(Logistics Facility)”) zone is intended primarily for development of modern logistics facilities to complement the development of Hong Kong as a Regional Distribution Centre and Logistics Hub.
- (m) The “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Port Back-up, Storage and Workshop Uses” (“OU(Port Back-Up, Storage and Workshop Uses)”) zone is intended primarily to cater for the port back-up facilities and container related uses. Port back-up related development such as container freight station, logistics centre, container vehicle park and container storage, repair yard and rural industry workshop are permitted within this zone.
- (n) The “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Parking and Operational Facilities for Environmentally Friendly Transport Services” zone is primarily for the provision of parking and operational facilities (including ancillary office) for Environmentally Friendly Transport Services serving the area.
- (o) The “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone.

**Provision of GIC Facilities and Open Space in Draft Hung Shui Kiu and Ha Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/HSK/1**  
《洪水橋及厦村分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/HSK/1》的休憩用地及主要政府、機構或社區設施

Type of Facilities 設施種類	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) 《香港規劃標準與準則》	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population) 《香港規劃標準與準則》按規劃人口算的要求	Provision 數量		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision) 過剩/短缺(與已規劃數量比較)
			Existing Provision 現有	Planned Provision 已規劃	
District Open Space 地區休憩用地	10 ha per 100,000 persons 每 100,000 人 10 公頃	21.80 ha 公頃	0	48.71	+26.91 ha 公頃
Local Open Space 鄰舍休憩用地	10 ha per 100,000 persons 每 100,000 人 10 公頃	21.80 ha 公頃	3.15	35.38	+13.58 ha 公頃
Secondary School 中學	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17 每 40 名 12 至 17 歲青少年 設一間全日制課室	271 classrooms 間課室	0	300	+29 classrooms 間課室 <sup>1</sup>
Primary School 小學	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11 每 25.5 名 6 至 11 歲兒童 設一個全日制課室	469 classrooms 間課室	0	450	-19 classrooms 間課室 <sup>1</sup>
Kindergarten/ Nursery 幼兒班及幼稚園	26 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to 6 每 1,000 名 3-6 歲以下幼童 應設 26 間課室	137 classrooms 間課室	0	96	-41 Classrooms 間課室 <sup>1</sup>
District Police Station 警區警署	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons 每 200,000-500,000 人 設一間	0.44	0	1	+0.56
Divisional Police Station 分區警署	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons 每 100,000-200,000 人 設一間	1.09	0	0	-1.09 <sup>2</sup>
Hospital 醫院	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons 每 1,000 人設 5.5 張病床	1199 beds 張病床	0	1000 beds 張病床	-199 beds 張病床 <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The number of kindergarten, primary school and secondary school sites are recommended by EDB. There are existing kindergarten, primary school and secondary school sites to the south of Castle Peak Road. 教育局建議中學、小學及幼稚園的數目。現有中學、小學及幼稚園位於青山公路以南。

<sup>2</sup> HKPF required a district police station plus married staff quarters. 警務處要求一間警區警署連已婚警察宿舍。

<sup>3</sup> The provision of hospital beds is determined on a regional basis. 醫院病床數目是按區域計算。

Type of Facilities 設施種類	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) 《香港規劃標準與準則》	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population) 《香港規劃標準與準則》按規劃人口算的要求	Provision 數量		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision) 過剩/短缺(與已規劃數量比較)
			Existing Provision 現有	Planned Provision 已規劃	
Clinic/Health Centre 普通科診療所/健康中心	1 per 100,000 persons 每 100,000 人設一間普通科診療所/健康中心	2.18	0	2	-0.18
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms) 裁判法院 (8個法庭)	1 per 660,000 persons 每 660,000 人設一間有 8 個法庭的裁判法院	0.33	0	1	+0.67
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre 綜合青少年服務中心	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 每 12,000 名 6-24 歲年齡組別的兒童/青年設一間	2.67	0	2	-0.67 <sup>4</sup>
Integrated Family Services Centre 綜合家庭服務中心	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons 每 100,000 至 150,000 人設一間	1.45	0	1	-0.45 <sup>4</sup>
Library 圖書館	1 district library for every 200,000 persons 在每個分區內各設 1 間分區圖書館。此外，每 200,000 人應設一間分區圖書館	1.09	0	0	-1.09 <sup>5</sup>
Sports Centre 體育館	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons 每 50,000-65,000 人設一間	3.35	0	3	-0.35 <sup>5</sup>
Sports Ground/ Sport Complex 運動場/運動場館	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons 每 200,000-250,000 人設一個	0.87	0	1	+0.13
Swimming Pool Complex – standard 游泳池場館-標準池	1 complex per 287,000 persons 每 287,000 人設一個標準場館	0.76	0	0	-0.76 <sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Subject to DSW's requirements. 按社會福利署要求而提供。

<sup>5</sup> LCSD will keep monitoring the demand and quality of recreational facilities, and if needed, consideration will be given to providing new facilities in the future.  
康樂及文化事務署會繼續監察康樂設施的需求和質素，如有需要，將來會考慮提供新設施。