

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. CB(1)1461/12-13(02)

Ref: CB1/PL/DEV

**Panel on Development**

**Meeting on 15 July 2013**

**Updated background brief on the  
proposed North East New Territories New Development Areas**

**Purpose**

This paper provides background information on the proposed North East New Territories New Development Areas ("NENT NDAs") and gives a brief account of the views and concerns expressed by Members on the subject at the meetings of the Legislative Council ("LegCo") and its various committees during the current legislative session<sup>1</sup>.

**Background**

2. The Planning and Development Study on NENT commissioned in 1998 identified Kwu Tung North, Fanling North and Ping Che/Ta Kwu Ling as suitable NDAs for development in one scheme. In view of the slower growth of population, the NDA proposals were shelved in 2003. The findings of the "Hong Kong 2030: Planning Vision and Strategy", promulgated in 2007, recommended proceeding with the NDA developments to address the long-term housing need and to create more employment opportunities. The Chief Executive ("CE") announced in his

---

<sup>1</sup> The current (2012-2013) legislative session marks a watershed in the discussion on NENT NDAs. The discussions at LegCo during the session focused on the Recommended Outline Development Plans ("RODPs") for NENT NDAs. These plans were released by the Administration for public consultation (the Stage 3 public engagement) in June 2013 and have aroused great controversies. Discussions on the proposed NENT NDAs from 2008-2009 to 2011-2012 (before the RODPs were issued) have become not so relevant to the recent development of the NENT NDAs proposal. A summary of the views and concerns expressed at LegCo on the proposal during this period is available in the background brief on the same subject issued on 26 October 2012 (LC Paper No. CB(1)61/12-13(06)).

2007-2008 Policy Address that the planning for NENT NDAs was one of the ten major infrastructure projects for economic growth.

### **The planning and engineering study**

3. In February 2008, the Panel on Development ("DEV Panel") discussed the Administration's proposal to carry out a planning and engineering study on NENT NDAs ("the Study") with the objective to formulate a planning and development framework and an implementation programme. A relevant funding proposal at an estimated cost of \$54.2 million was approved by the Finance Committee ("FC") in May 2008. The Administration briefed the DEV Panel on the three stages of public engagement ("PE") under the Study in November 2008, November 2009 and June 2012 respectively.

### The Recommended Outline Development Plans and the Stage 3 public engagement

4. The Stage 3 PE ("PE3") was conducted from mid-June to September 2012<sup>2</sup> to gauge public views on the Recommended Outline Development Plans ("RODPs") for the three NDAs. Under the RODPs, about 533 hectares ("ha") of developable land will be provided, including about 150 ha of housing land to provide some 54 000 new housing units for about 150 000 persons. Other than providing housing land, the NDAs will serve to meet other strategic land use requirements and offer development spaces for the six industries promoted under the 2009-2010 Policy Address. The development theme, major land uses and key development parameters of the NDAs under the RODPs are set out at **Appendix I**.

5. During PE3, a lot of comments against the NENT NDAs proposal ("the Proposal") were voiced out. They included the allegations/views of "Hong Kong-Shenzhen unification"<sup>3</sup>, "selling out Hong Kong"<sup>4</sup>, developing

---

<sup>2</sup> PE3 was originally scheduled to last between June and August 2012. It was subsequently extended to the end of September 2012 in response to the requests from the affected residents and members of the public.

<sup>3</sup> This refers to the view that the Government is planning to integrate NENT NDAs with Shenzhen into a boundary zone with a view to serving the Mainlanders who do not need an entry permit to visit Hong Kong.

<sup>4</sup> This refers to the view that NENT NDAs are planned by or for the Mainland, which undermines the principle of "One Country, Two Systems" and high degree of autonomy as stipulated in the Basic Law.

NENT NDAs to serve the rich Mainlanders<sup>5</sup>, uprooting the existing agricultural activities in the areas, adversely affecting the livelihood of the existing farmers, lack of policy for sustaining and promoting local agriculture, inappropriate public-private housing ratio<sup>6</sup>, inadequate public consultation, etc.

6. There was a motion debate at the Council meeting of 24 October 2012 on the NENT NDAs planning and engineering study<sup>7</sup>. At the meeting of DEV Panel on 30 October 2012, the Administration briefed Panel members on the public comments received from PE3. The DEV Panel held two special meetings on 8 and 15 December 2012 to receive public views on the Proposal. About 200 deputations including affected villagers attended the special meetings. Their views are summarized at **Appendix II**.

### Need for NENT NDAs

7. Noting that it was proposed under the RODPs that the three NDAs would provide 150 ha of housing land for a population of 151 600 people, some Members queried why the Administration did not make good use of the vacant land elsewhere in the territory to accommodate the population but insisted on the controversial Proposal. There were queries on whether NENT NDAs were developed in the overall interest of Hong Kong. The Administration explained that as existing land immediately available for large-scale housing development was limited and it was projected that there would be an increase of about 1.4 million people (680 000 households) in the coming 30 years, there was an imminent need to conduct studies, including that for NENT NDAs, to develop housing land in the medium to long term. The Administration stressed that NENT NDAs would be developed to be Hong Kong's new towns. It had not proposed to integrate NENT with Shenzhen by opening up the border area.

### Housing development and development density

8. In the 2013 Policy Address, it was stated that the Administration would take forward 'as appropriate' the policy of "Hong Kong properties for Hong Kong people" ("HKPHKP") in the proposed NENT NDAs.

---

<sup>5</sup> This refers to the view that the Mainlanders would be the main buyers of the private housing units in the NDAs. Hence, the NDAs would become the rich Mainlanders' place of residence.

<sup>6</sup> The Administration has proposed that about 23 000 housing units (43%) in NENT NDAs would be for public rental housing and about 31 000 units (57%) for private housing.

<sup>7</sup> The original motion and the amendments were negatived.

Some DEV Panel members opined that this position had not addressed the public suspicions that the areas would become a backyard where the rich Mainlanders would be the main buyers of the private housing units therein. They urged the Administration to make public the information about the area of land or number of units for private housing in the three NDAs to be covered by the HKPHKP policy. In response, the Administration explained that given the changes in the market conditions over the time span of 20 years between now and the development of the housing sites therein, it was imprudent to set a fixed proportion of flats subject to the HKPHKP restriction at the juncture.

9. Under the RODPs, the public-private housing ratio in the proposed NENT NDAs was 43:57. Some members considered that without compromising the design for a quality living environment, the Administration should increase the ratio as well as the development intensity. In response, the Administration undertook to re-examine the development intensity in a holistic manner, balancing various considerations. It advised that preliminary study results showed that there was room to increase the percentage of public housing in the proposed NDAs to over 50%. Other planned private housing would be mostly small- and medium-sized units. On a member's concern that the Administration's proposal of reserving only 20% of housing land in NENT NDAs for public rental housing ("PRH") could not address the public's demand, the Administration said that the proportion had been proposed for PE3 in light of the planning considerations at that time and would be suitably adjusted upon the public views collected.

#### Development schedule and implementation programme

10. Some DEV Panel members held the view that PRH developments in NENT NDAs should be completed as soon as possible to meet the strong public demand for PRH units. There were views suggesting that the Administration should accord priority to the development of Kwu Tung North and Fanling North NDAs as they provided most of the residential units in the three NDAs. In light of some deputations' views, some members suggested that the Administration should resume part, say, one-third, of the site of the Fanling golf course for public housing development, in view of the site's proximity to the Sheung Shui railway station, thereby saving the need to develop NENT NDAs. To resume the site timely, they urged the Administration to give advance notice to terminate the relevant private recreational lease of the golf course. There were also views suggesting that if the site was to be developed, the

Administration should consider combining it with the site of CE's villas nearby the Kwu Tung North NDA for a large-scale housing project.

11. The Administration advised that it had all along been keeping an open mind on whether the development of the three NDAs were to be undertaken separately and in phases. As more than one option for refining the proposal were being examined, no concrete numbers and timetables about the PRH developments could be confirmed at the juncture, except that the housing developments would be completed in phases over a period of 10 years starting from 2022 or 2023. As regards the lease of the Fanling golf course, the Administration advised that a review on the policy on private recreational leases would be conducted. According to the Administration, even if the golf course could be dedicated for other uses, it took time for the Administration to carry out detailed feasibility study on its suitability for high density development and other technical assessments. Even if the golf course could be opened up for development, it could not replace NENT NDAs as far as the development schedule was concerned.

#### Implementation approach

12. Some Members considered that the adoption of the Conventional New Town Approach ("CNTA")<sup>8</sup>, proposed by the Administration for PE3, would allay the public concern about Government policies being tilted in favour of the private sector and discourage private developers to force residents out from the land assembled by these developers. However, those who objected to adopting CNTA held the view that as the Government should only resume private land under the Land Resumption Ordinance (Cap. 124) when the land was required for a public purpose, the Government would be subject to legal challenge if it resumed land for the purpose of reselling it for private housing developments. They cast doubt on whether the land resumption under CNTA was in compliance with the Articles 6 and 105 of the Basic Law in respect of protection of private property right. They held the view that the private-sector participation ("PSP") approach could speed up the implementation of the proposed NENT NDAs project and queried how CNTA would be different from the approach adopted in the past new towns which provided land exchange entitlements for affected landowners. There were also concerns whether public money to be expensed on the resumption of private land under CNTA, estimated to be around \$40 billion, would go to the pockets of

---

<sup>8</sup> Under CNTA, the Government would resume and clear all the private land planned for public works projects, public housing and private developments, carry out site formation works and provide infrastructure before allocating land for various purposes including disposal of the land planned for private developments in the market.

some developers who had already acquired a considerable amount of land in NENT since the late 1990's. Some Members opined that in deciding on an implementation approach, the key consideration was the provision of new housing supply in NENT within the shortest time. In response, the Administration assured members that it would duly consider all the comments received in PE3 before making a final decision on the implementation approach

#### Impacts on existing residents and farmers

13. Members noted that many villagers strongly requested that the implementation of the Proposal should not destroy their efforts in establishing their homes and community networks in NENT. There were concerns about the Administration's arrangements to cater for the affected villagers' requests for in-situ rehousing and retaining their current rural living environment if the proposed project was to proceed. Some Members and deputations in support of local agriculture and organic farming cautioned that the proposed Nature Park and the "Agricultural" zones under the RODPs might not be able to provide sufficient land to meet the needs of all the farmers to be affected. Furthermore, some farmers might not be willing to abandon their existing farmland and re-start their farming practices in new places.

14. While admitting that with the implementation of the Proposal, some farmers would not be able to continue their agricultural practices in-situ, the Administration advised that relevant Government departments would help identify land suitable for agricultural rehabilitation and assist in lining up interested farmers with landowners who were willing to lease out/sell their farmland to them. For local rehousing purpose, the Administration had reserved a site of about 3.2 ha in the Kwu Tung North NDA. Review on the existing compensation and rehousing arrangements was underway. In response to some members' concerns that some villagers were under threat of land acquisition by developers who had been acquiring and hoarding land in NENT, the Administration advised that the villagers should approach the Social Welfare Department or the Police for assistance.

#### Employment opportunities and economic development

15. Some Members were concerned about how the Administration would ensure that the industries in the proposed NENT NDAs would generate the 52 100 job opportunities to be provided and that the jobs were suitable for local residents, in particular the PRH residents who might not

be able to afford the cost for travelling to work across districts. At the Council meeting of 31 October 2012, a Member raised a written question on the types of the industry to be developed in the areas. Noting that the proposed NDAs would provide sites for special and high value-added industries, some DEV Panel members queried whether industry players' response to moving into the areas was only lukewarm. The Administration responded that while the "Special Industry" and "Commercial, Research and Development" sites in the proposed NDAs would provide half of the job opportunities, another half would be associated with the facilities supporting the residential developments in NENT NDAs, such as retail and community services. As it would take at least a decade to start the population intake in NENT NDAs, it was not practicable for the Administration to forecast at the juncture which industries would finally move into the areas. In response to a DEV Panel member's question on whether the proposed industrial areas would eventually be converted to sites for luxurious residential development, the Administration advised in the negative.

#### Other planning and design considerations

16. Members have raised questions at the Council meetings in December 2012 and July 2013 about the Administration's plan to provide community facilities such as schools, hospitals, policing facilities in tandem with the first population intake in the proposed NENT NDAs as well as the retail floor area to be made available to meet the pressing demand for shopping facilities arising from the increase in the number of visitors. Some DEV Panel members stressed the importance of sustainable development and balanced communities in the proposed NDAs. There were views urging the Administration to build the Northern Link early to strengthen the connectivity between the areas and other districts so as to cater for the transport needs of the future residents. The Administration replied that the planning of NENT NDAs was people-oriented. Provision of community facilities in the areas would be in line with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. The railway would be the main carrier under the external public transport strategy for the Kwu Tung North NDA. To reduce the transport need of residents, high-density residential zones would be centred within 500 metres of the proposed Kwu Tung North railway station.

17. The DEV Panel noted the comments of some NENT residents on the possible adverse impacts of the various proposals under the RODPs on the ecology and the natural environment. Examples of such proposals include the provision of Police training facilities, the extension to the

existing Shek Wu Hui Sewage Treatment Works as well as some road schemes. The Administration undertook that it would examine the comments in detail when considering the amendments to the RODPs.

#### Adequacy of public consultation on the development proposal

18. DEV Panel members noted that while some deputations had expressed support to the proposed development to cater for the need of housing and economic developments, some had raised objection to the Proposal and demanded "no removal, no demolition". Some residents alleged that many non-indigenous villagers in the areas to be affected by the Proposal were not aware of it and the impacts on them until a very late stage. They said that many people who had voiced their opinions in the PE exercises were not the affected residents. At a special meeting of FC to examine the Draft Estimates of Expenditure 2013-14 in April 2013, a member enquired whether the Administration would carry out a consultation afresh to engage the community in planning NENT NDAs. The Administration replied that subject to the progress of the Study, the Administration would determine whether and how further consultation would be conducted. It emphasized that under the statutory planning procedures, members of the public would have adequate channels to participate in the finalization of the plan for the proposed NENT NDAs.

#### Motion passed by the Panel on Development

19. At the special meeting of the DEV Panel on 15 December 2012, members passed a motion urging the Administration to, amongst others, withdraw the Proposal and immediately stop the misleading media campaign. In response to the motion, the Administration explained that since resuming in 2008, the Study had been at the forefront of various major studies on new development areas in terms of progress. The housing supply for the whole community would be seriously affected if the Proposal was withdrawn.

#### **Recent developments**

20. On 25 May 2013, eight Members, including Duty Roster Members handling the complaint against the Proposal lodged by affected residents,

accompanied by officials of the Development Bureau, conducted a site visit to NENT<sup>9</sup>.

21. CE stated in his 2013 Policy Address that the Administration was actively studying the possibility of appropriately increasing the development density and proportion of public housing, and was identifying sites for new Home Ownership Scheme flats in the proposed NENT NDAs. On 4 July 2013, the Administration published the PE3 Report and announced the revised development proposals for NENT NDAs. It will brief the Panel on the Report and the revised proposals at the meeting on 15 July 2013.

22. A list of relevant papers is at **Appendix III**.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
12 July 2013

---

<sup>9</sup> The relevant press releases issued by the LegCo Secretariat are at the following hyperlinks:  
<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/press/papers/pr20130520-1-e.pdf>;  
<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/press/papers/pr20130525-1-e.pdf>.

## Appendix I

### Development Themes, Major Land Uses and Key Development Parameters of NENT NDAs under the Recommended Outline Development Plans<sup>10</sup>

	<b>KTN NDA</b>	<b>FLN NDA</b>	<b>PC/TKL NDA</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Development Theme</b>	Mixed Development Node	Riverside Township	Quality Business/Residential Area	-
<b>Major Land Uses</b>	Residential; Commercial, Research & Development; Long Valley Nature Park	Residential; Government Facilities	Residential; Special Industry; Government Facilities	-
<b>Total Area (ha)</b>	450	166	171	787
<b>Developable Area<sup>(a)</sup> (ha) (% Total)</b>	251 (56%)	129 (78%)	153 (90%)	533 (68%)
<b>New Population<sup>(b)</sup></b>	81,900	52,100	17,600	151,600
<b>New Residential Units</b>	28,700	18,600	6,500	53,800
<b>Housing Mix (Public:Private)</b>	55:45	39:61	0:100	43:57
<b>Plot Ratio</b>	2 – 5	2 – 5	0.75 – 2.5	-
<b>Maximum Height</b>	35 storeys	35 storeys	10 storeys Special Industry: 35m	-
<b>Estimated Increase in Employment</b>	35,400	6,000	10,700	52,100

(a) Referring to areas with new developments on the RODPs, excluding areas zoned "Village Type Development", "Conservation Area", "Green Belt", "Agriculture" and "River Channel", as well as those already occupied by existing/committed developments which have to be retained in future.

(b) Excluding those in indigenous villages and existing/committed developments.

<sup>10</sup> Source: The Administration's paper for the meeting of the Panel on Development on 30 October 2012 (LC Paper No. CB(1)61/12-13(05))  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1030cb1-61-5-e.pdf>)

**Special meetings of the Panel on Development on 8 and 15 December 2012**

**North East New Territories New Development Areas Planning and Engineering Study ("the Study")**

**Summary of major views expressed by deputations  
and the Administration's responses**

<b>A. Supportive views</b>	
1.	The proposed North East New Territories ("NENT") New Development Areas ("NDAs") project could address the housing shortage problem, provide job opportunities, help promote economic and social developments in Hong Kong.
2.	The high property prices and rentals in the urban areas were not affordable to young people. The proposed project would provide housing units in NENT and help young people realize their dream of becoming a flat owner.
3.	The proposal to reserve land in the proposed NENT NDAs for developing the six industries where Hong Kong enjoyed clear advantages, special industry and high value-added industries etc. were welcomed.
4.	Development of special industries in the proposed NDAs would create more job opportunities.
5.	The NENT NDAs proposal ("the Proposal") would provide an opportunity for the Administration to reserve more land in NENT as "Agriculture" zones for farmers to practice wet agriculture as well as organic farming.

<b>A. Supportive views</b>	
6.	Following its implementation, the proposed project would improve the unsatisfactory living environment of the existing villages in the concerned areas.
7.	The views that the Administration was 'selling out Hong Kong' in developing NENT NDAs and that the proposed NDAs would become the 'back gardens of the Mainlanders' were groundless.

<b>B. Objecting views</b>		<b>Administration's responses</b>
1.	There was no imminent need for NENT NDAs due to slower population growth.	There would be an increase of 1.4 million people and 680 000 households in the coming 30 years, and a decline in the average household size (2.9 people per household in 2011 and projected to be 2.7 in 2031). It was necessary to exhaust every possible means to open up new land for development.
2.	The proposed project could not provide an immediate solution to meet the pressing housing demand as the first population intake in the NENT NDAs would not take place until 2022.	
3.	The Administration should first develop vacant land in the developed areas instead of proceeding with the proposed project.	There was 391.5 hectares of unleased or unallocated Government land in "Residential" and "Commercial/Residential" areas in Hong Kong. They included irregularly shaped sites which might not be suitable for housing development. Existing land immediately available for large scale housing development was limited.
4.	The proposed project would extinguish the non-indigenous villages and destroy the farming business in the concerned areas.	
5.	The Fanling golf course as well as the site of the Chief Executive's villas near the Kwu Tung North	
		Even if the land lots currently occupied by the golf course could be used for other purposes, the Administration would

<b>B. Objecting views</b>		<b>Administration's responses</b>
	NDA should be resumed and developed for providing housing, hence saving the need to develop NENT NDAs.	have to carry out a detailed feasibility study on the suitability of the site for high density development and conduct technical assessments. The use of the land lots in question could not replace the Proposal in terms of development schedule.
6.	The proposed project was intended for 'unification of Hong Kong and Shenzhen' and 'selling out Hong Kong'. The future NENT NDAs would be used as residential areas that served the rich Mainlanders. NENT NDAs would not become Hong Kong people's new towns.	NENT NDAs would be developed to be Hong Kong's people's new towns. The Administration had not proposed to integrate NENT with Shenzhen by opening up the boundary area. Building up a residential area for the Mainlanders was never a guiding principle for the proposed NDAs.
7.	Many villagers currently residing within the areas proposed for development had lodged strong objections to the Proposal. They demanded 'no removal, no demolition' and withdrawal of the proposed project. They would not accept any compensation and resettlement arrangements.	It was inevitable that some residents would be affected due to the implementation of the proposed project. The Administration would make appropriate rehousing and compensation arrangements for the affected residents.

<b>C. Other views</b>		<b>Administration's responses</b>
<u>Impacts on existing residents, compensation and rehousing</u>		
1.	The Administration should preserve the existing villages and their characters while improving the	The Administration was reviewing the existing compensation and rehousing arrangements having regard to the past

<b>C. Other views</b>	<b>Administration's responses</b>	
	experience in major public works projects with a view to working out more desirable compensation and rehousing arrangements for site clearance based on the premise that such arrangements were reasonable and sensible.	
2.		living environment. The Proposal should not lead to removal of villagers' ancestral graves/urns in some of the areas to be affected.
3.		The Administration should allow villagers to stay at areas near their homes and maintain their custom and social networks.
4.		There were concerns about the rehousing arrangements for affected residents who were not eligible for public housing.
5.		Moving the villagers to public housing estates might not be acceptable to the affected residents, in particular the elderly.
	The Administration should allow flexibilities in the compensation and rehousing arrangements. There were queries on whether affected villagers would be entitled to similar compensation arrangements as those for Choi Yuen Village and Chuk Yuen Village. The Administration should announce the details of the arrangements as soon as possible.	

<b>C. Other views</b>	<b>Administration's responses</b>
<u>Impacts on farmers and supply of agricultural land</u>	
6.	In view of the difficulties for farmers, especially the elderly ones, to rehabilitate their agricultural practices at new locations, they should be allowed to continue their agricultural practices in-situ.
7.	Farmers who were required to move to other places to continue their farming practices should be entitled to a reasonable amount of compensation and be allowed to start their farming practices in the new places prior to clearance of their existing farmland.
8.	The Administration should introduce measures to safeguard against damages to the existing farmland.
9.	To meet the shortage in residential land and to keep sufficient amount of land for agricultural purposes especially good quality farmland, priority should be given to re-planning existing brownfield sites, conversion of existing industrial buildings, rezoning the Government land within 'Village Type Development' zones and redevelopment of vacant schools.
<p>The relevant Government departments would help identify land suitable for agricultural rehabilitation and assist in lining up interested farmers with farmland owners who were interested in selling or leasing their land to them.</p> <p>Under the Recommended Outline Development Plans ("RODPs") for the proposed NENT NDAs, the core of Long Valley area was designated as a Nature Park where wet agriculture practice could be allowed. In addition, two pieces of land to the north and south of the Nature Park and a piece of land in Fu Tei Au in the Fanling North NDA would be maintained as 'Agriculture' zone, in which existing farming practice could continue.</p> <p>In terms of enhancing land supply, the Administration had continued to adopt a multi-pronged approach to meeting housing and other needs and building up a 'land reserve', including a number of studies for NDA development, such as the NENT NDAs planning and engineering study, as a way to open up land for development, and reviewing different land uses such as the uses of "Government, Institution or Community", Industrial and Green Belt sites. The Administration would consider rezoning land suitable for</p>	

<b>C. Other views</b>		<b>Administration's responses</b>
10.	The proposed Nature Park in Long Valley for wetland compensation was not appropriate due to its high ecological value. The planned 'Agriculture' zones in Fu Tei Au Village were occupied mostly by fish ponds and squatters, making it impossible to spare land for agricultural rehabilitation.	other uses, where appropriate, in order to effectively utilize brownfield sites. Among the current land uses in the proposed Hung Shui Kiu and Kwu Tung North NDAs, there were many open storages and rural workshops.
<u>Employment opportunities and economic development</u>		
11.	The Administration should provide sufficient employment opportunities in NENT NDAs so as to reduce cross-district employment and residents' travel expenses.	Job opportunities would be provided in the proposed industrial sites in the proposed NDAs and the facilities supporting the residential developments in NDAs, such as retail and community services.
12.	The proposed 'Special Industries Area' and 'Commercial, Research and Development Zone' in the proposed NDAs might not attract investors. Such industries should operate in the vacant industrial buildings rather than in NENT.	As it would take at least a decade to start the population intake in the proposed NENT NDAs, it was not practicable for the Administration to forecast at the juncture which industries would finally move into the areas.
13.	The Administration should capitalize the opportunities arising from the proximity of the proposed NDAs with the border area.	During the Stage 1 public engagement exercise, some considered that attention should be drawn to the long-term development of the whole Pearl River Delta, which included Hong Kong, when planning NENT NDAs. Therefore, when formulating the planning proposals for the NDAs, apart from

<b>C. Other views</b>		<b>Administration's responses</b>
14.	Local economic activities such as soy source factories, logistics industries, etc, should be allowed to continue their operations in the area.	providing housing land supply, the Administration also considered the strategic location of NDAs being in close proximity to the boundary district, which could provide land for the development of local industries.
<u>Development density and housing development</u>		
15.	The proposed density of private residential developments at the proposed NDAs was too low and it was expected that these developments were made for the rich.	The Administration would re-examine the development intensity and the proportion of public housing in the proposed NENT NDAs. Most of the low-density development areas were designated in the Ping Che/Ta Kwu Ling NDA as there would be a lack of railway transportation in the area.
16.	The proposed NENT NDAs should be mainly for public housing and the proportion of such should be adjusted upward.	
17.	At least half of the land in the proposed NENT NDAs should be set aside for the implementation of the 'Hong Kong properties for Hong Kong people' ("HKPHKP") policy.	The Administration was prepared to apply the HKPHKP policy to the private housing sites in the proposed NDAs, taking into account the real estate market situation and other considerations at the time of land sale.
<u>Community and transport facilities</u>		
18.	The Administration should prudently plan NENT NDAs by providing supporting facilities and employment opportunities in a timely manner and not to repeat the experience of Tin Shui Wai.	The planning of NENT NDAs was people-oriented. Employment opportunities will be provided. Provision of community facilities and open spaces in the area would be in line with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines.

<b>C. Other views</b>		<b>Administration's responses</b>
19.	The Administration should enhance connectivity between the proposed NENT NDAs and the urban areas.	The proposed NENT NDAs project would follow the railway-based development approach. The population would be concentrated near the proposed railway station.
20.	The proposed Northern Link should be implemented as early as possible to complement the proposed NENT NDAs project and to divert the patronage from the East Rail Line.	The Highways Department was conducting a study to review and update the Railway Development Strategy 2000. The Civil Engineering and Development Department would maintain close liaison with the Highways Department to explore the suggestion of enhancing the railway network to connect the proposed NENT NDAs.
<u>Implementation approach</u>		
21.	The Conventional New Town Approach ("CNTA") could protect squatter residents and farmers from being forced to move out due to land acquisition by private developers. It would help to make sure the whole project would be accomplished on schedule, and the public and recreational facilities would be provided at an appropriate time to align with the schedule for housing developments. The Private-sector Participation Approach ("PSPA") was in favour of the interest of developers.	The Administration would duly consider all the comments received in the Stage three public engagement before making a final decision on the implementation approach

<b>C. Other views</b>		<b>Administration's responses</b>
22.	If CNTA was to be adopted, the Proposal would involve an estimated cost of \$40 billion for resuming private land. This might facilitate the collusion between the business sector and the Government.	
23.	PSPA could speed up the project since many land lots located at the proposed NDAs were ready for immediate development.	
24.	Land resumption under CNTA might have adverse impact on landowners and developers who wished to pursue their own development plans in NENT.	
25.	To make land resumption more efficient, the Administration should issue land exchange entitlements to affected landowners.	
26.	The Administration should ensure the implementation process to be fair and transparent.	
<u>Public engagement</u>		
27.	Many residents, in particular non-indigenous villagers ("non-IVs"), were aware of the Proposal and its impact on them at a very late stage. The	Subject to the progress of the planning and engineering study, the Administration would determine whether and how further consultation would be conducted. Under the statutory

<b>C. Other views</b>		<b>Administration's responses</b>
	Administration should consult not only District Councilors or the village representatives, as their views did not represent the views of all the residents. The Administration should take into account the views of both IVs and non-IVs in its planning process.	planning procedures, members of the public would have adequate channels to participate in the finalization of the development plan for NENT NDAs.
28.	The Administration should take the initiative to contact the residents to be affected by the project, have face-to-face communication with them, and consult each and every household in the villages. A task force should be set up to liaise with affected parties, providing them with information on land resumption, compensation and rehousing issues.	
29.	The Administration had not genuinely given public the right to know the Proposal and fully express their views on it. It had neither responded to all the queries and concerns raised by the public regarding the Proposal. The Administration should re-launch the consultation to fully engage the community in planning NENT NDAs.	

## Appendix III

### New Development Areas in North East New Territories

#### List of relevant papers

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Panel on Development	26 February 2008	<p>Administration's paper on "North East New Territories New Development Areas -- Planning and Engineering Study" (LC Paper No. CB(1)860/07-08(03))  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/papers/dev0226cb1-860-3-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/papers/dev0226cb1-860-3-e.pdf</a></p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1276/07-08)  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/minutes/de080226.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/minutes/de080226.pdf</a></p>
Public Works Subcommittee	23 April 2008	<p>PWSC(2008-09)2 on the funding proposal on "Review studies on North East New Territories New Development Areas: consultants' fees and site investigation"  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/fc/pwsc/papers/p08-02e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/fc/pwsc/papers/p08-02e.pdf</a></p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. PWSC93/07-08)  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/fc/pwsc/minutes/pw080423.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/fc/pwsc/minutes/pw080423.pdf</a></p>
Finance Committee	9 May 2008	<p>FCR(2008-09)7 on "Recommendations of the Public Works Subcommittee made at its meeting held on 23 April 2008"  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/fc/fc/papers/f08-07e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/fc/fc/papers/f08-07e.pdf</a></p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. FC12/08-09)  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/fc/fc/minutes/fc080509.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/fc/fc/minutes/fc080509.pdf</a></p>

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Panel on Development	25 November 2008	<p>Administration's paper on "North East New Territories New Development Areas -- Planning and Engineering Study -- Stage One Public Engagement" (LC Paper No. CB(1)232/08-09(12))  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1125cb1-232-12-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1125cb1-232-12-e.pdf</a></p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)817/08-09)  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20081125.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20081125.pdf</a></p>
Panel on Development	24 November 2009	<p>Administration's paper on "North East New Territories New Development Areas -- Planning and Engineering Study -- Stage Two Public Engagement" (LC Paper No. CB(1)396/09-10(09))  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1124cb1-396-9-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1124cb1-396-9-e.pdf</a></p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1124/09-10)  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20091124.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20091124.pdf</a></p>
Panel on Development	28 June 2012	<p>Administration's paper on "North East New Territories New Development Areas -- Planning and Engineering Study -- Recommended Outline Development Plans and Stage Three Public Engagement" (LC Paper No. CB(1)2207/11-12(03))  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr11-12/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0628cb1-2207-3-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr11-12/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0628cb1-2207-3-e.pdf</a></p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2599/11-12)  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr11-12/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20120628.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr11-12/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20120628.pdf</a></p>

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Council Meeting	11 July 2012	<p>Hansard -- written question (No. 10) on "North East New Territories New Development Areas Planning and Engineering Study" (p.18516 - p.18521)</p> <p><a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr11-12/english/cou_nmtg/hansard/cm0711-translate-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr11-12/english/cou_nmtg/hansard/cm0711-translate-e.pdf</a></p>
Council Meeting	17 October 2012	<p>Written question (No. 16) on "Land reserve and land supply" (p.164 - p.174)</p> <p><a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/cou_nmtg/hansard/cm1017-translate-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/cou_nmtg/hansard/cm1017-translate-e.pdf</a></p> <p>Written question (No. 18) on "Land for residential development" (p.178 - p.181)</p> <p><a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/cou_nmtg/hansard/cm1017-translate-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/cou_nmtg/hansard/cm1017-translate-e.pdf</a></p>
Council Meeting	24 October 2012	<p>Oral question (No. 2) on "Developing new development areas" (the main question and the Administration's main reply) (p.544 - p.556)</p> <p><a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/cou_nmtg/hansard/cm1024-translate-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/cou_nmtg/hansard/cm1024-translate-e.pdf</a></p>
Council Meeting	24 October 2012	<p>Motion on "North East New Territories New Development Areas Planning and Engineering Study" and amendments to the motion</p> <p><a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/cou_nmtg/motion/cm20121024m1.htm">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/cou_nmtg/motion/cm20121024m1.htm</a></p>
Panel on Development	30 October 2012	<p>Administration's paper on "North East New Territories New Development Areas Planning and Engineering Study -- Public comments received from Stage 3 Public Engagement" (LC Paper No. CB(1)61/12-13(05))</p> <p><a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1030cb1-61-5-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1030cb1-61-5-e.pdf</a></p>

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
		<p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)288/12-13)  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20121030.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20121030.pdf</a></p> <p>Administration's follow-up response to the meeting of 30 October 2012 on "North East New Territories New Development Areas Planning and Engineering Study" (LC Paper No. CB(1)203/12-13(01))  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1030cb1-203-1-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1030cb1-203-1-e.pdf</a></p>
Council Meeting	31 October 2012	<p>Written question (No. 8) on "Residential development in the North East New Territories New Development Areas" (p.1061 - p.1066)  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/councilmtg/hansard/cm1031-translate-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/councilmtg/hansard/cm1031-translate-e.pdf</a></p>
Council Meeting	5 December 2012	<p>Written question (No. 15) on "North East New Territories New Development Areas" (p.3074 - p.3076)  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/councilmtg/hansard/cm1205-translate-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/councilmtg/hansard/cm1205-translate-e.pdf</a></p>
Panel on Development	8 December 2012	<p>The Panel discussed with the Administration and deputations on the subject of "North East New Territories New Development Areas Planning and Engineering Study"  <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/agenda/dev20121208.htm">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/agenda/dev20121208.htm</a></p>
Panel on Development	15 December 2012	<p>The Panel discussed with the Administration and deputations on the subject of "North East New Territories New Development Areas Planning and Engineering Study"</p>

<b>Council/Committee</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Paper</b>
		<p><a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/agenda/dev20121215.htm">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/agenda/dev20121215.htm</a></p> <p>Administration's follow-up response to the motion passed on "North East New Territories New Development Areas Planning and Engineering Study" at the meeting on 15 December 2012 (LC Paper No. CB(1)412/12-13(01))</p> <p><a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1215cb1-412-1-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/papers/dev1215cb1-412-1-e.pdf</a></p>
Panel on Development	22 January 2013	<p>Administration's paper on "2013 Policy Address -- Policy Initiatives of Development Bureau" (LC Paper No. CB(1)428/12-13(03))</p> <p><a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0122cb1-428-3-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/papers/dev0122cb1-428-3-e.pdf</a></p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)735/12-13)</p> <p><a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20130122.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr12-13/english/panels/dev/minutes/dev20130122.pdf</a></p>
Council Meeting	3 July 2013	<p>Oral question (No. 2) on "Increasing retail facilities and floor area" (the main question and the Administration's main reply)</p> <p><a href="http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/201307/03/P201307030216.htm">http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/201307/03/P201307030216.htm</a></p>