

Land Use Proposal of San Tin Technopole

Public Engagement Report

February 2024





土木工程拓展署
Civil Engineering and Development Department
North Development Office



規劃署
Planning Department

Land Use Proposal of San Tin Technopole

Public Engagement Report

February 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction1**
 - 1.1 Background1
- 2. Summary of Public Engagement Activities2**
 - 2.1 Project Website and Leaflet2
 - 2.2 Roving Exhibitions and Mobile Exhibition Centre2
 - 2.3 Briefing Sessions.....2
 - 2.4 Written Submissions Received.....2
- 3. Overview of Public Comments3**
- 4. I&T Development4**
 - 4.1 Summary of Comments.....4
 - 4.2 Summary of Responses to Comments5
- 5. Land Use Planning and Urban Design7**
 - 5.1 Summary of Comments.....7
 - 5.2 Summary of Responses to Comments8
- 6. Transport and Infrastructure 11**
 - 6.1 Summary of Comments..... 11
 - 6.2 Summary of Responses to Comments 12
- 7. Environment, Ecology and Landscape 13**
 - 7.1 Summary of Comments..... 13
 - 7.2 Summary of Responses to Comments 15
- 8. Implementation Arrangement..... 17**
 - 8.1 Summary of Comments..... 17
 - 8.2 Summary of Response to Comments 19
- 9. Way Forward 21**

Appendices

- Appendix A List of Exhibitions
- Appendix B List of Briefing Sessions

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 In September 2019, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and the Planning Department (PlanD) jointly commissioned a Feasibility Study on the first phase development of New Territories North, with the aim to formulate a Preliminary Outline Development Plan for the San Tin / Lok Ma Chau (STLMC) Development Node. An Initial Land Use Plan for the STLMC area was presented to the Legislative Council in mid-2021. In October 2021, CEDD and PlanD jointly commissioned an Investigation Study to expand the development area in STLMC and formulate a Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP), taking into account the plan for San Tin Technopole in the Northern Metropolis Development Strategy announced in the context of the 2021 Policy Address.
- 1.1.2 San Tin Technopole covers the Hong Kong-Shenzhen Innovation and Technology Park (HSITP) at the Loop and STLMC area. As HSITP is already under construction, the RODP covers the area outside the Loop. On 23 May 2023, the Panel on Development of the Legislative Council was briefed on the RODP. A 2-month public engagement (PE) was conducted from 6 June to 5 August 2023 (PE period) to solicit public views on the RODP.

2. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

2.1 Project Website and Leaflet

2.1.1 To ensure effective dissemination of information related to San Tin Technopole, a project website (<https://www.nm-santintech.hk>) has been launched. Within the PE period, the project website recorded a hit rate of over 6,000.

2.1.2 The project website includes a study overview, land use proposal, key planning features, implementation arrangement and an information centre. In addition, the project website provides up-to-date PE activities during the PE period, including the schedule of roving exhibitions and briefing sessions conducted. It also includes photographs taken during exhibitions and selected briefing sessions, and relevant papers presented to statutory bodies.

2.1.3 The Study Team also delivered the leaflet on San Tin Technopole to more than 4,300 mailboxes / addresses within and around the project area through the postal circular service, with a view to distributing project information to villagers / residents and operators in the area.

2.2 Roving Exhibitions and Mobile Exhibition Centre

2.2.1 The Study Team conducted seven roving exhibitions in Hong Kong (HK) and Shenzhen (SZ), and arranged mobile exhibition centre during the PE period. About 40,000 visitors were recorded at the roving exhibitions conducted within the PE period. Details of these exhibitions are summarised in **Appendix A**.

2.3 Briefing Sessions

2.3.1 During the PE period, a total of 13 briefings sessions / meetings were conducted. Apart from consulting various statutory and advisory bodies (including Town Planning Board, Sub-committee on Planning, Land and Conservation under the Advisory Committee on the Northern Metropolis, Planning Sub-committee of the Land and Development Advisory Committee, Yuen Long District Council and Heung Yee Kuk), the Study Team met the innovation and technology (I&T) sector, professional institutes and green groups. Briefing sessions were also arranged for local stakeholders with a total of over 500 attendees, including San Tin Rural Committee, villagers, operators and owners of affected brownfields, fishponds, agricultural / livestock farms. Details of these briefing sessions are summarised in **Appendix B**.

2.4 Written Submissions Received

2.4.1 During the PE period, a total of 174 written comments were received. Among them, 24 comments were from groups or organisations (including advisory body, professional institutes, think tanks, business sector, green groups and concern groups, etc.).

3. OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

- 3.1.1 The project was generally welcomed as a flagship project in the Northern Metropolis (NM) supporting the development of Hong Kong as an international I&T centre in future. Organisations including Yuen Long District Council and Heung Yee Kuk expressed support for the San Tin Technopole project. The media reports and news commentaries on the project were generally positive¹.
- 3.1.2 Comments collected during PE, including the written comments and views/suggestions raised in the briefing sessions, can be categorised into five aspects, namely (1) I&T development; (2) land use planning and urban design; (3) transport and infrastructure; (4) environment, ecology and landscape; and (5) implementation arrangement. Among the 174 written comments, about 10% touch on I&T development, about 30% on land use planning and urban design, about 10% on transport and infrastructure, about 80% on environment, ecology and landscape, and about 20% on implementation arrangement (some comments touch on more than one aspect).
- 3.1.3 A summary of comments and responses for each aspect are presented in Sections 4 to 8.

¹ The analysis of media reports and news commentaries was from 23 May 2023 (i.e. the briefing to the Panel on Development of the Legislative Council on the RODP of San Tin Technopole) until completion of the PE exercise on 5 August 2023.

4. I&T DEVELOPMENT

4.1 Summary of Comments

(a) Economic Positioning of I&T Park and HK-SZ Collaboration

- 4.1.1 Those who commented generally welcomed the development of the NM into a “new international I&T city” as well as the positioning of San Tin Technopole as a hub for clustered I&T development that would create synergy with the SZ I&T Zone, thereby supporting HK’s long-term I&T development and economic growth. Some considered that the strategic location of San Tin Technopole would facilitate further collaboration between HK and SZ while enhancing integration of HK into the Greater Bay Area (GBA).
- 4.1.2 Some considered that the role and positioning of San Tin Technopole as a hub for I&T development should be clearly defined, and differentiated from other I&T development areas in SZ and HK (such as HK Science Park, Cyberport and the proposed Ma Liu Shui reclamation) to achieve complementarity and avoid competition. Some suggested fostering collaboration between HK and SZ under the existing policies and mechanism.
- 4.1.3 Some pointed out the need to reactivate the manufacturing sector for HK’s sustainable growth, and that the I&T Park could provide land for downstream manufacturing. The presence of a manufacturing base would also be essential to create a complete I&T ecosystem and contribute to the success of the I&T Park.
- 4.1.4 Some suggested that there should be closer collaboration between the I&T Park and local universities with a view to creating synergy among the I&T industry, academia and research institutes. For example, land could be reserved for universities to set up research centres or laboratories, while consideration could be given to promoting commercialisation so as to provide opportunities for universities to apply their research findings.

(b) Demand for I&T Land

- 4.1.5 The Government’s initiative to increase land supply for I&T development was generally supported as the vast amount of I&T land in San Tin Technopole could attract I&T enterprises to complement HK’s strong research and development (R&D) capabilities and nurture a comprehensive I&T ecosystem.
- 4.1.6 Some considered that I&T land requirement should be policy-driven based on a thorough understanding of the needs of the I&T industry. Some asked for further elaboration of the basis for reserving about 300 hectares (ha) and 7 million square meters (m²) of gross floor area (GFA) for I&T development, and articulation of the industries and companies being targeted. Some opined that the area of the SZ I&T Zone might not be a good reference for San Tin Technopole given the difference in contexts of I&T development in the two places.

(c) Planning Details of I&T Park

- 4.1.7 It was generally recognised that adequate land use flexibility should be built in to meet the ever-changing I&T needs. Some considered that there should be restriction on the development parameters and urban design guidelines to govern future development. Some worried that the “flexi-zoning” concept might deprive the area of planning control on building height, open space network, etc. which appeared necessary given the proximity of the I&T Park to the ecologically sensitive wetlands and fishponds.
- 4.1.8 Some considered that more details should be provided on the plan for the I&T land, such as the types of I&T uses, development parameters and provision of facilities and digital infrastructure (e.g. data centres and 5G/6G network) needed for smart city development (e.g. autonomous vehicles).
- 4.1.9 Apart from I&T uses and talent accommodation, some suggested that a wider spectrum of supporting facilities, such as shops and services, hotel, recreational use and other community facilities including international school, could be considered to realise the “live, work, play and

learn” concept within a 15-minute neighbourhood, cultivate networking and clustering effects, and create a world-class I&T community with critical mass in San Tin Technopole.

- 4.1.10 Some suggested that more talent accommodation units (than the assumed 6,400) could be provided in San Tin Technopole. Some cautioned that the provision of talent accommodation should not lead to a change in focus of the area from I&T development to property development.
- 4.1.11 In terms of development intensity, there were views that the proposed maximum plot ratio (PR) 6 for I&T land was excessive, emphasising the need for quality design like that of the HK Science Park (PR 2.5), the low-rise character of similar I&T developments in other places, and the incompatibility of such high PR with the ecological environment and wetland setting to the northwest and the nearby villages.
- 4.1.12 Some suggested that more sizeable I&T land parcel should be created, while some opined that the land parcels for I&T use could be further sub-divided. Some considered the I&T land parcels around Chau Tau and Pang Loon Tei small and scattered.

(d) Land Disposal Mechanism

- 4.1.13 The possibility of land disposal by diversified means other than open tender taking into account the industry-specific policy of the Innovation, Technology and Industry Bureau (ITIB) was generally supported.
- 4.1.14 Some considered that the land disposal mechanism should be fair and transparent to ensure that all parties would have equal chance to participate in the I&T development of San Tin Technopole, and if such a mechanism could be smoothly implemented, it might apply to land for other industries in HK.

(e) Other Comments

- 4.1.15 Apart from increasing I&T land supply, the Study Team received other general comments on how the Government could promote I&T development in HK. Suggestions included formulating a proactive economic development strategy and industrial policy to support HK’s development into a “new international I&T city”, allocating adequate resources to support the local I&T industries and nurture local young talents, providing incentives to attract I&T enterprise investment at San Tin Technopole like direct land grant, concessionary land premium and simple land lease conditions, setting up a high-level body to provide one-stop investment attraction services, and formulating policies and flexible mechanism to facilitate talent entry and cross-boundary transfer of data, product samples, workers, payment/fund, etc.

4.2 Summary of Responses to Comments

- 4.2.1 The National 14th Five-Year Plan supports HK to develop into an international I&T centre. The 2022 Policy Address also highlights that I&T would provide key impetus for HK’s high-quality economic development. The HK I&T Development Blueprint (I&T Blueprint) promulgated in December 2022 has set out a clear development path and strategic planning for HK’s I&T development over the next 5 to 10 years under four broad development directions and eight major strategies. The I&T Blueprint has identified I&T fields of strategic value that HK should pursue, including life and health technology, artificial intelligence and data science, advanced manufacturing and new energy technology industries.
- 4.2.2 It is recognised in the I&T Blueprint that the supply of land for I&T development in the past might not be able to fully meet the rising demand arising from I&T development, particularly that space is required for midstream and downstream activities including new industrialisation and advanced manufacturing. Moreover, the occupancy rate of the existing I&T developments in HK, such as HK Science Park, Cyberport and InnoParks in Yuen Long, Tseung Kwan O and Tai Po, has already reached almost 90%, accentuating the needs for more I&T land to facilitate and sustain future I&T development. San Tin Technopole is a flagship project bringing forth new land supply at a strategic location for I&T development.

- 4.2.3 Located at the heart of NM and in close proximity to SZ I&T Zone in Huanggang and Futian, San Tin Technopole is strategically positioned to be a hub for clustered I&T development that creates synergy with SZ I&T Zone contributing to the I&T development in HK and the development of the South-North dual engine (finance – I&T). It could provide a platform to foster innovation, collaboration and technological advancement, driving the development of an international I&T hub in the GBA.
- 4.2.4 In parallel with the formulation of the RODP, ITIB has commenced a consultancy study with a view to recommending specific I&T areas / sectors to be developed on various land parcels in San Tin Technopole, the infrastructures and facilities required, as well as the development and financing mode. The study will also look into the suitable implementation mechanism and possible land disposal arrangement for the I&T land. Findings of the consultancy study will be available by 2024.
- 4.2.5 On land use planning front, our intention is to provide maximum flexibility for uses of different I&T fields and different stages of I&T value chain (including R&D, product development, mass production), talent accommodation and other supporting facilities (including commercial and retail facilities) so as to nurture a complete I&T ecosystem, by formulating a wider range of permitted uses which are compatible with one another under the zoning of I&T land.
- 4.2.6 While flexibility will be provided for the future I&T development, we would be mindful of the need to stipulate necessary development control to ensure that the planning intention for I&T development would not be compromised. Key development parameters such as development intensity, building height, and non-building area (NBA) restriction for preserving birds' flight corridors or air paths, and stepped height profile to ensure design harmony with the wetland setting and adjacent villages, will be imposed through statutory means (e.g. on statutory outline zoning plan) and/or administrative means (e.g. on departmental outline development plan, land grant conditions, contractual documents with land users) as appropriate in order to regulate the use of land.
- 4.2.7 The proposed PR of 6 is the maximum allowed in San Tin Technopole, and will only be adopted at suitable I&T sites mainly at the southeastern part of San Tin Technopole abutting Ki Lun Shan and Ngau Tam Shan. For the I&T sites which are in close proximity to the proposed Sam Po Shue Wetland Conservation Park (WCP) and traditional villages, lower development intensity will be adopted to ensure design harmony.
- 4.2.8 Regarding the comments on the size of certain I&T land parcels, it should be noted that I&T land of varying sizes are proposed on the RODP with the intention to provide flexibility for future allocation of land for I&T facilities of different scales (start-ups, leading tech firms) and purposes.
- 4.2.9 The Study has assumed 6,400 talent accommodation units within the I&T Park for technical assessments. The actual number of talent accommodation units to be provided would make reference to it but will also be contingent on the nature, scale, operational and business needs of the prospective tech firms.
- 4.2.10 Other complementary uses and living support for I&T workers like retail, dining and open space have been planned in the San Tin Town Centre and are also allowed on I&T land under "flexi-zoning". Further cultural and recreational facilities and Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities will be available in the San Tin Town Centre.
- 4.2.11 Comments and suggestions on land disposal mechanism and industrial policy formulation are noted.

5. LAND USE PLANNING AND URBAN DESIGN

5.1 Summary of Comments

(a) *Urban-Rural Integration*

- 5.1.1 The concept of urban-rural integration in the planning of San Tin Technopole was well received. Nonetheless, there were different views on how such concept should be realised and enhanced through the RODP, including:
- incorporating the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zones into the RODP and taking into account the need of villages when planning their neighbouring uses;
 - improving some dilapidated environment, facilities and infrastructure in existing villages;
 - respecting the development rights of indigenous villagers and sustaining the continuity of villages by reserving land for village expansion; and
 - addressing possible incompatibility of the proposed high-density developments through stepped building height and gradual transition of development intensity; setting back high-rise developments from villages and reserving buffer areas to ensure the proposed development would be responsive to the site context and reduce visual impact; preserving village character; and ensuring landscape and visual coherency through roadside landscape.
- 5.1.2 Some suggested allowing the development of multi-storey Small House (丁廈) to address the housing needs of indigenous villagers and to develop the village areas.
- 5.1.3 Some were concerned that the proposed I&T Park around Chau Tau village was too close to the village, bringing visual, air circulation and air quality impacts. Some suggested providing buffer (with playground, carpark, etc. for villagers) between the village and the proposed I&T Park. Suggestions to retain some village houses in Chau Tau were also received.
- 5.1.4 Some considered that the existing cultural and heritage resources should be preserved to bring uniqueness to San Tin Technopole, and suggested conducting cultural and heritage surveys to identify buildings and artefacts with historical values for preservation. There were requests from local villagers to preserve Tin Hau Temple (天后宮), Fuk Tak Temple (福德廟) and Heroes Temple (英雄古廟) of Mai Po Lung Village, and to retain some existing ancient shrines, ancestral graves, *fung shui* trees, etc.
- 5.1.5 Some considered that the boundary of San Tin Technopole was artificially drawn without respecting natural features. There were suggestions that the northwestern boundary should follow the existing fish pond bunds, and that there should be design harmony between the I&T Park and the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP.
- 5.1.6 On agriculture, some considered that the 7 ha land originally proposed for agricultural use on the Initial Land Use Plan presented to the Legislative Council in mid-2021 should be retained. Some opined that the existing farmland in the area should be retained to enrich the future townscape of San Tin Technopole and enable the younger generation to appreciate the agricultural history of San Tin.

(b) *Housing Split*

- 5.1.7 Some pointed out that the proposed public to private housing split of 70:30 might not be able to suit the future housing needs of high end I&T workers and might trigger more traffic trips for cross-district commuting to work.

(c) Provision of GIC Facilities

- 5.1.8 Some considered that the planning of GIC facilities should cater for local needs based on the age profile of the planned population and avoid over-dependence on provisions from other districts.
- 5.1.9 For the proposed cultural and recreational complex, while some cast doubt on its need in view of the large number of existing / planned cultural facilities in West Kowloon and East Kowloon, some welcomed it as it could serve the wider population of NM and strengthen the uniqueness of San Tin Technopole. Some comments pointed out that the complex was located relatively far from the proposed railway stations.

(d) Urban Design Concepts

- 5.1.10 The proposed urban design concepts including 15-minute neighbourhood and blue-green network were generally supported. Comments are mainly interested in how such concepts could be realised to nurture a unique identity for San Tin Technopole, and how it could benefit the villagers therein.
- 5.1.11 Concerning blue-green network, there were suggestions to retain some existing fishponds in San Tin Technopole as water bodies in public open space, and existing trees and landscape should be conserved. Such subtle infiltration of natural ecosystem in the urban area could help shape a community with strong identity and liveability.
- 5.1.12 There were suggestions in further enhancing the living and working environment of San Tin Technopole, such as promoting blue coverage and green plot ratio, providing greenery at different levels of buildings to maximise greenery coverage with reference to overseas examples in Japan (e.g. specification for greenery coverage area) and Singapore (e.g. walkable green roof of buildings), etc.

5.2 Summary of Responses to Comments

- 5.2.1 The planning and design of San Tin Technopole fully embraces the concept of urban-rural integration. The planning intention is to preserve the existing “V” zones. Through the development of the surrounding areas, the villagers would benefit from the comprehensively planned GIC facilities, open space, cultural facilities and improved transport connectivity (road, railway and public transportation, pedestrian and cycling networks) and enhanced infrastructure services (including drainage and sewage treatment, etc.).
- 5.2.2 To achieve design harmony between the villages and neighbouring developments, suitable open space or amenities have been proposed in the peripheral area of the “V” zones where appropriate. Lower development intensity would be adopted for the neighbouring I&T development taking into account the adjoining villages. Breezeways to promote wind penetration to the villages have been incorporated throughout the development area. To better reflect the spatial relationship between the villages and new development, the “V” zones adjoining the development will be shown on the Revised RODP.
- 5.2.3 Regarding the suggestions on village expansion and developing multi-storey Small House, it should be noted that sufficient land is still available within the “V” zones concerned to cater for outstanding Small House applications. The proposal of multi-storey Small House is a major policy change from the existing Small House Policy and has significant implications that extend beyond the San Tin Technopole development. There are also diverse views in the community. The matter requires prudent consideration outside the context of the proposed development.
- 5.2.4 The Government will continue to consider how best to improve the village environment and facilities, and to communicate with the local villagers in this regard.
- 5.2.5 As regards the potential development impacts on Chau Tau village, technical assessments have been conducted and confirmed that the RODP would not result in unacceptable environmental or visual impacts. An NBA has been designated to facilitate wind penetration in and out of Chau Tau village. The new road and amenity strip franking the southern boundary of the concerned “V” zone could serve as a buffer between the village and the

- proposed I&T Park. The open space and public car park planned nearby will benefit both the future residents and surrounding villages. Consideration is being given to retaining some village houses which are in close proximity to the “V” zone concerned, subject to technical assessments.
- 5.2.6 The adjoining “V” zones are preserved, as are all historic buildings and structures therein. As part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment has been conducted and confirmed that the Project would not bring significant adverse impact on known or potential cultural heritage resources in the area.
- 5.2.7 The aforementioned Tin Hau Temple, Fuk Tak Temple and Heroes Temple are not Declared Monuments or graded historic buildings. Neither are they within the “List of 1,444 historic Buildings in Building Assessment”, nor “List of New Items for Grading Assessment with Assessment Results” published by the Antiquities Advisory Board. Nevertheless, we will explore the feasibility of relocating these temples (in whole or in part) to suitable location(s) in future in consultation with relevant Government bureaux / departments.
- 5.2.8 About 7 ha of farmland was originally proposed to be retained on the Initial Land Use Plan in 2021. However, there were views then that queried the need for such agricultural land in the central part of the new development area and considered it incompatible with the overall positioning and land use planning of the area. To optimise the land resources, there were suggestions then to include the aforesaid farmland, which is within 500m from the proposed San Tin Station, for development on the RODP. The site is now planned for a cultural and recreational complex and open space. The Government just released the Blueprint for the Sustainable Development of Agriculture and Fisheries, proposing to designate Agricultural Priority Areas, implement Agricultural Park Phase 2 and put forward measures for urban farming and leisure farming, which are beneficial to promoting local agricultural development.
- 5.2.9 We will propose revision to the Town Planning Board’s Definition of Terms used in the Statutory Plans for ‘Open Space’ to include urban farm to the effect that urban farm proposed and supported by relevant bureau / department can be integrated into open space. With 55 ha of open space earmarked for San Tin Technopole, this approach can allow more space that is close to people’s daily lives to be reserved for urban farm. Under this approach, we would not need the originally proposed designated zoning of 2,000 m² of land as “Urban Farm” in the southern part of San Tin Technopole. The site can be incorporated as part of the wider “Open Space” (“O”).
- 5.2.10 The public to private housing split of 70:30 has made reference to the 10-year housing supply target of the Long Term Housing Strategy. It is adopted as a planning assumption for estimating the land requirement and conducting technical assessments for New Development Areas (NDAs) at this stage. The actual allocation of land for public or private housing use will be determined at due course, taking into account the prevailing policies, the housing supply and demand, and other relevant factors at that time. The RODP as well as infrastructural planning and provision have built in flexibility for adjusting the housing split if needed.
- 5.2.11 GIC facilities have been planned in San Tin Technopole in accordance with the HK Planning Standards and Guidelines and in consultation with relevant bureaux / departments. To realise the 15-minute neighbourhood concept, the siting of GIC facilities has taken due consideration of the locations of the preserved villages and future population clusters. A comprehensive and comfortable pedestrian and cycling network has also been planned to enable the villagers and future residents to reach the GIC facilities for daily necessities and major transport facilities within 15 minutes on foot or by cycling.
- 5.2.12 The cultural and recreational complex would be a landmark development in the NM that would not only cater for the community needs, but also support HK’s role as an East-meets-West centre for international cultural exchange.

- 5.2.13 San Tin Technopole features a comprehensive blue-green network, comprising revitalised drainage channels, wetland, retention ponds, open space and knolls, which would create ecological linkages within San Tin Technopole. Soft transition from the I&T Park to the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP would be ensured through the designation of a 35m-wide NBA as a landscape buffer with provision of passive recreational activities along the project boundary.
- 5.2.14 Suggestions on urban design of San Tin Technopole are noted and would be considered in the next stage of the Project.

6. TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

6.1 Summary of Comments

(a) Road and Railway Networks

- 6.1.1 Those who commented generally concurred with the need for strategic transport infrastructure to support the proposed development.
- 6.1.2 There were concerns about the traffic condition in the Northwest New Territories given that some road links and junctions in the region appeared to be saturated with traffic during peak hours, and it was anticipated that the proposed development would worsen the situation.
- 6.1.3 Noting that San Tin Technopole would be connected to the future NM Highway, some were concerned if the implementation programme of NM Highway would match with the proposed development. Some opined that with a number of road infrastructure projects being implemented at similar timeline (such as Route 11 and NM Highway), the Government should plan ahead these projects to ensure adequate resources for their orderly implementation.
- 6.1.4 Some comments were concerned about the inadequate public transport provision (with three railway stations) to serve the entire San Tin Technopole with over 600 ha. Some raised concern that the commissioning year of the proposed Northern Link (NOL) Main Line in 2034 could not match with the target first population intake in 2031.
- 6.1.5 Some suggested providing feeder service to supplement the pedestrian and cycling networks, while some proposed green public transport in San Tin Technopole to reduce the potential transport-induced environmental impacts and carbon emission. Some villagers requested more accessible public transport to the village area.
- 6.1.6 Specific comments on railway lines were also received. For the proposed NOL Spur Line, in view of the uncertainty in its implementation programme, some suggested constructing a new railway station on the existing Lok Ma Chau Spur Line. Some questioned about the location of the proposed railway station near Chau Tau which was not at the central part of I&T Park, and suggested realigning the proposed NOL Spur Line to serve more I&T sites while providing more railway stations to serve the wider catchment area. Some suggested putting the proposed railway station at the fringe of the I&T Park, and implementing transit-oriented development to energise the I&T Park and realise the 15-minute neighbourhood concept. There were also suggestions on how the railway station near Chau Tau should be named.
- 6.1.7 As for cross-boundary connection, some comments highlighted the importance of a more direct and integrated domestic and cross-boundary transport infrastructure system to facilitate further integration of HK and SZ. Some were concerned about how the proposed transport infrastructure could facilitate the external connection of San Tin Technopole with SZ I&T Zone and wider areas, and asked whether there would be measures to facilitate cross-boundary travel at various control points at / near San Tin Technopole.

(b) Pedestrian and Cycling Network

- 6.1.8 Noting that San Tin Highway and Fanling Highway would divide San Tin Technopole into northern and southern parts, some were concerned about the pedestrian connectivity between the I&T Park and San Tin Town Centre. Some comments called for a more pedestrian and cycling friendly environment, including human-centric street design through prioritising pedestrians and cyclists over vehicular traffic, and provision of more bicycle parking facilities.

(c) Infrastructures

- 6.1.9 Some opined that the proposed effluent polishing plant (EPP), food waste pre-treatment facilities and water reclamation plant would give an unwelcoming image and arrival experience for San Tin Technopole as they were situated along San Tin Highway which was the main gateway entering the Technopole. Some considered the proposed EPP with food waste pre-treatment facilities and district cooling system (DCS) would have adverse

environmental impact and affect the *fung shui* of the ancestral tomb to the north of the EPP site. There were suggestions on provision of underground recycling or refuse collection facilities within San Tin Technopole.

- 6.1.10 Some raised concern about the flood susceptibility in the low-lying San Tin area, especially with the proposed filling of fishponds and site formation works which might affect the drainage capacity in the area. Studies should also be undertaken to demonstrate that drainage would be sufficient under extreme weather.

6.2 Summary of Responses to Comments

- 6.2.1 Various transport infrastructures have been planned to support the future traffic demand of San Tin Technopole such as the proposed NOL Main Line, the proposed NOL Spur Line and the proposed NM Highway. An intra-district Smart Green Feeder System is also proposed to serve the population and employment clusters located away from the railway catchment areas as well as to cater for the internal transport / circulation needs of San Tin Technopole. Detailed design and implementation programme would be coordinated amongst the concerned Government bureaux / departments and the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) to ensure timely provision of transport infrastructures to tie in with designed population / business intake. Sufficient road-based public transport would be provided to serve the travel demand and business operation needs before the commissioning of NOL Main Line and Spur Line.
- 6.2.2 Railway alignments would be affected by a number of factors / considerations, e.g. railway safety and operational considerations, physical and land use constraints, environmental impacts, etc. Comments on the alignment, station locations and station name of the proposed NOL Spur Line have been conveyed to concerned Government bureaux / departments and MTRCL for consideration.
- 6.2.3 In terms of cross-boundary connection, on top of the railway connectivity to Huanggang and Futian, San Tin Technopole would be connected to the new Huanggang Port via the realigned San Sham Road.
- 6.2.4 There would be a comprehensive cycle track network and pedestrian walkway system connecting various parts of San Tin Technopole. To enhance the north-south connectivity of San Tin Technopole, a total of seven pedestrian / cycle crossings would be provided across the San Tin Highway / Fanling Highway, of which three would be newly constructed, including an iconic landscape deck for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 6.2.5 The proposed EPP, food waste pre-treatment facilities, water reclamation plant and DCS are essential infrastructures serving San Tin Technopole and will be implemented in tandem with Phase 1 development. With suitable design and landscape treatment, they will unlikely cause adverse environmental and visual impact to the surrounding uses. Sites have been reserved on the RODP for recycling and refuse collection.
- 6.2.6 The proposed site formation level and drainage system would provide necessary flood protection level to San Tin Technopole, with consideration of climate change effects. The proposed blue-green infrastructures, such as the revitalisation of drainage channels and the flood attenuation facilities, would improve the capacity of drainage system in the area and provide climate change resilience to the developments.
- 6.2.7 Technical assessments have confirmed that the development proposals are technically feasible and there will not be any insurmountable planning, engineering and environmental problems.

7. ENVIRONMENT, ECOLOGY AND LANDSCAPE

7.1 Summary of Comments

(a) Sustainability, Carbon Neutrality and Climate Resilience

- 7.1.1 Those who commented generally considered that sustainability and climate resilience should be taken into account in the planning of San Tin Technopole. Some opined that sustainability principles with regard to energy production and use, wastewater and solid waste treatment, etc., should be applied. Some were concerned if there would be any application of renewable energy, such as solar energy and hydrogen fuel, and any renewable energy target to be achieved in San Tin Technopole, and suggested a wider use of solar panels at the roof of GIC buildings and footbridge cover, etc.
- 7.1.2 While the goal of developing a carbon neutral community aligning with HK's Climate Action Plan 2050 (CAP2050) was appreciated, some opined that a carbon audit should be conducted to demonstrate how the goal could be achieved. Detailed and feasible measures should be put in place to balance the carbon budget of the proposed development.
- 7.1.3 Some expressed concern about how climate resilience could be safeguarded in San Tin Technopole. The proposed revitalisation of the two existing San Tin Eastern and Western Main Drainage Channels for diverting flood water / surface runoff, and provision of floodable landscape under the "sponge city" concept was supported.
- 7.1.4 Some asked if the development had taken into account the sea level rise as projected by the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and questioned if resilient design had been incorporated in the planning of San Tin Technopole, citing the measures proposed for Kau Yi Chau Artificial Islands.
- 7.1.5 There should be appropriate urban and landscape design, building disposition, blue-green ratio, etc. to create an urban neighbourhood with comfortable micro-climate and reduce urban heat island effect. Some were concerned that the functions of existing fishponds and farmland in respect of carbon sequestration and combating climate change would be hampered due to the proposed development.
- 7.1.6 There was a suggestion to include the surrounding mountains, such as Ngau Tam Shan and Ki Lun Shan, in formulating the strategies on urban forestry, forestation and open space design, which could help enhance the biodiversity, reduce the urban heat island effect and serve as a carbon sink for the Project. There was also a suggestion to review the boundary at Pang Loon Tei to exclude and retain the mature woodland.

(b) Fishpond Conservation

- 7.1.7 There were views that the Government should justify the proposed fishpond filling (some 90 ha) by demonstrating that the I&T development was an essential project with overriding public interest.
- 7.1.8 There were concerns about the filling of fishponds within Wetland Conservation Area (WCA) and Wetland Buffer Area (WBA) for I&T development which would affect the biodiversity value and ecological integrity of the Deep Bay Wetland ecosystem. Some comments pointed out that the existing fishponds in San Tin were part of the Deep Bay Wetland outside Ramsar Site which is one of the 12 Priority Sites for Enhanced Conservation, and considered that the fishponds were habitat for a variety of fish, birds, etc. including some important or possibly threatened species. The proposed development would also lead to fragmentation of the ecological network between Hoo Hok Wai, the Loop and Sam Po Shue.
- 7.1.9 Some considered that the filling of fishponds would violate the "precautionary approach" and "no-net-loss in wetland" principle under the Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' (TPB PG-No. 12C). There were also views that the Project would overturn the long established planning control in conserving the Deep Bay wetlands and encourage other private developments in WCA and WBA.

- 7.1.10 Some were concerned about the reduction in scale of the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP from about 520 ha as mentioned in the Northern Metropolis Development Strategy to about 300 ha. Some also opined that the WCP should not be taken as a compensation for the wetland loss due to the proposed development, but should be proactively conserved in its own right.
- 7.1.11 There were views that the Government should first complete the strategic feasibility study on the development of WCPs System being conducted by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) before deciding on the scale of the Project. Some also suggested that the Government should provide more information about the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP, such as its indicative boundary, intended uses, proposed conservation measures to satisfy the “no-net-loss in wetland” principle, management and financial arrangements, and future connection to the proposed Hoo Hok Wai WCP for reference.
- 7.1.12 Regarding the Government’s intention to create environmental capacity through the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP, some questioned about the definition of “environmental capacity” and considered that bird density alone might not be a good indicator of “environmental capacity” as some species such as otters required more undisturbed areas.
- 7.1.13 Some considered that fish stocking in the future WCP could not mitigate the loss of habitats for non-piscivorous (non-fish-eating) bird species. The high cost for active wetland management was also a concern, based on the experience from the Lok Ma Chau Ecological Enhancement Area of the Lok Ma Chau Spur Line project.
- 7.1.14 There were concerns about the interface issues between the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP and San Tin Technopole, such as edge effects and glare impact on birds.

(c) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

- 7.1.15 In view of the expansion of project boundary as compared to that in the EIA Project Profile and the issued Study Brief, some considered that there would be significant changes in environmental impacts in aspects such as ecology, water quality of Deep Bay marine environment and freshwater bodies etc., which should be assessed in details. Some opined that the original Project Profile / Study Brief should be replaced by new ones covering the expanded project boundary to avoid under-estimation of the ecological functions and conservation value of existing fishponds in San Tin and the entire Deep Bay wetlands ecosystem. Some considered that alternative development options to avoid infringement of WCA and WBA should be provided and discussed in the EIA Report.
- 7.1.16 Some considered it necessary to adjust the assessment period, sampling method and the assessment area for the expanded project boundary. Some opined that the potential ecological impact on the entire Ramsar Site beyond the project area (such as Mai Po Nature Reserve at about 1.2 km to the west) should be considered holistically.
- 7.1.17 There were concerns about how the environmental and ecological impacts of the I&T Park could be assessed objectively under the flexi-zoning approach for the I&T Park. Some opined that the findings of ITIB’s consultancy study on the development plan for San Tin Technopole should be submitted for consideration during the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO) and statutory plan making processes.

(d) Interface with the Ramsar Site

- 7.1.18 There were concerns about the interface issue between the San Tin Technopole and the Mai Po Inner Deep Bay Ramsar Site which was recognised as a Wetland of International Importance.

(e) Ecological Corridor and Bird Flight Path

- 7.1.19 There were concerns about the overlapping of the project boundary with two existing egretries, namely Mai Po Village Egretty and Mai Po Lung Village Egretty, and as a result the possible loss of habitats, obstruction of bird flight paths and other potential disturbances due to the high-density I&T development.

- 7.1.20 Some considered that the birds' habitat would be affected despite efforts to safeguard the bird flight paths at the I&T sites such as designation of NBAs and stepped building height. There was a suggestion to build overpasses / underpasses to enhance or maintain the existing wildlife corridor as a mitigation measure.

(f) Agricultural Land

- 7.1.21 Some opined that traditional farming had unique values such as landscaping and ecological functions that could not be replaced by hydroponics or vertical farming in the proposed urban farm. The Government was suggested to minimise further farmland loss in HK and retain the existing agricultural land as far as possible to create an urban farmland network that could become part of the green landscape while functioning as a wildlife corridor.

(g) Landscape Proposal

- 7.1.22 Some comments suggested that more landscape and streetscape treatments could be introduced to add vibrancy and diversity to San Tin Technopole. Further landscape design elements, including vertical greening and landscaped deck, should be explored. For the proposed landscape buffer interfacing the I&T Park and the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP, some considered the landscaping could be extended beyond the I&T Park to seamlessly integrate with the proposed open space and blue-green network.

7.2 Summary of Responses to Comments

- 7.2.1 To align with CAP2050's call for green planning and developing carbon neutral community and address climate change, San Tin Technopole would adopt Smart, Green, Resilient (SGR) initiatives under three aspects including (i) planning and urban design (e.g. 15-minute neighbourhood, blue-green network, breezeways aligning with prevailing wind direction, maximising greenery), (ii) SGR infrastructure system (e.g. revitalisation of drainage channels to include green landscape with flood attenuation facilities, DCS, EPP and food waste pre-treatment facilities, common utility enclosure, water reclamation facilities), and (iii) smart and sustainable mobility with green transport modes (e.g. railway as backbone of sustainable transport, comprehensive pedestrian and cycling network, provision of transport interchange hub/public transport interchange, charging facilities for electric vehicles and green fuel stations). Application of renewable energy at San Tin Technopole, e.g. photovoltaics, would be further explored at the later stage of the Project.
- 7.2.2 Regarding the justifications for I&T development, please refer to paragraphs 4.2.1 to 4.2.3 above.
- 7.2.3 San Tin Technopole is a designated project under EIAO. The potential environmental and ecological impacts arising from the development of San Tin Technopole, based on the latest proposed development boundary and land uses, have been assessed in accordance with the EIA Study Brief issued under EIAO. Among others, a 12-month ecological survey has been conducted. The ecological impact assessment covers areas within 500m outside the latest proposed development boundary. According to the findings of the EIA, there are no insurmountable environmental and ecological impacts arising from the development of San Tin Technopole. Mai Po Village Egret and Mai Po Lung Village Egret will be preserved together with their associated major bird flight paths. Preservation of bird flight paths and provision of wildlife corridors are detailed in the EIA Report. The loss in wetland and fisheries function arising from the development of San Tin Technopole will be mitigated with the key measure being the proposed development of the Sam Po Shue WCP. The EIA report which includes the details of the environmental assessment has been submitted to EPD for consideration. The EIA Report is made available for public inspection during the period from 2 February 2024 to 2 March 2024.
- 7.2.4 EPD has confirmed that the EIA Study Brief issued in June 2021 remains applicable for the latest project area as all the potential environmental issues which need to be assessed in the EIA study are already covered in the Study Brief, and that the study approach and details of the methodology such as sampling, duration and frequency of the ecological survey therein remain valid.

- 7.2.5 TPB PG-No. 12C is applicable to “Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance”. While the San Tin Technopole project does not belong to this category, it has to undergo an EIA process and obtain approval for the EIA report, ensuring that there will be no-net-loss in ecological function and capacity of the wetlands concerned. The proposed development requires filling of about 90 ha of fishponds, and about half of them have no fish farming activities or have even been abandoned for years.
- 7.2.6 The Government will establish the Sam Po Shue WCP. Sam Po Shue WCP will enhance the conservation of habitats and mitigate the impact to ecology and fisheries arising from the development of San Tin Technopole, to ensure no-net-loss in ecological function and capacity of the wetlands concerned. More specifically, the Government will enhance the ecological and fisheries resources of the wetland concerned with active conservation management and modernised aquaculture to compensate for the loss in wetland and fisheries resources arising from the development of San Tin Technopole. AFCD is now conducting a strategic feasibility study on the development of WCPs System to determine the locations, extents, functions, positioning and management mode etc. of various parks proposed under the WCPs System (including Sam Po Shue WCP), with completion of the relevant study expected in the first half of 2024. The Government expects that the construction works for the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP will commence in around 2026/2027 the earliest for completion earlier than or upon the full operation of the San Tin Technopole project (tentatively in 2039). Sensible transition between the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP and the proposed development would be ensured by adopting a building height profile stepping down from 75mPD to 15mPD towards the wetland, with a 35m-wide NBA along the wetland edge to minimise the disturbance impact of the proposed development on the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP. Major bird flight paths are also preserved by designation of NBAs and low-rise facilities.
- 7.2.7 A piece of land of 980 m², which is currently occupied by temporary structures and without any ponds, at the easternmost tip of the Mai Po Inner Deep Bay Ramsar Site was originally included in the RODP. While this piece of land was intended to be part of the proposed landscape buffer (designated as NBA) between the I&T Park and Sam Po Shue WCP on the RODP, in view of the concern on the encroachment onto the Ramsar Site, the project boundary has been revised to exclude the said piece of land, which will be incorporated as part of the Sam Po Shue WCP being proposed.
- 7.2.8 The boundary of San Tin Technopole has also been optimised to avoid direct impact on a patch of mature woodland at Pang Loon Tei which has been identified as a movement corridor and potential breeding grounds for a high diversity and abundance of mammal species.
- 7.2.9 In response to the comment on retaining existing agricultural land, please refer to the response in paragraphs 5.2.8 and 5.2.9.
- 7.2.10 Comments on the detailed landscape design of San Tin Technopole are appreciated and would be considered at the next stage of the Project.

8. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT

8.1 Summary of Comments

(a) Implementation Programme and Mechanism

- 8.1.1 Some opined that the challenges to resume large extent of private land within the next few years should not be underestimated, and expressed concern about the timely commencement of the development as scheduled, i.e. land resumption starting from end 2024 and the first population intake starting from 2031.
- 8.1.2 There were views that more details on the development phasing, i.e. sub-phasing, should be provided as soon as possible. Some were concerned about the mismatch in business and population intake, given that sites in Phase 1 (mainly I&T Park) would be occupied starting from 2031 or earlier, while the bulk population intake in Phase 2 (San Tin Town Centre) would only commence in 2034. Some suggested more housing units should be provided in Phase 1 in tandem with I&T enterprise intake so as to provide adequate accommodations for the I&T talents. Due consideration should also be given to the phasing and population and economic land intake of other major development projects in the pipeline, such as Kau Yi Chau Artificial Islands.
- 8.1.3 The public-private partnership (PPP) approach for the development of San Tin Technopole was generally welcomed, and details of the PPP arrangement should be announced as soon as possible. In this regard, some lot owners within the proposed I&T Park expressed interest to develop their sizable lot for comprehensive I&T development through in-situ land exchange application. Proposal to incorporate the proposed Fire Services Department New Territories Workshop and an indoor sports centre near the western boundary of the Project in a private residential development was also received.
- 8.1.4 With regard to the Enhanced Conventional New Town Approach (ECNTA) adopted in Kwu Tung North / Fanling North and Hung Shui Kiu / Ha Tsuen NDAs, there were suggestions for formulating a new set of criteria for San Tin Technopole to allow more landowners to participate in the development process, for example, to extend its applicability to non-residential sites (including I&T sites and logistics, storage and workshop (LSW) sites) and sites of less than 4,000m² in size. For Tso/Tong land, some highlighted the difficulty to obtain unanimous consent of villagers for submitting in-situ land exchange applications, and requested to review the Tso/Tong mechanism to facilitate their participation in the development through PPP. Innovative forms of PPP were also suggested, such as the redevelopment models in SZ which allow villagers to participate in redevelopment, or issuance of development bonds as an alternative to cash compensation for land resumption to allow landowners to share the upside while reducing the Government's cash flow pressure.

(b) Arrangements for Land Resumption and Clearance

- 8.1.5 Comments generally considered that more details on the clearance arrangement for the affected villagers / residents, operators and owners (including brownfield, livestock farms / agriculture farms and fishponds) should be provided, including detailed land resumption boundary and programme, rehousing / reprovisioning arrangement and compensation. The Government should give a reasonable notice period to the affected parties before land resumption to facilitate their operation planning and relocation.
- 8.1.6 On compensation eligibility, some affectees noted that there was a time gap between the promulgation of the RODP in mid-2023 and land resumption starting from Q4 2024, and suggested the Government to conduct freezing survey as soon as possible to register their interest as the operators might be requested by landowners to terminate the tenancy early.
- 8.1.7 Some affectees suggested the Government to review the compensation arrangement, for example, it was unfair for the principal tenants (i.e. tenants who sub-lease land to the actual operators) who had made substantial investment in the businesses (brownfield operations in particular) being ineligible for ex-gratia compensation. Some landowners were concerned about the lower compensation rate for land resumed for conservation purpose (Tier 2 rate) as compared to land resumed for development uses and suggested removal of the Tier 2 rate.

There were also views that the Government should establish a transparent framework to expedite the settlement of compensation, such as imposing an administrative timeframe for the Government to respond to claims with explanation of compensation assessments.

- 8.1.8 Noting that the clearance under Phase 1 development would commence in Q4 2024, some were concerned if the dedicated rehousing estate site and the LSW sites would be ready to accommodate the displaced villagers / residents and brownfield operations.

(c) Rehousing Arrangement for Affected Villagers / Residents

- 8.1.9 A number of non-indigenous villages would be affected by the development of San Tin Technopole. Some appealed to the Government to provide rehousing units with acceptable living environment and size, preferably within the same district. There were also concerns about relocating the affected villagers / residents to transitional housing of the Hong Kong Housing Authority before moving into dedicated rehousing estates.

- 8.1.10 As some affected villagers / residents were elders who might not adapt to living in high-rise public housing developments, some suggested earmarking suitable land for village reprovisioning at the fringe of San Tin Technopole. There were also requests for retaining the whole Ha Wan Tsuen and some village houses at Lok Ma Chau.

(d) Reprovisioning Arrangement for Affected Operators

- 8.1.11 Many affected operators requested the Government to render assistance in relocating their businesses, stressing that even if a relocation site could be identified, a long lead time would be required to comply with all relevant departmental requirements. Some also demanded seamless reprovisioning, i.e. land resumption and clearance should be carried out only after the existing operations were reprovisioned. There were also concerns about the increasing land rent since the announcement of various development projects in NM.

I. Brownfield Operators

- 8.1.12 Some considered the three LSW sites with a total area of 16 ha on the RODP inadequate to accommodate all brownfield activities affected by the Project. Some cast doubts on the practicability of multi-storey buildings (MSBs) for accommodating brownfield operations, given most brownfield sites were currently operating under a “low cost, high efficiency” business model and some heavy machineries and construction materials could not be accommodated in MSBs. There was a suggestion to co-locate LSW and I&T uses under the “single site, multiple use” model for the existing brownfield operators to continue their businesses. Some also expressed difficulties in identifying relocation sites that would suit their current operations.
- 8.1.13 There were requests for the Government to further relax the Category 3 areas under the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 13G) to accommodate the affected brownfield operations, especially open storages.

II. Agricultural / Livestock Farm Operators

- 8.1.14 Some agricultural farm operators opined that there was no agricultural policy to sustain agricultural development in HK, and considered that the Government should formulate appropriate policies to promote agricultural development in accordance with the Basic Law, as well as to safeguard food safety in HK through promoting local farming practices. Some requested reserving land for agricultural use at the fringe of San Tin Technopole, as well as speeding up the establishment of Agricultural Park Phase 2. Some also considered that the proposed urban farm on the RODP was insufficient to cater for the needs of the sector.
- 8.1.15 The livestock farm operators expressed concerns that it was unable for them to keep their livestock licence under the prevailing policy if relocation site(s) were not yet identified. The agricultural / livestock farm operators were also concerned about the lack of land earmarked for agricultural / livestock farms in the RODP.
- 8.1.16 There was also a suggestion to develop MSBs to accommodate the affected agricultural / livestock farm operations, similar to MSBs for brownfield operations.

III. Fishponds Operators

- 8.1.17 Some fishpond operators considered that the Government should formulate appropriate policies to promote aquaculture development. There were also views to retain some existing fishponds within the project boundary, while some queried if the affected fishponds could be reprovisioned and compensated in other parts of NM or through developing MSBs for fish culture. Some asked for a more detailed timetable for fishpond resumption in view of the long period of an aquaculture cycle, and requested the Government to conduct freezing survey as soon as possible to register their interest, for fear that genuine fishpond operators might not be eligible for compensation due to early tenancy termination and eviction by their respective landowners. Some were concerned if there would be any indirect impact on the nearby fishponds arising from the proposed development.

8.2 Summary of Response to Comments

- 8.2.1 San Tin Technopole is a strategic project driving HK's I&T development and economic growth while also meeting the community's housing and community needs. Some existing structures, brownfield operations, agricultural activities, fishponds, etc. in the project area would inevitably be affected. When the Government resumes and clears the land, compensation and rehousing arrangements would be provided according to the policy. In recent years, the Government has enhanced the compensation as well as rehousing arrangements. The government has also stepped up assistance to brownfield operators in relocating their operations.
- 8.2.2 Specifically, the Government has enhanced its compensation and rehousing package in 2022. Ex-gratia allowances and rehousing arrangements will be offered to eligible squatter occupants, operators and landowners affected. Details are available on Lands Department (LandsD)'s website (<https://www.landsd.gov.hk/en/land-acq-clearance/land-resumption-clearance/rehousing.html>). Those who are not eligible for ex-gratia allowances may turn to statutory compensation if they wish to put up a claim for loss.
- 8.2.3 With the implementation of San Tin Technopole, the Government will set up community liaison and service teams in a timely manner, with a view to identifying affected parties' needs, explaining the development plans and the compensation and rehousing arrangements, offering counselling, referrals and other assistance, and facilitating the communication between the affected parties and Government departments.
- 8.2.4 Brownfield operations are business undertakings. As in the case for other business undertakings affected by development projects, the Government could not provide "one-on-one" or "seamless" re-provisioning arrangements. It is Government's long-term objective to accommodate suitable brownfield operations in general in MSBs, allowing operations in a controlled environment and more orderly and land-efficient manner. In addition to the 16 ha LSW sites in San Tin Technopole, the Government has reserved a total of 72 ha of land in Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen NDA and Yuen Long South Development for industrial and logistics use, and have planned MSB developments near Yuen Long InnoPark. Since the planning and construction of MSBs take time, and not all brownfield operations can be relocated to MSBs, the Government would continue to provide assistance to affected business operators (including the brownfield operators affected by the San Tin Technopole development) through a number of measures, including reaching out to them at the soonest possible juncture, providing monetary compensation to allow them to plan ahead for departure and meet the necessary costs, and providing information on possible sites for accommodating brownfield operations and also government land through short-term tenancy. With a view to stepping up the support to affected operators, the Development Bureau (DEVB) has set up a dedicated team in 2023 to provide operators with one-stop services, including coordinating different departments to assist operators seeking reprovisioning in submitting planning applications, undertaking relevant preliminary preparatory work, and obtaining relevant approvals from other departments as soon as possible to implement the relocation arrangements upon securing the planning permission. DEVB has also set up a dedicated webpage to provide one-stop information for affected brownfield operators.

- 8.2.5 Regarding sustainable agricultural development, various initiatives including Agricultural Park Phase 2, Consultancy Study on Agricultural Priority Area and Sustainable Agricultural Development Fund would support local agriculture and strengthen its foundation for further development. Please refer to the response in paragraphs 5.2.8 and 5.2.9 above.
- 8.2.6 To provide support to livestock farms affected by Government development projects, DEVB, the Environment and Ecology Bureau (EEB), AFCD and relevant departments have formed an interdepartmental working group to draw up plans to provide assistance across different aspects, including identifying sites to develop MSBs for livestock farms for reprovisioning, conducting feasibility studies and related assessments, and carrying out related infrastructure and site formation works. The industry has been conducting a consultancy study on the building design guidelines for multi-storey livestock farms with financial support of the Government.
- 8.2.7 EEB and AFCD had worked hand in hand with the agriculture and fisheries industry to formulate a blueprint for the sustainable development of agriculture and fisheries, so as to raise the quality and value of local produces as well as the productivity of the industry through an array of measures covering finance, infrastructure, land and technical support. The said blueprint was published on 14 December 2023.
- 8.2.8 The phasing implementation plan of San Tin Technopole released in PE was a preliminary one. Detailed phasing and implementation programme would be formulated in the later stage of the Project, while details on the implementation arrangement / approach as well as the land resumption and clearance programme would be further worked out.
- 8.2.9 The Government is mindful of the need to provide sufficient notification time to potential clearers / affectees before commencing the land clearance/resumption exercise.
- 8.2.10 The Government will further leverage market forces to expedite the development of NM. The Government will extend the ECNTA to all new development areas and improve its operational arrangements, including applying the land exchange arrangements to designated sites for industries and private community/welfare facilities, and facilitating landowners owning 90% or above of the private land within the designated development site to carry out consolidated development.

9. WAY FORWARD

- 9.1.1 From the views collected in PE activities, there is general support of the RODP, notably the industry-driven spatial planning approach of earmarking large plots of land for I&T development. Based on public comments received, we have refined the RODP². The revised RODP is at the following link: <https://nm-santintech.hk/en/land-use-proposal/rodp/>.
- 9.1.2 Going forward, while the EIA report is under public inspection, we are finalising the Outline Zoning Plan based on the Revised RODP for statutory town planning procedures to commence in Q1 2024. Other statutory procedures related to land resumption and works will follow suit. Meanwhile, the government will maintain communication with affectees, including landowners, squatter occupants, brownfield operators, etc., to provide information on compensation and rehousing arrangements and clearance programme, and offer reprovisioning assistance as appropriate to brownfield operators.
- 9.1.3 Subject to funding approval from the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council, site formation works would commence in Q4 2024.
- 9.1.4 The Study Team welcomes the public to continue sharing their views and opinions on San Tin Technopole, and hereby expresses sincere gratitude to all individuals / organisations who have offered their valuable views and opinions during the PE period.

² The changes include refining the project boundary to avoid encroachment onto the Ramsar Site, deleting the “Urban Farm” site and incorporating it as part of the “O” zone, rezoning part of a road to “O” zone to reflect the continuous open space beneath it, rezoning a site near the alignment of NOL Spur Line to “Government, Institution or Community”, etc.

Appendix A

List of Exhibitions

Roving Exhibitions

Venue	Date
Hong Kong Science Park	7 June – 11 June 2023
City Gallery	8 June – 30 June 2023 6 July – 31 August 2023
Yuen Long District Community Services Building	12 June – 16 June 2023
Festival Walk	29 June – 5 July 2023
Times Square	1 July – 8 July 2023
Shenzhen Museum of Contemporary Art and Urban Planning	5 July – 5 August 2023
Tung Chung Community Liaison Centre	11 July – 4 August 2023

Mobile Exhibition Centre

Venue	Date
Sha Tin Town Hall	20 June – 21 June 2023
SKH Kei Wing Primary School	28 June – 29 June 2023
Fu Cheong Estate	5 July – 6 July 2023
Tin Wah Estate	7 July 2023
San Tin Rural Committee	10 July 2023
Tin Ching Estate	11 July 2023
Po Leung Kuk Tin Ka Ping Primary School	12 July 2023
Ka Fuk Estate	13 July 2023

Appendix B

List of Briefing Sessions

Statutory / Advisory Bodies

Date	Statutory / Advisory Bodies
9 June 2023	Sub-committee on Planning, Land and Conservation under the Advisory Committee on the Northern Metropolis
16 June 2023	Town Planning Board
27 June 2023	Yuen Long District Council
11 July 2023	Heung Yee Kuk
2 August 2023	Planning Sub-committee of Land and Development Advisory Committee

Other Organisations / Stakeholders

Date	Organisations / Stakeholders
21 June 2023	San Tin Rural Committee
15 July 2023	Professional Institutes, including: Hong Kong Institute of Architects, Hong Kong Institution of Engineers, Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects, Hong Kong Institute of Planners, Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors, and Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
19 July 2023	Agricultural/Livestock Farm Operators
22 July 2023	Villagers
31 July 2023	Brownfield Operators
3 August 2023	I&T Sector
4 August 2023	Green Groups
4 August 2023	Fishpond Operators