

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:10 a.m. on 26.4.2016.
  
  2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Mr Michael W.L. Wong

## Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong Vice-chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

## Vice-chairman

Professor K.C. Chau

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)  
Mr C.W. Tse

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 3  
Transport and Housing Bureau  
Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Assistant Director (Regional 3), Lands Department  
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

3. The Chairman said that the meeting was a continuation of the hearing of the representations and comments in respect of the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (Tsing Yi OZP) No. S/TY/27 commenced on 21.4.2016.

[Professor S.C. Wong and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

4. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests for the representations and comments had been made in the morning session of the hearing on 21.4.2016. No further declaration of interests had been received from Members since then, except that Mr Franklin Yu had declared business dealings with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK) who were consultants of the Housing Department (HD), which would undertake the proposed public housing in respect of two of the amendment items of the Tsing Yi OZP. The meeting agreed that as Mr Yu was not involved in the consultancy work for the proposed public housing, he could stay at the meeting. Members' declared interests were recorded in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the minutes on 21.4.2016.

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The following government's representatives, presenters, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

## **Government Representatives**

### *Planning Department (PlanD)*

Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)

Ms Fannie F.L. Hung - Senior Town Planner/Kwai Tsing (STP/KT),

Miss Annie H.Y. Wong - Town Planner/Kwai Tsing (1) TP/KT)

### *HD and Its Consultants*

Ms Emily W.M. Ip - Planning Officer (PO)

Ms May S.S. Yeung - Architect

Mr Hong Wing Kit - Senior Civil Engineer (SCE)

Mr Wong Yuk Ming - Environmental Consultant, AECOM  
(Air Ventilation Assessment Consultant)

Mr Chris K.S. Leung - Transport Planner, MMHK

Mr Steven K.H. Tang - Principal Environmental Consultant, MMHK

### *Transport Department (TD)*

Mr Honson H.S. Yuen - Chief Transport Officer/New Territories South West (CTO/NTSW)

## **Representers, Commenters and Their Representatives**

R17 – 村上純一

R370 – Lau Wai Yin

R744 – Mr Kee

C173 – Chu Ka Leung

- Miss Lau Wai Yin ] Representer/Commenter and  
Mr Chu Ka Leung ] Representers' representative

R28 – 何偉文

R157 – 何智賢

R746/C38 – Tang On Kei

C39 – Ho Wing Yin

- Miss Tang On Kei - Representer, Commenter and  
Representers'/Commenters'  
representative

R87 – Mou Chak Iao

Mr Mou Chak Iao

- Representer

R97/C272 – Lai Chung Ming

R834 – 村上皓彥

R839 – 林明儀

C26 – 林啓洪

C181 – Kee

C189 – Hang Yi

Mr Lai Chung Ming

- Representer, Commenter and  
Representers'/Commenters'  
representative

R120 – Cheung Kwei Lan

R256 – Zhou Chu

R549 – Sit Yuen Ching

Miss Cheung Kwei Lan

- Representer and Representers'  
representative

R143 – 龍秀琼, Raymond Tang

C66 – Raymond Tang

Mr Raymond Tang - Representer and Commenter

R170 – Wong Kar Fai

Mr Wong Kar Fai - Representer

R209 – Ng Wai Chi

R317 – Kwong Yuen Ching, Cora

C69 – Maggie Lam

Miss Kwong Yuen Ching, Cora - Representer and Representer's/  
Commenter's representative

Mr Chan Wai Yip - Representers'/Commenter's  
representative

R373/C5 – Tam Kar Kin Samuel

R635 – Lam Kar Leung Simon

R675 – Cheung Mei Ki

R948/C8 – Tso Ka Lee

Mr Poon Chi Shing ] Representers'/Commenters'  
Mr Ng Chi Wah ] representatives

R414/C213 – Wong Yu Mei

Ms Wong Yu Mei - Representer and Commenter

R426 – 譚嘉諾

C176 – Poon Miu Kuen

Ms Poon Miu Kuen - Commenter and Representer's  
representative

R471 – Yuen Kwok Ping

Yuen Kwok Ping - Representer (Attending only)

R561/C223 – Cheung Yuk Chun

Ms Cheung Yuk Chun - Representer and Commenter

R575 – Amy Cheung

Ms Amy Cheung - Representer

R584 – So Sheung Chun

Mr So Sheung Chun - Representer

R589/C342 – Chau Man Hon

R641 – 周志常

R686 – 麥婉萍

Mr Chau Man Hon - Representer, Commenter and  
Representers' representative

R618 – Li Ho Keung

Mr Li Ho Keung - Representer

R661 – Chan Yu Pak

Mr Chan Yu Pak - Representer (Attending only)

R698 – Chan Sau Kwan

Mr Chan Tsun Shing - Representer's representative (Attending  
only)

R751 – Leo Chow

R757 – Chow Cheuk Hin

R758 – Joanne Choi

R907 – 吳先生

R919/C185 – Ng Ka Ho

C184 – Ha

C186 – Hang Yi

Mr Ng Ka Ho - Representer, Commenter and  
Representers'/Commenters'  
representative

R775 – Wong Hin Shing - Representer

Mr Wong Hin Shing

R904 – Wong Oi Ling

Ms Wong Oi Ling - Representer

C77 – Yeung Kam Fook

Mr Yeung Kam Fook - Commenter

C101 – Wong Sai Kit

Mr Wong Sai Kit - Commenter

C316 – Chang Ka Tai

Mr Chang Ka Tai - Commenter (Attending only)

6. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the general procedure of the hearing as follows:

- (a) for each hearing session, government's representatives would first brief Members on the background. Afterwards, the representers/commenters or their representatives would be invited to make oral submissions in turn according to their numbers;
- (b) as a large number of representers/commenters or their representatives had registered to make the oral submissions, the Board agreed on 29.1.2016 that each of them should be allotted 10 minutes for their oral submission;
- (c) there was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters or their representatives 2 minutes before the allotted time was to expire and when the allotted time limit was up; and
- (d) question and answer (Q&A) sessions would be held after all attending representers/commenters or their representatives at each

hearing session had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government representatives or representers/commenters or their representatives; and after the Q&A sessions, the hearing on that day would be adjourned, and the representers/commenters or their representatives and the government representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing all the oral submissions from the representers/commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations/comments in closed meeting, and inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

[Miss Winnie M.W. Wong arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

7. The Chairman then invited the representative of PlanD to brief Members on the representations and comments with respective to the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Fonnie F.L. Hung, STP/KT, PlanD repeated the presentation that was made in the morning hearing session of the meeting on 21.4.2016 and recorded in paragraph 8 of the minutes of 21.4.2016.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

8. The Chairman then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their written submissions.

R17 – 村上純一

R370 – Lau Wai Yin

R744 – Mr Kee

C173 – Chu Ka Leung

9. Mr Chu Ka Leung made the following main points:

- (a) he was the former Chairman and a current member of the Owners'

Committee (OC) of Rambler Crest and had resided at Rambler Crest for 10 years. He intended to provide some background information of Rambler Crest:

- (i) in 1998, Hutchinson Whampoa Properties Limited (Hutchinson) was allowed to develop the Container Terminal No. 9 (CT9) and the site where Rambler Crest now stood was previously a piece of industrial land. To facilitate the rezoning at the site from “Industrial” (“I”) to “Commercial” (“C”), which would allow uses including office and hotel/service apartments (SA), an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) submitted by Hutchison was accepted by the Board. The site was subsequently granted to Hutchison, involving a land premium of over HK0.3 billion. The “C” site would serve as a buffer between Mayfair Gardens/Cheung Ching Estate and CT9 by reducing the impacts of noise and glare from CT on the nearby residential developments;
- (ii) the “C” site, which was not suitable for residential use, was the subject of an approved SA development. As there was a lack of regulations/restrictions for the selling of SA, Rambler Crest had been packaged by the developer as a residential development. The residents were misled when purchasing the flats at Rambler Crest;
- (iii) Rambler Crest was completed in 2004 and since then the residents had been adversely affected by the poor air quality, noise and glare impacts from CT9. They had sought help from over ten government departments to resolve the problem, but none of them could offer any help; and
- (iv) according to the relevant regulations, any SA development in Hong Kong should be provided with central air-conditioning to reduce noise impact from the surrounding area and occupiers of

SA developments were generally transients who might tolerate a higher noise level on a temporary basis. However, the developer had only provided a so-called central fresh air intake system and equipped each unit with a split-type air conditioner. Over 90% of the residents of Rambler Crest had covered up the central fresh air ducts at their units as the air, which was extracted from 1/F of Rambler Crest to all residential units, was filled with vehicular emissions from those tour coaches gathering outside the three hotels of Rambler Crest. It was also estimated that about 200 tour coaches would go in/out of Rambler Crest daily during peak hours. The residents had suffered from adverse noise impact from CT9 and costly electricity bills for daily use of air conditioners;

- (b) he asked why the Government and the Board would agree to the sale of flats at Rambler Crest and wondered if malpractice and coalition between the Government and developer were involved. The request of the residents of Rambler Crest to inspect the EIA submitted by Hutchinson for the rezoning proposed so as to better understand the related assessment criteria was also turned down by the Government on the ground of confidentiality;
- (c) due to the construction of CT9, the proposed public rental housing (PRH) development at Tsing Hung Road (the Site) under the current Tsing Yi OZP was originally a compensation measure to serve the residents of Mayfair Gardens/Cheung Ching Estate and to improve the air quality there. It was thus heavily vegetated with about 2,000 trees;
- (d) the Government should not hastily accept the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and Environmental Assessment Study (EAS) of the proposed PRH development at the Site, which were highly unsatisfactory, unrealistic and incomplete. In the TIA, for example, the locations of traffic surveys included Cheung Wang Estate which was far from Tsing Hung Road, and both large and small vehicles were included in the assessment,

despite the fact that more than half of the existing vehicles running along the local roads were heavy goods vehicles, given the land uses in this part of Tsing Yi e.g. storage, logistics, shipyards and various chemical/cement/sewage treatment plants, etc. In view of the proximity of the Site to CT9, the finding of the EAS that merely 10% of the units within the proposed PRH development would be subject to noise and glare impacts from CT9 was doubtful;

- (e) should all PRH units be equipped with air conditioners and double-glazing windows so as to mitigate the impacts from CT9, the costs of the proposed PRH development would be further increased. Aside from the noise and glare impacts from CT9 and poor air quality, the future residents of the PRH development would be subject to other environmental problems, including noise from aircraft, container storage yards, trailer ferries, heavy traffic in local roads such as Tsing Yi Road where heavy goods vehicles went in/out of the Petrol Filling Station (PFS). All of that would far exceed the acceptable noise level of 70 dB(A)/hour for domestic premises;
- (f) the proposed facilities including a kindergarten and a neighbourhood elderly centre at the PRH development would also be subject to noise level beyond the acceptable level of 50dB(A)/hour as stated in Chapter 9 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG);
- (g) Members of the Board should not be misled by the findings/recommendations of the technical assessments for the proposed PRH development. The Hutchison's EIA for the rezoning of Rambler Crest indicating that it was not suitable for residential use had already been endorsed by the Board. Allowing the current PRH development next to Rambler Crest would cast doubts on the acceptability of the Hutchison's EIA. Residents of Rambler Crest would urge for a full investigation if the proposed PRH development was agreed by the Board. He requested Members to be mindful of the figures and reports provided by government departments and to assess their accuracy for making a fair

decision;

- (h) the Government had jeopardised many existing planning principles and ignored local residents' concerns in its search for housing land. The residents of Rambler Crest did not object to PRH development as they agreed that the needs for public housing should be addressed. However, the Government had bypassed the Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) which had objected unanimously to the proposed PRH development at the Site. This was unprecedented. Members should consider the rationale behind the objection of K&TDC; and
- (i) the future residents of the PRH development would hold Members of the Board accountable for their grievances and complaints arising from the fact that the Site was not suitable for residential use. The Site was not suitable due to its proximity to the largest oil depot in Hong Kong, located further to the south of the Site about 1.5 km away. The oil depot would pose serious fire/safety risk/hazard to the future residents. The Broad Environmental Assessment (BEA) attached to the Paper for the PRH development did not mention the oil depot. Members should consider carefully to prevent any disastrous accidents from happening.

R28 – 何偉文

R157 – 何智賢

R746/C38 – Tang On Kei

C39 – Ho Wing Yin

10. With the aid of a visualizer, Miss Tang On Kei made the following main points:

- (a) it was unclear as to the basis for the proposed PRH for the Site, since the nearby site of Rambler Crest was previously considered unsuitable for residential use;

- (b) while it had been put forth by the Government that Rambler Crest with its hotels could act as a buffer between CT9 and the Site, three blocks of the PRH development would in fact abut CT9 and be directly affected by it;
- (c) given the existing hotels in Rambler Crest and the nearby logistics centres, the local roads were congested with large vehicles during the peak hours, including container vehicles, trailers and tour coaches. Referring to the photographs taken from her home during a.m./p.m. periods on 19, 21 to 24.4.2016 as shown on the visualizer, she indicated that the local roads such as Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Hung Road were highly congested due to those vehicles;
- (d) there was no longer any supportive representation on the Tsing Yi OZP since the four grounds for the only one supportive representation, including the need for road widening and more GMB routes, had not been upheld by PlanD as recorded in the TPB Paper No. 10085 (the Paper). The Government should listen to the views of the residents and abort the PRH proposal;
- (e) she raised the following observations on the Paper:
  - (i) there were five SA buildings in Rambler Crest, not one SA building as stated in paragraph 6.1.3 (c) of the Paper;
  - (ii) referring to paragraph 6.3.3 of the Paper, it was stated that the public transport services in the area would be monitored after the population in-take at the PRH development, including the introduction of bus service enhancement measures and strengthening of the existing Green Minibus Bus (GMB) services. She questioned why the monitoring would commence only after but not before the population in-take, and how long would the problem be monitored before measures were taken to address it;

- (iii) existing situation of bus services in the local area during the morning peak hours should be provided and examined in the Paper. Residents of Rambler Crest already had difficulty in getting on public transport for leaving/getting to Tsing Yi, and an example of the problematic bus routes was bus route No. 85G from Kwai Fong to Tsing Yi. The bus stop opposite Rambler Crest was the last stop before entering Tsing Yi South Bridge. As such, for the new bus route, whether sufficient buses would be provided to cater for the local population during peak hours and if the Government had already consulted the operators for providing the required buses;
- (iv) according to paragraph 6.3.19 of the Paper, extension of the existing bus route No. 249M (Mayfair Gardens – TYRS) to the proposed PRH development was suggested by the Government. The feasibility of that proposal was doubtful since bus route No. 249M had already been extended from Mayfair Gardens in Tsing Yi South to Tsing Yi North;
- (v) as it was envisaged that over 80% to 90% of the students in the proposed PRH development would go to schools in the school district of Kwai Tsing, more buses should be deployed for the local bus routes No. 43 and 43A;
- (vi) paragraph 6.3.16 of the Paper had stated that ‘the traffic impact induced by the proposed PRH development was acceptable from traffic engineering point of view.’ That was unrealistic. There were currently several residential developments under construction and once completed, they would add to the congestion problem at Tsing Yi South Bridge for outbound traffic to the Kowloon areas; and
- (vii) paragraph 6.3.13 indicated that no adverse air quality impact due to the operation of the PFS at Tsing Yi Road was

anticipated. Why it was only anticipated but not certain that there would be no adverse air quality;

- (f) the increase in traffic would give rise to safety concerns on the local roads. Placing the PRH development in close proximity to an existing PFS at Tsing Yi Road was particularly undesirable from the safety perspective. Heavy vehicles had previously tipped over several times at the junction near the PFS;
- (g) whether the Government had consulted the occupiers/users of the cargo handling area such as container storage yards regarding the PRH proposal as it would affect them as well. Some of the containers and trailers associated with the cargo handling area were parked along the local roads in this part of Tsing Yi and might need to be relocated due to the PRH development; and
- (h) in view of the above, the Site was not suitable for the proposed PRH development. Members of the Board should disregard the findings and recommendations of the technical assessments for the PRH proposal as the nearby site of Rambler Crest was considered unsuitable for residential use in the past.

11. The Chairman said that the presentation made by PlanD's representative earlier at this hearing session was the summary of the departmental findings and recommendations/views. The presentation did not represent the Board's position. The Board would take into consideration all written and oral submissions, including those of the presenters, commenters and their representatives, when deciding on the Tsing Yi OZP in a deliberation session to be arranged on another day.

R97/C272 – Lai Chung Ming

R834 – 村上皓言

R839 – 林明儀

C26 – 林啓洪

C181 – Kee

C189 – Hang Yi

12. Mr Lai Chung Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he was the current Chairman of the IO of Rambler Crest and would provide further background information on behalf of the residents of Rambler Crest as follows:
  - (i) the residents of Rambler Crest were first aware of the proposed PRH development in April 2015 through newspapers;
  - (ii) according to the relevant documents they gathered subsequently, the Government had identified in 2014 a total of 13 sites in the district of Kwai Tsing for public housing purposes;
  - (iii) during the last 12 months, the residents of Rambler Crest had raised many serious concerns on the findings of various assessments relating to the proposed PRH development. Opposing views to the development were conveyed to the Government, and upon their strong and repetitive requests, a local forum was held on 18.9.2015 where the residents were informed of the development's details. Up to now, the government officials who attended the forum had yet to provide answers to the questions raised by the residents at the forum;
  - (iv) as the Paper contained refinements to the PRH proposal, the residents were strongly disappointed that they were not informed of these changes beforehand. The Paper also had incorrect information; and

- (v) the residents of Rambler Crest had sought views from the neighbours including Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate in formulating their grounds of objection in their oral submissions for the hearing, and much of their work was done after office hours in the evenings;

*Hearing Arrangements*

- (b) the representers and commenters were informed in mid-March 2016 to attend the hearing on 1.4.2016, which was later changed to 21 and 26.4.2016. The Paper was provided to them not long before the date of the hearing. He asked if all that were in line with the provision of the relevant Ordinance as it appeared that representers and commenters had not been given sufficient time to prepare their oral submissions;

*Opposing Grounds*

*Open Space Provision*

- (c) the Site was not suitable for development, as demonstrated by the fact that it had been zoned “Open Space” (“O”) on the Tsing Yi OZP to serve as a buffer between CT9 and the residential developments for more than a decade and it was on a slope. Both PlanD and the Lands Department (LandsD) knew that the Site was not suitable for residential development. It was only recently selected for the proposed PRH development in order to meet the supply of land for housing;
- (d) government officials had stated that Tsing Yi would still have over 40 ha of open space even after the Site of about 4 ha was developed for other use. Referring to a plan, he said that 90% of the existing “O” sites were in Tsing Yi North, and the Site was the only sizable “O” site in Tsing Yi South. Over 60% of the land in Tsing Yi South were for industrial uses and the Site currently helped purify the air and brought visual relief to the residents in that urbanised environment. The parks and recreational facilities of the “O” sites in Tsing Yi North were inaccessible to the local

residents in Tsing Yi South, as it would take more than 30 minutes to walk there. It would be unfair to them should the Site be developed for other use, which was equivalent to 90% of the “O” zone in Tsing Yi South;

- (e) it had been stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of Tsing Yi OZP that the planning intention of the “O” zone was ‘..for the provision of outdoor open-air public space for active and/or passive recreational uses serving the needs of local residents....’ and that ‘The area for passive recreational purposes mainly consists of well-wooded slopes and hills which should be preserved in the interest of general amenity.’ Using the Site for non-open space purposes was contrary to those statements;
- (f) no assessments or appraisals had been conducted by the Government to demonstrate that the Site was the most suitable site out of the 40 ha of “O” sites in Tsing Yi for the proposed PRH development. If not, the Board and residents of Rambler Crest should be provided with such information. At the outset, the Site might appear to be the one that would encounter less of a hurdle than other “O” sites, as the objections came mostly from the residents of Rambler Crest. However, besides Rambler Crest, the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate also objected to the proposed PRH development;

#### *Tree Species*

- (g) in PlanD’s presentation, it was mentioned that there were about 1,800 trees within the Site, and none of them were Old and Valuable Trees or trees of rare species. However, that had no bearing on their value and role in purifying the air and providing greenery and visual relief for the benefits of the local residents. The lack of programme by the Leisure & Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to provide recreational facilities at the Site did not mean that the “O” status of the Site should be removed;
- (h) the Board had previously rejected planning applications for developing “O” sites. The rejection grounds were related to the need for preserving the buffer area and visual relief as well as to prevent permanent loss of open space and the creation of undesirable precedent;

*Public Consultation*

- (i) the K&TDC was not properly consulted on the proposed PRH development. In May 2015, it had objected unanimously to the proposed PRH development and it requested further information from the Government. Despite this, the proposed PRH development was being forged ahead, including the submission of the proposed amendments to the Tsing Yi OZP for the Board's consideration. In August 2015, the gazetted OZP was not submitted for discussion in the DC but for DC members to raise their views to the Board;
- (j) the questions raised at the forum were not answered. The current PRH proposal differed from previous government projects such as columbarium which would only proceed upon receiving support from DCs. That was unreasonable. The residents of Rambler Crest should have been consulted as their views on the design aspect could potentially help to enhance the PRH proposal. If the PRH development was to go ahead, the design of the PRH scheme should be further improved so as to reduce its impacts on Rambler Crest. The Board should consider this properly;

*Visual Impact*

- (k) the Visual Appraisal (VA) conducted for the proposed PRH development did not include any impact on Rambler Crest even though it would give rise to adverse visual impact and reduce sunlight penetration to Rambler Crest. According to the layout provided by PlanD, the nearest block of the proposed PRH development i.e. Block No. 4 would be 60 metres from the boundary of Rambler Crest. By reducing the number of blocks in the PRH proposal from five to four, it revealed problems in the original design and nullified the previous findings of the assessments that the five-block design was justified on all technical grounds. There would be scope for further improvement and discussion in order to minimise the impacts to Rambler Crest's residents;

*Traffic Impact*

- (l) the consultant of the TIA only conducted traffic surveys on three days. Given the daily experience of the residents of Rambler Crest on the traffic conditions during peak hours, their views were more realistic than those figures presented in the TIA;
- (m) the existing public transport services and road network would not be able to support the 4,000 units of the proposed PRH development. The local residents had already suffered from the lack of bus/GMB services and existing traffic congestion. The problem would get worse upon completion of the new residential/logistics developments in the area. The current GMB routes No. 88F and 88G were already serving the hotel guests as well as workers from the container terminal. While provision of additional buses and bus routes had been suggested in the TIA, there was no guarantee that they would in fact be provided. Previous consultation with the GMB companies had revealed that there was a lack of drivers and no GMBs would be added. The residents of Rambler Crest would also not benefit from the provision of new buses, since the bus stop opposite Rambler Crest was the last stop before entering Tsing Yi South Bridge for outbound journeys to Kowloon/Central;
- (n) Tsing Yi Station was far from Tsing Yi South. The walking time from Rambler Crest to Tsing Yi Station would be about 30 minutes. Bus/GMB services were therefore necessary. The PRH proposal should not be taken forward until the traffic and transport issue, especially public transport services, was resolved;

*Total Costs*

- (o) the estimated total costs of the proposed PRH development should be released to the public. HD's representative's response at the hearing session on 21.4.2016 that there was no cost difference between building on a flat land and that on slopes was questionable. Construction costs for building on slopes should be 30% to 40% higher than that of flat land, due to more complicated foundation and site formation works. Hence, given the costs of the proposed PRH development, the extra costs would amount to 1.6 to 1.8 billion. HD should be asked on the cost aspect to ensure cost-effectiveness in public spending;
- (p) the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office had pointed out that building on a slope of 20 degrees or more would increase the risk of landslides, and the costs would be higher than that of building on a flat land, while the long-term maintenance costs would also be high. Hence, building on the Site was not desirable; and
- (q) Members should consider the justifications/arguments of both sides in making a decision, which should not be affected by the Government's target for meeting the housing needs.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes.]

R87 – Mou Chak Iao

13. Mr Mou Chak Iao made the following main points:

- (a) he was the first batch of residents of Rambler Crest and had resided there with his family for 12 years;
- (b) he and his family had to endure living with closed windows daily and long waiting time to get on buses/GMBs, the latter had worsened over the years due to nearby hotel guests;

- (c) LCSD indicated that the Site was not suitable for development into a park due to the safety concern arising from the slope. Only a small-scale park was provided at Tsing Hung Road. Hence, the Government had adopted a double standard by having residential use on the Site and disregarded the need to safeguard the health of the residents. There was no genuine consultation, as the K&TDC was indeed bypassed in respect of the proposed PRH development. The residents of Rambler Crest had no choice but to protest against injustice;
- (d) there were other sites available in Tsing Yi and the Site should not be selected; and
- (e) Members had a social responsibility and should carefully consider the justifications put forth by the residents.

R143 – 龐秀琼, Raymond Tang

C66 – Raymond Tang

14. Mr Raymond Tang made the following main points:

- (a) he grew up in a public housing estate and through his own hard work, he was able to purchase a flat at Rambler Crest in 2013;
- (b) he had difficulty in attending the hearing on time that morning as there was a lack of bus services in the area surrounding Rambler Crest. Buses going to Kowloon via Tsing Yi South Bridge often bypassed the bus stop opposite Rambler Crest, which was the last bus stop before Tsing Yi South Bridge, since they were already full;
- (c) Rambler Crest, while not being included in the VA of the PRH proposal, it was covered by the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA). That reflected the Government had adopted a double standard. Besides being incomplete, the technical assessments of the PRH proposal had adopted incorrect methodologies, such as the TIA which only involved a 3-day

traffic survey and such survey was conducted just before public holidays, and a viewpoint of the VA was taken from Lai King, which was far from the Site;

- (d) while there were two GMB routes and a shopping mall in Rambler Crest, they were mostly used by the hotel guests, in particular, after 6 p.m. daily. There were insufficient facilities for the proposed PRH development;
- (e) given Tsing Yi Station was far from Rambler Crest with walking time of over 35 minutes, bus/GMB services were essential to the local residents, especially the elderly and children. However, the existing bus/GMB services were already inadequate to serve the local residents, let alone the additional PRH population. There was already traffic congestion due to the on-going road works in Tsing Yi. The suggestion to extend the existing bus route No. 249M in the TIA was not feasible as the route was already a circular route with no room for further extension. Instead, the length of that route should be reduced so as to shorten the travelling time for the residents of Mayfair Gardens, Cheung Ching Estate and Rambler Crest. The other suggestion for providing new buses or bus/GMB routes was also not viable, since they would be subject to commercial decisions of the bus companies, the difficulty in hiring drivers for GMBs and the number of hotel guests using the bus/GMB service;
- (f) in PlanD's presentation, it was mentioned that none of the trees were of rare species and some were of poor health according to the tree survey conducted by tree experts, implying that the trees could be removed. That was unreasonable. Whether a site visit had been made to inspect the trees at the Site and whether the residents (i.e. users) had been consulted on the conditions of the trees; and
- (g) there was no merit for developing the Site. At the public forum, it was put forth by a consultant that the Site was the only site available in Tsing Yi for the proposed PRH development. However, there was a parking lot with containers near Block No. 1 of Rambler Crest, which was larger than

the Site, and might be considered for PRH development. The residents of Rambler Crest should not be unfairly treated.

R120 – Cheung Kwei Lan

R256 – Zhou Chu

R549 – Sit Yuen Ching

15. Miss Cheung Kwei Lan made the following main points:

- (a) she was a retiree and was compelled to attend the hearing so as to safeguard the interests of the next generation;
- (b) the Government had blatantly ignored the views of the residents of Rambler Crest and the various issues in pursuing the proposed PRH development at the Site;
- (c) there was no sound ground to support the development of the Site for the following reasons:
  - (i) the Site was not suitable for residential use since it was subject to adverse noise and glare impacts from the surroundings and was in close proximity to a PFS. The area also lacked sufficient transport infrastructure. The future PRH residents would suffer as a result;
  - (ii) the greenery of the Site should be preserved as it had helped purify the air and provided visual relief to the local residents;
  - (iii) high construction costs for the proposed PRH development due to the related slope works;
  - (iv) there were other alternative sites in Tsing Yi North where sizable vacant lands were available; and

- (v) the technical feasibility of the proposed PRH development was yet to be demonstrated. The AVA, for example, contained predictions on wind directions which might differ from reality;
- (d) the residents of Rambler Crest were being unfairly treated under the name of public interest. Their daily living had already been affected by the large number of Mainland visitors in the area. The future PRH residents would further deprive the residents of Rambler Crest of their current facilities and amenities. The Board would need to strike a balance between the interests of all parties and should reject the proposed PRH development; and
- (e) Members should act conscientiously and make a fair decision, which should not be affected by the Government's target for meeting the housing needs.

R373/C5 – Tam Kar Kin Samuel

R635 – Lam Kar Leung Simon

R675 – Cheung Mei Ki

R948/C8 – Tso Ka Lee

16. Mr Poon Chi Shing made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of K&TDC and attended the hearing session on 21.4.2016. He clarified that the representers objected to any kind of building development at the Site, not just PRH development;

*Previous Hearing Session*

- (b) government representatives might have been ill prepared for the previous hearing session on 21.4.2016. At that Q&A sessions, HD's representative, for example, had incorrectly stated that the four blocks of the proposed PRH development shared the same building height i.e. 140 mPD. In fact, the correct heights ranged from 125mPD to 140mPD. Government representatives were unclear about the sewage disposal and

only vaguely stated that proposed PRH development would not have any impact on the existing sewage tunnel. According to the related documents, the sewage from the PRH development would directly be disposed into the sewage tunnel and thus generating adverse environmental impacts. As for noise, the consultants could not provide an answer on the extent of the noise level that could be reduced by the installation of double-glazing windows;

*Objection from K&TDC*

- (c) it was highly unsatisfactory that PlanD's presentation earlier at the current hearing session as well as the related documents had misrepresented the views of K&TDC, which stated that K&TDC had no comment on the PRH proposal. In May 2015, a motion was passed at K&TDC that pending further information from the Government, the PRH proposal should be shelved. At a later meeting, K&TDC objected to the PRH proposal, as the information from the Government was too piecemeal and as a result was not discussed by K&TDC. K&TDC had only been provided with a 2-page consultation paper from PlanD and had not been given sufficient time to respond to the various government documents including the Paper. Indeed, K&TDC was being informed, rather than consulted, as far as the PRH proposal was concerned;
- (d) Members should note that K&TDC had not rendered support to the PRH proposal and their objection to the proposal was on the ground that the Site was simply not suitable for residential use. In 2004, in measuring the noise level of Rambler Crest due to CT9, the Environmental Protection Department did not opt for doing the measurement when the windows were opened as noise exceedance far beyond the acceptable level was envisaged. Alternative sites should be explored. In fact, PlanD had identified a total of 13 potential sites for housing development which was presented to K&TDC in 2014. K&TDC should be properly consulted on the PRH proposal;

*Technical Assessments*

- (e) residents of Rambler Crest had been very dissatisfied with the ways the Government had handled their concerns. Their requests for additional traffic surveys and viewpoint from Rambler Crest for VA had not been followed up by the departments. The VA did not include the photomontage with the viewpoint from Rambler Crest towards the Site, while inappropriate viewpoints which were far from the Site were included. The TIA did not have any assessment on the new access to the proposed PRH development at the Site. The technical assessments for the proposed PRH development were considered highly unsatisfactory, biased and incomplete;
- (f) during the construction of Rambler Crest back in 2004, K&TDC requested for an additional new bus route (i.e. No. 242X), the then Environment, Transport and Works Bureau, in its reply to K&TDC, emphasised that railway remained as the backbone of the public transport and their request was therefore turned down. Hence, the TIA's suggestion for new bus routes to address the traffic impact arising from the proposed PRH development was not feasible. The Transport Department (TD) had over the years implemented various traffic improvement measures in Tsing Yi South, but TD had so far been ineffective in addressing the problem. Only a new bus route No. 948 had recently been added by TD;
- (g) furthermore, as revealed in the discussion paper for the Subcommittee on Matters relating to Railways of the Legislative Council, the Tsuen Wan Line and Tung Chung Line were already running at 98% and 84% of their capacities respectively. There was little room for accommodating additional population;
- (h) overall, the technical feasibility of the proposed PRH development was yet to be demonstrated. According to a letter from LandsD dated 19.4.2016, HD had applied to LandsD for carrying out a further site investigation at the Site. As the site investigation might reveal further findings on the

suitability of the Site for development, the proposed PRH development should not proceed pending completion of such site investigation; and

- (f) many residents of Rambler Crest could not attend the hearing due to the change of the original date of the hearing session from 1.4.2016 to 21 and 26.4.2016. The Paper and the accompanying technical assessments were not comprehensive nor did they respond to the questions raised by the residents. Members should request the submission of full and complete assessments from the concerned government departments for the Board's consideration and seriously consider the grounds put forward by the residents of Rambler Crest.

17. The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 1:05 p.m.

18. The meeting was resumed at 2:20 p.m. on 26.4.2016.
19. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) Mr Michael W.L. Wong	Chairman
Professor S.C. Wong	Vice-chairman
Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang	
Professor K.C. Chau	
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam	
Ms Christina M. Lee	
Mr Stephen H.B. Yau	
Dr F.C. Chan	
Mr Peter K.T. Yuen	
Mr K.K. Cheung	
Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung	
Dr C.H. Hau	
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	
Professor T.S. Liu	
Miss Winnie W.M. Ng	
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1) Mr C.W. Tse	
Assistant Director (Regional 3), Lands Department Mr Edwin W.K. Chan	

**Agenda Item 1 (Continued)**

[Open Meeting]

**Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)**

20. The following government representatives, and the representers/commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

**Government Representatives**

*Planning Department (PlanD)*

Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)

Ms Fannie F.L. Hung - Senior Town Planner/Kwai Tsing (STP/KT)

Miss Annie H.Y. Wong - Town Planner/Kwai Tsing 1 (TP/KT1)

*Housing Department (HD) and Its Consultants*

Ms Emily W.M. Ip - Planning Officer (PO)

Ms May S.S. Yeung - Architect

Mr Hong Wing Kit - Senior Civil Engineer (SCE)

Mr Wong Yuk Ming - Environmental Consultant, AECOM  
(Air Ventilation Assessment Consultant)

Mr Chris K.S. Leung - Transport Planner, Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK)

Mr Steven K.H. Tang - Principal Environmental Consultant, MMHK

*Transport Department (TD)*

Mr Honson H.S. Yuen - Chief Transport Officer/New Territories South West (CTO/NTSW)

Mr Patrick K.H. Ho - Senior Engineer/Kwai Tsing (SE/KT)

**Representers, Commenters and Their Representatives**

R17 – 村上純一

R370 – Lau Wai Yin

R744 – Mr Kee

C173 – Chu Ka Leung

Miss Lau Wai Yin ] Representer/Commenter and Representers'

Mr Chu Ka Leung ] representatives

R28 – 何偉文

R157 – 何智賢

R746/C38 – Tang On Kei

C39 – 何穎妍

Miss Tang On Kei - Representer, Commenter and Representers'  
representative

R87 – Mou Chak Iao

Mr Mou Chak Iao - Representer

R97/C272 – Lai Chung Ming

R834 – 村上皓言

R839 – 林明儀

C26 – 林啟洪

C181 – Kee

C189 – Hang Yi

Mr Lai Chung Ming - Representer, Commenter and Representers'/  
Commenters' representative

R120 – Cheung Kwei Lan

R256 – Zhou Chu

R549 – Sit Yuen Ching

Ms Cheung Kwei Lan - Representer and Representers' representative

R143 – 龍秀琼, Raymond Tang

C66 – Raymond Tang

Mr Raymond Tang - Representer and Commenter

R170 – Wong Kar Fai

Mr Wong Kar Fai - Representer

R209 – Ng Wai Chi

R317 – Kwong Yuen Ching, Cora

C69 – Maggie Lam

Miss Kwong Yuen Ching, Cora - Representer and Representer's/Commenter's representative

Mr Chan Wai Yip - Representers' and Commenter's representative

R373/C5 – Tam Kar Kin Samuel

R635 – Tam Kar Leung Simon

R675 – Cheung Mei Ki

R948/C8 – Tso Ka Lee

Mr Poon Chi Shing ] Representers' and Commenters'

Mr Ng Chi Wah ] representatives

R414/C213 – Wong Yu Mei

Ms Wong Yu Mei - Representer and Commenter

R426 – 譚嘉諾

C176 – Poon Miu Kuen

Ms Poon Miu Kuen - Commenter and Representer's representative

R471 – Yuen Kwok Ping

Ms Yuen Kwok Ping - Representer (Attending only)

R561/C223 – Cheung Yuk Chun

Ms Cheung Yuk Chun - Representer and Commenter

R575 – Amy Cheung

Ms Amy Cheung - Representer

R584 – So Sheung Chun

Mr So Sheung Chun - Representer

R589/C342 – Chau Man Hon

R641 – 周志當

R686 – 麥婉萍

Mr Chau Man Hon - Representer, Commenter and Representers' representative

R618 – Li Ho Keung

Mr Li Ho Keung - Representer

R654 – Lam Kwok Kay

Mr Lam Kwok Kay - Representer

R661 – Chan Yu Pak

Mr Chan Yu Pak - Representer (Attending only)

R698 – Chan Sau Kwan

Mr Chan Tsun Shing - Representer's representative (Attending only)

R751 – Leo Chow

R757 – Chow Cheuk Hin

R758 – Joanne Choi

R907 – 吳先生

R919/C185 – Ng Ka Ho

C184 – Ha

C186 – Hang Yi

Mr Ng Ka Ho - Representer, Commenter and Representers'/  
Commenters' representative

R775 – Wong Hin Shing

Mr Wong Hin Shing - Representer

R904 – Wong Oi Ling

Ms Wong Oi Ling - Representer

C77 – Yeung Kam Fook

Mr Yeung Kam Fook - Commenter

C101 – Wong Sai Kit

Mr Wong Sai Kit - Commenter

21. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited the representers/commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

R209 – Ng Wai Chi

R317 – Kwong Yuen Ching, Cora

C69 – Maggie Lam

22. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chan Wai Yip made the following main points:

- (a) He displayed a photo showing that Rambler Crest was currently enjoying a view of green landscape over the proposed public rental housing (PRH) site (the Site) at Tsing Hung Road. If the Site was developed for PRH with the nearest building block at about 60m from Rambler Crest, the open view of Rambler Crest would be blocked, which would be similar to the situation as shown in another photo, and air ventilation would be

affected;

- (b) while the government representatives pointed out to Members at the last meeting on 21.4.2016 that the proposed PRH development at the Site would not impose insurmountable adverse impacts on the surrounding areas, a paper submitted to the Panel on Environmental Affairs of the Legislative Council in 2013 indicated that air, noise and light pollution could affect people's health and lead to increase in public expenditure on health services. As such, the Government implemented strict environmental control measures to reduce the related pollution. When the planning application for the development of Rambler Crest was considered by the Town Planning Board (the Board) in 1999, the development was required to be equipped with mechanical ventilation system and acoustic insulation glazing in lieu of openable windows to mitigate the noise impact from Container Terminal No. 9 (CT9) and adjacent roads so as to achieve the acceptable noise levels of 60dB(A) and 50dB(A) during day and night times respectively. As the acoustic windows designed by HD for the proposed PRH flats were openable, they would not be able to achieve the same performance on insulation of noise and atmospheric particulates as the non-openable windows of Rambler Crest. On the other hand, it might not be practical to require the PRH residents to use air-conditioning at all times as a mitigation measure. However, if the Board agreed to rezone the Site for PRH development, similar environmental mitigation requirement of installation of non-openable windows should be imposed for the PRH flats;
- (c) he wondered if the number of building blocks in the proposed PRH development could be reduced from four to three by increasing the height of each block. However, he worried that if the number of blocks was reduced to three without increasing the building height and reducing the number of flats, the footprint of each block would have to increase, thereby exacerbating the adverse air ventilation and visual impacts. Although HD had proposed to reduce the number of building blocks from five under the original scheme to four under the latest scheme, the number

of flats was instead increased from about 3,800 to 4,400 with corresponding increase in population. As the Site was the only green space for the residents of Tsing Yi South, he requested that no housing blocks should be constructed at the Site and the Site be retained for open space use;

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (d) the Site was currently serving as a buffer between the logistic and container-related uses to the south and the residential use to the north. If it was used for PRH development, the future residents of the Site would be more exposed to the polluting uses in the south than the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate to the north;
- (e) while Members had raised concern on the difference in construction cost between development on flat land and on sloping site in the last meeting, the representative of HD indicated that there would not be much difference despite the slope gradient of the Site varied between 20 to 38 degrees. Before the recent change in policy, the Government considered that sloping sites with gradient of more than 20 degrees were not suitable for development. While the recent Policy Address announced that sloping sites with gradient of not more than 25 degrees might also be explored for development, many professionals of the construction industry raised concerns on the policy initiative from the safety point of view. The Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office had pointed out that allowing development on slopes with gradient of 25 degrees, though technically feasible, would have greater danger and incur higher construction and maintenance costs. The Secretary for Development also said that the cost issue was a major concern for development on steeper slopes. As the Site was intended for PRH development, it was expected that the future high maintenance cost of the slopes would be borne by public fund;

- (f) while the government representatives were unable to provide Members with information in the last meeting on the number of traffic congestion in Tsing Yi caused by traffic accidents over the past three years, he had gathered some information from the residents that there were at least six serious traffic congestion caused by breakdown, overturning and collision of buses, container vehicles and other vehicles on the nearby roads over the 9-month period from August 2015 to April 2016, hindering the residents of Tsing Yi South to go to work and school. The blockage of the local roads also affected the operation of the nearby logistic uses which were a main economic sector of Hong Kong. The increase in population arising from the proposed PRH development would inevitably exacerbate the current traffic congestion problem;
- (g) there were stormwater drainage system, drainage reserve and sewage treatment works on and adjacent to the Site. As the stormwater drainage system was an open channel, it might generate odour and attract children of the future PRH development to go and play there which could be dangerous. Although the government representatives pointed out that appropriate odour treatment measures had been adopted in the adjacent sewage treatment works, it still generated odour nuisance to the residents of Rambler Crest. As the drainage reserve ran across the middle of the Site, it is prone to damage by the construction works of the proposed PRH development;
- (h) while the Paper indicated that there would be clinic, day care centre for the elderly and kindergarten provided within the Site and that the GFA of the commercial centre was about 4,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA, he wondered whether all the facilities would be accommodated within the commercial centre or in separate premises. The scale of the proposed commercial centre was similar to the size of Eslite Bookstore in Causeway Bay or Sincere Department Store in Tsuen Wan. It might be too small to serve a population of 12,000;

- (i) when assessing the ratio of flow to capacity of the road junctions in the traffic impact assessment (TIA), there was no differentiation on the types of vehicles. However, long vehicles such as container vehicles and buses would take up more road space than cars in general. As Tsing Yi Road was heavily used by container vehicles and buses, the TIA might have over-estimated the road capacity;
- (j) the traffic consultants had conducted three surveys on 29.1.2015, 31.3.2015 and 28.4.2015 respectively to study the traffic flows at the adjacent roads and road junctions and the traffic impacts on public transport services. He considered that the one-day duration of each survey might not be able to truly reflect the real traffic situation of the area, in particular the survey on 31.3.2015 which was conducted before the Easter Holidays when schools were already on vacation. The conduct of the surveys at individual locations could not reflect the overall picture. Besides, only buses were studied in the survey of public transport services but minibuses and taxies were not. The road usage by private cars and other commercial vehicles was also neglected;
- (k) the future Block 4 of the proposed PRH development would only be 40m away from the Esso petrol filling station (PFS) at Tsing Yi Road, which was too close and dangerous to the future residents. In addition, while Rambler Crest and Mayfair Gardens were already prone to explosion risk of the oil depots in Tsing Yi South, the proposed PRH development was even closer to the oil depots and exposed to such risk;
- (l) the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) had not indicated that they would forgo the Site for development of an open space. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), open space could be active or passive. The Site overgrown with trees was actually a passive open space currently being enjoyed by the nearby residents. The trees on the Site were grown by the residents of Rambler Crest some years ago who had a great passion for those trees;

- (m) the technical assessments, in particular the TIA, conducted for the proposed PRH development were hasty and inadequate. Only a broad environmental assessment was conducted but not a formal environmental assessment study (EAS). The air quality and noise impacts of CT9 were not assessed. The air ventilation assessment (AVA) and visual appraisal were not thorough. The impacts of the committed and planned developments nearby were not fully taken into account in the assessments; and
- (n) the residents of Tsing Yi South generally opposed the proposed PRH development at the Site. The Board was urged to reject the zoning amendment of the Site for PRH development and revert the Site to its original “Open Space” zoning.

R414/C213 – Wong Yu Mei

23. Ms Wong Yu Mei made the following main points:

- (a) she was a housewife living in Rambler Crest. Her duty was to teach her children. It was wrong for the Board to take the Site, which was the only green and breathing space for the residents of Rambler Crest, for housing development. The Board should have sympathy on the residents. If the Board insisted on taking the Site for development, she could no longer tell her children what was right or wrong;
- (b) it was absurd that the photomontages of the proposed PRH development as provided in the visual appraisal could not be prepared from the viewpoint of Rambler Crest, which was mostly affected, albeit it was a private development. Members might not be able to understand how Rambler Crest would be affected by the proposed development and how the future residents of the PRH development would suffer from such design;
- (c) the flats in Rambler Crest needed to rely on air-conditioning with the

windows closed all the time to mitigate the dust and noise impact from the surrounding traffic and polluting uses. The trees on the Site helped provide fresh air to Rambler Crest;

- (d) there was often serious traffic congestion caused by traffic accidents and other emergency cases such as burst of water pipes in the road network around Rambler Crest, causing great disturbance to residents of Tsing Yi South. From July 2015 to January 2016, there were at least eight such incidents. Most of the accidents were related to container vehicles. It was lucky that there were no fire incidents or other emergencies happening in those times of serious traffic congestion, otherwise the lives of the local residents would be at risk. Although the government representatives had pointed out that the vehicular traffic of the container terminal and logistic use would largely bypass the residential area, it was not the case;
- (e) although the Government had proposed to increase the number of bus routes and the frequency of the existing public transport services to meet the needs of the future residents, the road capacity of Tsing Yi Road was limited as there were already many bus routes running along the road and the lanes of the road were very often closed for works. It was also unlikely that the road would be widened. The container vehicles also blocked the road frequently when they queued up outside the Esso PFS or made a turn at the roundabouts. With the population intake of the proposed PRH development, the current traffic problem would be exacerbated;
- (f) she queried how the proposed commercial centre at the Site could accommodate all the proposed welfare facilities plus the supporting retail and eating place uses for the residents. If the commercial centre could not provide adequate supporting facilities for the future residents, they had to travel to other areas or compete with the current residents for the facilities;
- (g) she wondered if the provision of medical services for the new population

had been taken into account in the rezoning proposal. Kwai Tsing and Tsuen Wan districts were mainly served by Princess Margaret Hospital and Yan Chai Hospital but capacities of the two hospitals were nearly saturated. The air of Tsing Yi South was particularly polluted by container vehicles travelling along the roads, which in turn affected the health of the residents. If the Site was used for housing development, it would increase the burden on local medical services;

- (h) there were similar sloping sites in the north-western part of Tsing Yi which were larger in size and could be used for PRH development. The cost for developing PRH there should be lower than at the Site. The Board should not take the Site for infill development; and

[Ms Christina M. Lee arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (i) she had participated in the planting of trees at the Site. Due to the large number of trees on the Site, it was unlikely that all the trees felled for development could be compensated.

R426 – 譚嘉諾

C176 – Poon Miu Kuen

24. Ms Poon Miu Kuen made the following main points:

- (a) she did not have enough time to comprehend the Paper which was sent to her only lately;
- (b) the TIA was done poorly and inaccurate. It was unreasonable for carrying out a traffic survey on 31.3.2015 before long holidays as students and some people were already on their vacation. The survey venue at Cheung Wang Estate was also inappropriate as Cheung Wang Estate was a terminal for the bus and minibus routes where people could get on board easily, whereas the proposed PRH development was midway down the routes where people were difficult to get on board during morning rush

hours;

- (c) residents in Tsing Yi South relied heavily on Tsing Yi South Bridge as their passage to the urban area. If a traffic accident happened on and blocked the bridge, the traffic of Tsing Yi South would be paralyzed. In one morning she needed to spend one and a half hour to go to Tsing Yi MTR Station from Rambler Crest because of a traffic accident blocking the road. On 22.4.2016 after the last meeting, she took a walk from Rambler Crest to Tsing Yi MTR Station with the intention to estimate the walking time for the journey, and found that it would take about 35 minutes,. However, the street environment along the way was unpleasant as it needed to pass by the container vehicle parks and industrial area. As the development proposal at the Site was problematic, all 24 members of the Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) requested the Government to shelve the proposal;
- (d) the proposed development at the Site together with the nearby Ching Chun Court development would bring a new population of about 15,000 to the area. As it was expected that many young people would move in to the new developments, the population might further increase in a few years when new babies were born. The proposed commercial centre with a GFA of about 4,000m<sup>2</sup> within the Site was inadequate to serve the needs to the residents;
- (e) she agreed that the viewpoints of the photomontages for the proposed development should be in public areas. However, she wondered why some public locations, such as the minibus stop, the access flyover and the podium of Rambler Crest, the Esso PFS and Tsing Yi Institute of Vocational Education (IVE), were not taken as the viewpoints. The selective viewpoints chosen by PlanD for the photomontages were misleading;
- (f) at the last meeting a government representative indicated that the Esso PFS was not dangerous to the adjacent residential developments as it was

not for filling of liquefied petroleum gas (LPG). However, according to the HKPSG, the principal function of PFS was to provide fuelling facilities as well as air and water for motor vehicles. In general and unless as otherwise specified, vehicular fuels might mean petrol, diesel, oil, and LPG. Except as otherwise specified, PFS generally refers to conventional PFS, petrol cum LPG filling station and LPG filling station. Besides, for PFS within built-up areas, they should preferably be located in relatively open areas and not surrounded by developments. Where such requirement could not be met, it was desirable that the surrounding buildings of the PFS were only low-rise. Obviously, a development of 140mPD in height was not low-rise and the proposed PRH development at the Site was not meeting the standards under the HKPSG;

- (g) as the service apartment blocks of Rambler Crest were blocked by the three linear hotel blocks to their south and east, no breeze could reach the apartment blocks from the south and east. If a new housing block of 140mPD was erected to their west, the ventilation to Rambler Crest would be further obstructed;
- (h) while noise level in a residential flat should be measured with window opened, the residents of Rambler Crest were asked by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) to close their windows before doing the measurement and the noise level so measured was marginally within the standard. She wondered whether the future PRH flats at the Site could meet the noise standard if their windows were of open-type. Although the HKPSG had set out the requirements for mitigating noise and glare impacts, it was not followed by the Government in the planning of the Site for housing use;
- (i) when the development of CT9 was planned in the 1990s, the Site was planned as an open space and a buffer for Mayfair Gardens as compensation. However, the government representative said that the proposed PRH development was also a buffer at the last meeting, which was irrational. According to the HKPSG, a buffer area was an area of

land separating incompatible land uses, being of sufficient extent to minimise the potential conflict between them. Those areas may contain non-sensitive structures or uses. Acceptable uses in the buffer area included godown, cold storage, carpark, amenity area and open space. Other less sensitive uses such as commercial and government/institutional facilities could also be considered. Residential use was definitely not an acceptable use in the buffer area; and

- (j) while the Paper stated that all the 1,800 trees on the Site were not old and were not valuable trees or of rare species, many of the trees were grown by the residents of Rambler Crest who had a great passion for them. The HKPSG required that no tree should be felled unnecessarily. When trees could not be retained in their original locations, they should be transplanted if feasible. As such, the Government should find a site of similar size in the vicinity to transplant all the trees on the Site if they had to be removed from the Site for development.

R751 – Leo Chow

R757 – Chow Cheuk Hin

R758 – Joanne Choi

R907 – 吳先生

R919/C185 – Ng Ka Ho

C184 – Ha

C186 – Hang Yi

25. A script summarising Mr Ng Ka Ho's presentation was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference. Mr Ng then made the following main points:

- (a) he received the bulky Paper only several days before the meeting and had spent a lot of time to comprehend its contents. Compared with the original design of the proposed PRH development that had been released for public consultation, the number of housing blocks at the Site had been reduced from five to four and the orientation of the blocks had also been changed. Some residents of Rambler Crest who had no comment on the

original design scheme might have comments on the new scheme. For instance, his flat could still receive some ventilation and sunlight through the building gap between Blocks 4 and 5 of the original scheme, but it would be totally blocked by Block 4 in the new scheme. Although the AVA report indicated that the air ventilation performance of Rambler Crest might be improved upon development of the Site, he could not imagine how the ventilation would be improved if his flat was facing the solid façade of Block 4;

- (b) while PlanD said that the change from five blocks to four blocks was to respond to public views, indeed the change was merely for satisfying the AVA as the 5-block scheme could not achieve an acceptable result on air ventilation;
- (c) there were two committed residential developments in the vicinity of the Site, one was Ching Chun Court under construction which would provide 465 flats for a population of over 1,000, and the other was the site at Sai Shan Road currently being put up for sale by tender which would provide about 600 flats for a population of over 2,000. In the TIA, not all the traffic surveys had taken into consideration the new population from the two developments;
- (d) three traffic surveys had been carried out for the TIA. The first one was conducted at three road junctions on 29.1.2015 to investigate the vehicular traffic flow. The second one was conducted at Cheung Wang Estate on 31.3.2015 to investigate the passenger demand for public transport services. The third one was conducted at Cheung Ching Estate on 28.4.2015 to investigate the occupancy of franchised bus and scheduled minibus routes. Each of the three surveys was conducted within one day. It was unreasonable for the TIA to draw its conclusion based on the one sample from each survey, which could lead to significant deviation from the actual situation. It was more proper for the surveys to be conducted throughout the five weekdays of a week to obtain more realistic and reliable results;

- (e) the traffic survey of 29.1.2015 was conducted at the Tsing Yi Interchange, the junction of Tsing Yi Road and Ching Hong Road and the junction of Tsing Yi Road and Sai Shan Road. There were continuous road closures in the road sections between those junctions for various works including road repairing works, underground water pipe replacement works and maintenance works of the utility companies on their underground cables and pipelines. The Tsing Yi Interchange was a 2-lane road but one of the lanes was closed for waterworks in the past two years causing great disturbance to the road traffic. However, the TIA did not assess or mention the impact of the temporary road closures on the local traffic;
- (f) the TIA estimated that the operational performance of the three road junctions would range from about 57% to 79% during AM peak hours after taking into account the current population and the population from the new developments of the Site, Ching Chun Court and the Sai Shan Road site. It should however be noted that if one of the roads or junctions was blocked by road closure, the relevant road section would become a bottleneck impeding the smooth flow of traffic. In fact, the local roads were already saturated in capacity and they could not sustain any further increase in population;
- (g) as there were many large logistics centres in the area, the local roads were heavily used by container vehicles and heavy vehicles. The road space occupied by a container vehicle was equivalent to the space occupied by two to three cars. When a container vehicle make a turn on the road, it would occupy two lanes and hence more road space. Such situations were also not assessed or mentioned in the TIA;
- (h) after adding a new ingress/egress point for the proposed PRH development and a new on-street lay-by for buses and minibuses at Tsing Yi Road, the road would be changed from two lanes to one lane and became busier. The TIA did not assess the traffic impact of such a change;

- (i) there was a proposal in the TIA to build a slip road connecting Tsing Yi Road with Tsing Hung Road but that proposal was dropped as the traffic flow was estimated to exceed the road capacity slightly after assessment. In fact, some traffic management measures, e.g. allowing only private cars and public transport vehicles to use the slip road, might be considered in order to retain the slip road proposal to help divert some of the traffic from Tsing Yi Road;
- (j) the traffic survey conducted at Cheung Wang Estate on 31.3.2015 revealed that the observed passenger demand for public transport services in the busiest AM peak hour at Cheung Wang Estate was 1,776 persons, which was 14.34% of the population of Cheung Wang Estate. Based on the result, it was estimated that the passenger demand of the proposed PRH development was 1,861 persons in the busiest AM peak hour, i.e. 14.34% of the estimated population for the proposed development. However, the one-day survey was conducted before the long Easter holidays when many students and workers were already on their vacation and did not need to go out. From the 2015 statistical data of the Census and Statistics Department, the ratio of employed persons to population was 51.77% and the ratio of students to population was 16.02%, totaling 67.79%. Applying the ratio to the estimated population of the proposed PRH development of about 13,000, about 8,800 persons of the development needed to go to work or school. If 50% of those persons would use public transport, the estimated passenger demand was 4,400 persons, which was much higher than the figure estimated by the traffic consultant. If the survey could be carried out for a longer duration and in the appropriate days, the result might be more plausible;
- (k) the survey of 28.4.2015 to investigate the occupancy of bus and minibus routes was carried out at the Ching Tao House stop of Cheung Ching Estate, but the stop where most people would take bus and minibus was the preceding one at Ching Wai House. The location of traffic survey was inappropriate;

- (l) based on the estimated passenger demand for public transport services of 1,861 persons, the traffic consultant further estimated that 15.5 bus capacities was adequate to satisfy the demand from the future population of the proposed PRH development, which had assumed that all passengers would take the same bus route to go to the same destination and had not taken into account the demands from Ching Chun Court and the Sai Shan Road site. However, from his observations at Cheung Ching Estate, Mayfair Gardens and Rambler Crest, half of the people would take bus and the other half would take minibus in the morning. Taking into account people's choice of routes and the additional population from the Site, Ching Chun Court and the Sai Shan Road site and adopting his estimated passenger demand figure, about 24 bus and 176 minibus capacities would be required to meet the public transport service demand of the area upon full development, which was much higher than the estimate made by the traffic consultant;
- (m) as regards the study of the occupancy of bus route No. 42A which was the most popular route, the traffic consultant estimated that there would be a shortfall of 1.2 bus capacity after the occupation of the proposed PRH development. However, his estimated shortfall was 8.6 bus capacities adopting his estimated passenger demand figure and taking into account the additional population from the Site, Ching Chun Court and the Sai Shan Road site;
- (n) as more and more logistics centres had opened in the area in recent years, the number of container vehicles travelling on the roads in Tsing Yi South had escalated significantly. However, the TIA had totally neglected the traffic flow of container vehicles in the area;
- (o) although the Government considered that there was an effective diversion mechanism at the Tsing Yi Interchange for container vehicles coming from Tsing Yi South Bridge to be diverted to the lower section of Tsing Yi Road whilst vehicles to the residential area to be diverted to the upper section of Tsing Yi Road, that was not the real situation. In fact, many

container vehicles would go to the Esso PFS at the upper section of Tsing Yi Road and queued up along the road;

- (p) the Government had not liaised with the bus companies and the minibus operators on whether they had the resources to provide additional services to meet the demand from the new population of over 16,000 in the area. When Kwai Luen Estate with four PRH blocks at Kwai Chung was planned several years ago, the Government had also committed that public transport services would be increased to meet the demand from the additional population. However, there was no improvement or increase of services after completion of the development despite the repeated requests of K&TDC. If the public transport services providers had no resources to enhance their services, the traffic of Tsing Yi South would become paralysed shortly;
- (q) it was only proposed to provide a total of 180 parking spaces, comprising 126 car parking spaces, 35 motorcycle parking spaces and 19 light goods vehicle parking spaces, for the proposed PRH development at the Site. While the adjacent Cheung Ching Estate had a much larger parking provision of 525 parking spaces for 4,800 flats, it was still insufficient to meet the current parking demand from the residents. It could be expected that due to the lack of sufficient parking spaces in the proposed development, on-street illegal parking would become common which would adversely affect the local traffic;
- (r) there was frequent traffic congestion at the upper section of Tsing Yi Road during the morning peak hours due to traffic accidents blocking the road. The traffic congestion delayed the residents' journey to work seriously;
- (s) he noticed that the quality of the consultant's employees conducting the traffic surveys varied a lot and some of them were very unprofessional. As the findings of the TIA were unreliable and misleading, he urged that the TIA should be redone;

- (t) the Site was subject to severe noise impact from different noise sources, including the preliminary sewage treatment works to its northeast, CT9 to its southeast, the highway of the Stonecutters Bridge to its south and the Esso PFS to its north;
- (o) the noise survey conducted by the environmental consultant on 3 spots of the Site on 3.2.2015 revealed that the measured noise levels from the fixed noise source had all exceeded the acceptable noise levels of 60dB(A) and 50dB(A) for day and night times respectively. The exceedance was particularly high at the spot at the northern site boundary which was close to the PFS that operated 24 hours a day. Although the Government indicated that noise mitigation measures such as acoustic windows could be incorporated in the proposed development, it was uncertain how effective the measures would be. It was also strange to note that the consultant had rashly raised the acceptable noise levels for day and night times to 70dB(A) and 60dB(A) respectively in the conclusion of the report in respect of the assessment of the fixed plant noise impact;
- (p) the report also concluded that with noise mitigation measures, the traffic noise compliance rate of the flats was estimated to be over 90%. While the acceptable noise levels for residential use owing to road traffic noise source was 70dB(A), residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) was subject to a more stringent noise level of 55 dB(A) under the HKPSG. As the proposed development comprised a RCHE, it should be subject to the noise standard of 55 dB(A) and, as such, the noise non-compliance rate of the flats should be much more than 10% even with mitigation measures;
- (q) the Site was located along the flight path and exposed to aircraft noise. However, the noise impact assessment report had not provided any assessment on aircraft noise;
- (r) as only a broad environmental assessment report had been done for the proposed development instead of a formal EAS, EPD had indicated that

they had no technical comment on the report as it did not contain any quantitative assessment. It was not the case as mentioned by PlanD that EPD had commented that the proposed development did not have insurmountable environmental problems;

- (s) EPD had required the development of Rambler Crest to provide closed windows, mechanical ventilation and air-conditioning as noise mitigation measures to alleviate the noise impact from CT9 in 2004. However, it appeared that all such mitigation measures would not be implemented in the proposed PRH development at the Site;
- (t) the Esso PFS at Tsing Yi Road was not a conventional PFS as it contained a lubricating oil storage to serve the container vehicles, which was highly dangerous. The distance between the PFS and Block 4 of the proposed PRH development was only about 40m. If there was an accident in the PFS causing explosion, Block 4 of the proposed development might collapse and it would further affect the buildings of Rambler Crest down the slope. The tragedy was inconceivable. PlanD and HD should be asked to confirm with FSD the potential hazard of the PFS on its surrounding residential uses. It should be noted that the HKPSG had already stated that PFS within built-up areas should preferably be located in relatively open areas and not surrounded by developments, and where such a requirement could not be met, it was desirable that the surrounding buildings of the PFS were only low-rise;
- (u) the HKPSG required that unrestricted vehicular access to drainage reserve should be provided at all times. Structures of any kind should generally not be permitted in a drainage reserve unless in exceptional circumstances. However, Blocks 3 and 4 of the proposed development were sited next to the drainage reserve and a vehicular access to Block 4 spanned across the reserve. It was against the requirements under the HKPSG;
- (v) Tsing Yi South was short of open spaces and recreational facilities as most of the facilities were located at Tsing Yi North. In 2000, when the Town

Planning Appeal Board considered an appeal case about rezoning a site at Yu Lok Lane, Sheung Wan from open space to residential use, it ruled that the calculation of provision of open space for an area should be on the basis of a 200m walkable distance. As such, it was unreasonable for PlanD to take into account the open spaces which were far away from Tsing Yi South in the calculation of the provision of open space in Tsing Yi South and claim that the provision was adequate;

- (w) according to the HKPSG, six children's playgrounds should be provided to serve the current population of 30,000 in Tsing Yi South. However, only three children's playgrounds were provided. Upon completion of the proposed PRH development at the Site, the population of the area would be further increased to 43,000, but no additional children's playground had been planned to serve the population;
- (x) the Site was an important green buffer for the residents of Tsing Yi South as it helped screen the noise and air pollution from CT9 and provided a breathing space for the nearby residents;
- (y) the cost of construction on slope was high. LCSD had indicated that the Site with its gradient varying from 20 degrees to 38 degrees was too steep and not suitable for development of recreational facilities. However, PlanD considered that the Site was suitable for housing development and the height of the future buildings could be as tall as 140mPD;
- (z) it was not easy for the K&TDC members from different political background to oppose the development proposal unanimously and request it to be shelved. The only reason for the unity of all District Council (DC) members was that the proposed development was problematic and unsuitable at the Site;
- (aa) he urged the Board to request that the TIA and the noise impact assessment be redone. There should also be studies on the provision of open space and recreational facilities, the impact of the PFS on the

surrounding residential uses and the impact of the proposed development on the drainage reserve as such issues did not comply with the requirements of the HKPSG. Moreover, the EAS should be completed as soon as possible to provide EPD with the quantitative environmental assessment results for comment. The Board should not approve the development proposal until the said assessments and studies were in place; and

- (bb) he suggested the deletion of Block 4 of the proposed PRH development from the scheme as Block 4 was close to the PFS, drainage reserve and sewage treatment works and was subject to the most severe noise impact. The site area released could be used for development of other recreational facilities to serve the needs of the local residents.

R561/C223 – Cheung Yuk Chun

26. Ms Cheung Yuk Chun made the following main points:

- (a) she lived in Rambler Crest some years ago when she was working in Central. As she could not endure the unreasonably long commuting time from Rambler Crest to her workplace, she moved out later. She moved back to Rambler Crest recently as she had retired. Due to the poor traffic conditions, Rambler Crest was not a suitable living place for the working people;
- (b) the residents of Rambler Crest also had to suffer from the persistent operating noise of the nearby container terminal; and
- (c) the trees on the proposed housing site provided the residents of Rambler Crest the only breathing space. The roots of the trees could help stabilise the slope. If the trees were removed for housing development, Rambler Crest would be prone to the risk of landslide. The structural safety of the access flyover and building blocks of Rambler Crest would also be affected.

R575 – Amy Cheung

27. Ms Amy Cheung made the following main points:

- (a) she opposed the proposed PRH development at the Site as the proposal was unjust and the technical assessments conducted were not exhaustive, and requested that the development proposal be shelved;
- (b) while the public might think the residents of Rambler Crest were selfish as they opposed the development proposal, the residents of Rambler Crest, Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate were all sufferers indeed. Rambler Crest was developed during the term of the first Chief Executive who strived to boost housing production and slanted towards the developer. The Board should have considered the relevant environmental assessments at that time before approving the development with conditions and allowing it to be sold as a service apartment project. The residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate agreed to the development of Rambler Crest at that time in return for the Government's commitment that the Site would be maintained as an open space and buffer and would not be used for any form of development. They also expected that the development of Rambler Crest could help improve the traffic conditions of the area. Unfortunately, after the occupation of the service apartments and opening of the three hotels of Rambler Crest in 2004, more than 5,000 new residents and the hotel guests started to compete with them on the public transport services and road space, but they still had to suffer from the noise impact of CT9. The greenery view of the Site was the only thing that the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate had benefited from the development of Rambler Crest. If the Government pursued the proposed development at the Site, it would not only take away the one and only compensation to the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate, but also bring in

over 12,000 new residents to compete with them for the daily necessities. It was totally unjust to the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate;

- (c) she noted that one resident of Cheung Ching Estate supported the zoning amendments for the proposed PRH development. It appeared that the resident had misunderstood that the development of the Site would help the redevelopment of Cheung Ching Estate. However, the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) had already indicated that they had no plan to redevelop Cheung Ching Estate. If that resident knew the truth, he might join them in objecting to the proposed PRH development;
- (d) it was not easy for laymen to understand the technical assessments for the project, which generally concluded that the proposed PRH development would not have insurmountable problems on the area. However, as the residents of the area could not envision the actual impacts of the nearby committed developments of Ching Chun Court and the Sai Shan Road site on their living at the moment, it was unjust to make assumptions of the possible impacts of those developments in the assessment reports;
- (e) the environmental assessment report indicated that over 15% of the flats in the proposed PRH development would be subject to a noise level exceeding the noise limit of 70dB(A), and upon implementation of noise mitigation measures, still 10% of the flats would exceed the noise limit. She wondered if the same types of noise mitigation measures currently adopted at Rambler Crest would be implemented for the proposed development. Indeed, the use of mechanical ventilation and air-conditioning as mitigation measures at Rambler Crest were impractical as it would affect the health of residents. She suffered from respiratory problem after living in Rambler Crest. Her doctor had advised her to open the windows of her flat to breath in fresh air. If the proposed PRH flats also had to rely on mechanical ventilation with their windows closed as a noise mitigation measure, the health of the residents would certainly be at risk;

- (f) the natural ventilation to the flats of Rambler Crest was already blocked by the three hotel blocks to their south and east. If a new housing block was to be built to the west, it would leave only a narrow gap for Rambler Crest to receive natural ventilation, despite the findings of the AVA report said that the ventilation performance at Rambler Crest would be improved. She wondered if any assessment reports had confirmed that the proposed PRH development would not adversely affect the intake of fresh air for the mechanical ventilation system of Rambler Crest;
- (g) the Paper mentioned that Tsing Yi residents would rely on the hospital facilities in the adjacent Tsuen Wan and Kwai Chung districts. With the increase in population of about 20,000 taking into account the new developments of the Site, Ching Chun Court and the Sai Shan Road site in the vicinity, there would be a deficit of 1,166 hospital beds in Tsing Yi. As the Site was only one of the 13 potential housing sites in Kwai Tsing district, she wondered if the medical facilities in the region could sustain all those developments;
- (h) development on slope was much more costly than on flat land. The Government should be cautious in the spending of public money and should choose the sites that would be lower in development cost to develop public housing;
- (i) she had participated in planting the trees on the Site. The 1,800 trees on the Site would first be sacrificed if the Site was used for PRH development. She hoped that the trees could be preserved;
- (j) Tsing Yi South was primarily planned for port back-up uses. The area was not suitable for large-scale housing development. The proposed PRH development at the Site should be shelved. The Government could redevelop Cheung Ching Estate instead to increase the number of housing units and improve the living conditions of the residents of Cheung Ching Estate. As the provision of recreational facilities was concentrated in

Tsing Yi North, the Government should consider using the Site for the development of recreational facilities to serve the residents of Tsing Yi South; and

- (k) a more thorough public consultation should be carried out to solicit public views on suitable sites for public housing development in Tsing Yi.

R584 – So Sheung Chun

28. Mr So Sheung Chun made the following main points:

- (a) he opposed the proposed PRH development at the Site;
- (b) he moved to Rambler Crest in 2012. His flat was poor in penetration of natural ventilation and sunlight. It could only have sunlight in less than 3% of the time in a year. His health and daily life were adversely affected after he had lived in the flat;
- (c) his flat only had a narrow view towards the Site. If the proposed PRH development was pursued, his flat would be totally blocked by Block 4 of the development. He could no longer see the sky from his flat and the penetration of natural ventilation and sunlight to his flat would be further worsened;
- (d) while the flats in the residential blocks of the proposed PRH development would be packed closely together causing wall effect, the public housing flats in Singapore were much desirable in design as there were gaps between the flats for better air ventilation. If the Government only aimed at maximising flat production at the Site without caring for the importance of air ventilation, the people living in those flats would have their health deteriorating rapidly, affecting the strength of manpower of Hong Kong as a whole.

[The meeting was adjourned for a break of 5 minutes.]

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R589/C342 – Chau Man Hon

R641 – 周志常

R686 – 麥婉萍

29. Mr Chau Man Hon made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in Rambler Crest since 2004 when the development was first occupied. He felt that he was deceived by the developer as the site of Rambler Crest was not suitable for residential development;
- (b) residents in Rambler Crest suffered from the serious noise, air and glare impacts from the adjacent CT9. The guests of the three hotels also created nuisance to the residents and they competed with the residents for public transport facilities;
- (c) as the site of Rambler Crest was zoned “Commercial” on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), the Government did not regard Rambler Crest as a normal residential development in the planning of supporting facilities for the area, and neglected the needs of those people who lived in over 1,500 flats at the site. Many of the current support facilities, e.g. a zebra crossing at the upper section of Tsing Yi Road and the playground at Tsing Hung Road, were fought for over the years by the residents themselves;
- (d) many problems encountered by Rambler Crest were still not yet resolved at the moment. For instance, residents had to wait for a long time to get on board the minibuses in the morning. They were also facing competitions from the workers of the nearby logistics centre which were opened recently for the minibus service;
- (e) the proposal to develop PRH at the Site would take away the only green

open space enjoyed by Rambler Crest. Like many of his neighbours, he had participated in the planting of trees on the Site in around 2005/2006. The residents witnessed the growth of the trees each day and had a great passion for them. The trees could not be removed lightly just because they were not old and valuable trees or were not of rare species. If the trees were of poor health, the Government should be responsible for curing them;

- (f) as the fresh air intake point of the mechanical ventilation system of Rambler Crest was located on 1/F of each block facing the Site, the residents of Rambler Crest were breathing the oxygen generated by the trees on the Site. If the Government fell all the 1,800 trees on the Site for housing development, it took away the residents' right to breath in fresh air;
- (g) Hong Kong was in general in short of hospital beds. In March 2016 when Hong Kong was in the winter influenza season, the occupancy rate of hospital beds at Yan Chai Hospital was 124%. The three hospitals in Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing districts, namely Yan Chai Hospital, Princess Margaret Hospital and Kwai Chung Hospital, had a total of 3,212 beds. The total planned population of Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing districts was about 816,000. That was equivalent to 3.9 hospital beds for every 1,000 people in Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing districts, which was lower than the territory-wide figure of 5.2 hospital beds for every 1,000 people. As Kwai Tsing district was in acute shortage of hospital beds, the Government should not pursue further development of the district without increasing the number of hospital beds correspondingly;
- (h) while the three hotel blocks of Rambler Crest helped shield off the glare impact from CT9 to the service apartment blocks, he queried if there would be any other measures such as installation of impermeable curtain to help the proposed PRH development shield off the glare;
- (i) while the government representatives had pointed out that the upper

section of Tsing Yi Road was mainly used by private cars and vehicles of the residential area whereas the lower section of Tsing Yi Road was mainly used by container vehicles and other heavy vehicles, that was not the actual situation. Indeed, many container vehicles used the upper section of Tsing Yi Road as they needed to go to the Esso PFS there, and many private cars of Rambler Crest would go to the lower section of Tsing Yi Road as the car park entrance of Rambler Crest was located at Tsing Hung Road; and

- (j) many of the traffic accidents in the area were caused by container vehicles as the driving behaviours of the container vehicle drivers were generally poor. They very often did not follow the rules of turning at the roundabouts and caused accidents.

#### R618 – Li Ho Keung

30. Mr Li Ho Keung said that although he did not understand the Paper, he noted that his neighbours who were present at the meeting all complained about the contents of the Paper as they were incorrect. The development proposal did not follow the relevant planning guidelines. He queried if the Government was transferring benefits to some party or the case involved maladministration.

#### R654 – Lam Kwok Kay

31. Mr Lam Kwok Kay made the following main points:

- (a) he had so far resided in three flats in Rambler Crest. The second flat he had lived faced the direction of CT9. Although the hotel blocks helped shield off some of the noise and glare from CT9 for the flat, he still experienced extreme noise and glare and had to close the windows all the time. Later on, he moved to his current flat on a middle floor, facing the green view of the Site. After living in the new flat for two years, he was shocked by the news that the Site would be used for PRH development which was totally irrational;

- (b) he worried that there would be great nuisances to Rambler Crest during the construction period of the proposed PRH development. His parents-in-law who lived in Cheung Ching Estate were experiencing the nuisances from the construction of Ching Chun Court currently. The future housing blocks would also be very close to his flat;
- (c) his mother was unwilling to come to live with him in Rambler Crest as the place was short of supporting facilities such as wet market and bank. She had to travel by minibus to Maritime Square at Tsing Yi MTR Station to get the daily necessities, but the hotel guests competed with her for the minibus. She considered that Rambler Crest was not a suitable living place for the elderly;
- (d) Tsing Yi South was not suitable for residential use as it was close to CT9 and a number of oil depots. The reason why he would live in Rambler Crest was because of the relatively low housing price due to the unpleasant living environment; and
- (e) he noticed that advanced site investigation works were undertaken by the Government at the Site and more than 100 trees had already been removed for the works.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left this session of the meeting temporarily at this point.]

R775 – Wong Hin Shing

32. Mr Wong Hin Shing made the following main points:

- (a) he used to support the Government on its policies but he strongly objected to the current development proposal at the Site. The Government should not blindly choose the Site, which was narrow, crowded, sloping and poor in ventilation, for an in-fill PRH development.

- (b) there was a global trend for green living. As the Site was heavily polluted by the adverse environmental impacts from CT9 and was poor in traffic conditions, it was not suitable for housing development. Facilities of the area were already competed keenly by the local residents, hotel guests, students of the tertiary initiations and workers of the logistics centres. The introduction of more population to the area would aggravate the problem;
- (c) the woodland on the Site had a high conservation value as it served as a green buffer for Tsing Yi South and was the breathing space for the surrounding residential developments. The removal of the woodland was detrimental to the health of the current and future residents;
- (d) he and his family members had allergic rhinitis problems. The atmosphere surrounding Rambler Crest was very dusty. Only two windows of his flat, which were facing the Site, could be opened for natural ventilation. The proposed development at the Site would take away their only source of fresh air and sunlight;
- (e) with limited access to the area and the proximity of the proposed development with the PFS, the lives of the residents in the area would be at risk; and
- (f) the Board should plan for a better environment for people but not to ruin the environment and create more problems to the area.

R904 – Wong Oi Ling

33. Ms Wong Oi Ling made the following main points:

- (a) although she opposed the zoning amendments for the proposed PRH development at the Site, she did not oppose the development of PRH for those in need;

- (b) she wondered if the future residents of the Site would be made aware of the poor living environment of the area before they moved in. The Government was totally irresponsible if it only provided the flats to the residents to live in but not concerned about the problems of the Site;
- (c) the trees on the Site helped stabilise the slopes and save the Government cost on slope maintenance. If the trees were felled for development, slope stability would be affected;
- (d) she showed Members a photo of the Site taken from her flat. Block 4 of the proposed PRH development would lie very close to the access flyover of Rambler Crest and the Esso PFS;
- (e) there were always road works on the section of road between Tsing Yi Interchange and the roundabout at the junction of Tsing Yi Road and Sai Shan Road. In about one-third of the time of the year, the width of half of the road would be closed for road works by the Government and other utility companies, leaving limited space for vehicles to pass through. The traffic of the area was seriously affected by the frequent road works; and
- (f) the residents of Rambler Crest could not accept the housing proposal. The Board should do proper planning for Hong Kong and make Hong Kong a better place for people to live in.

R170 – Wong Kar Fai

34. Mr Wong Kar Fai made the following main points:

- (a) a new population of about 15,000 was going to be added to the subject area of 0.5km<sup>2</sup> encircling Rambler Crest, Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate, which accounted for about 60% of the current population. He doubted if the Government would provide 60% of additional space of supporting transport, open space and community facilities to the area

correspondingly;

- (b) to the immediate east of the service apartment blocks of Rambler Crest was a linear wall of the hotel blocks extending for 300m in length. The flats of Rambler Crest facing east could hardly receive any sunlight all year round. If the Site to the west of Rambler Crest was used for the proposed PRH development, the flats facing west would lose 40% to 90% of their sunlight;
- (c) the hotel blocks were already blocking the natural ventilation to Rambler Crest from the east and southeast directions. The proposed PRH development at the Site would further block the winds from the west. While the AVA report indicated that southerly winds could reach Rambler Crest, the site to the immediate south of Rambler Crest at Tsing Hung Road was planned for the development of a multi-story container vehicle park or logistics centre. With the Mapletree Logistics Hub opened recently, a number of heavy vehicles were travelling along the roads to the south of Rambler Crest. The southerly winds to Rambler Crest were actually the dirty exhaust fumes and chemicals emitted from the heavy vehicles;
- (d) if residential use was developed close to the planned logistic use, more stringent restrictions would likely be imposed to the future operators of the logistic use and it was unfair to the operators. He had an experience of applying for setting up a small dangerous godown for storage of wines for his business and the application was not approved as the premises was close to residential use;
- (e) while the PFSs developed in Hong Kong should have complied with the relevant safety standards stipulated by the Government, the Government should also manage the potential risk associated with the operation of PFSs;
- (f) while the service apartments of Rambler Crest were protected by the three

hotel blocks in their front from the noise, air and glare impacts from CT9, Blocks 1 to 3 of the proposed PRH development were directly exposed to CT9 without any buildings in-between to protect them. That was unfair to the future residents. The problems should be stopped from happening at the outset; and

- (g) from his research, the area within one km from a container terminal was not suitable for residential use as various poisonous fumes and chemicals were emitted from the heavy machinery and vehicles used in container terminal. Besides, there was no current legislation in Hong Kong requiring vessels to switch off their engine when anchored in order to minimise pollution to the inland areas.

#### C101 – Wong Sai Kit

35. Mr Wong Sai Kit made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in Tsing Yi since he was a small boy;
- (b) it was PlanD's planning vision to bring Hong Kong people a desired living environment, which should encompass a leisure and green public space. However, the proposed PRH development at the Site was not in line with PlanD's advocacy for a desired living environment;
- (c) the highly intensive mode of development in the territory in the past hindering the penetration of natural ventilation and sunlight to housing units had led to the outbreak of SARS and was proven to be detrimental to healthy living. The development of the proposed PRH blocks in a congested environment might create the same problem;
- (d) a sense of space was an important planning concept. It was not purely measured in terms of the largeness of a residential unit but was a dynamic mix of psychological and physical attributes, including the need for and perception of comfort and privacy, internal layout of the unit, penetration

of natural light and air ventilation, the neighbourhood and the local environment. Such a planning concept was however not taken into consideration in the proposed PRH development;

- (e) although some PFSs were located very close to residential buildings in the main urban area, they were indeed the failure of the past due to the lack of proper planning. The Government should not repeat the same faults in the planning of the Site;
- (f) good planning should be done by all people. The views of the stakeholders should be taken into account in the planning of the Site. The unanimous opposition of all K&TDC members from different political background to the development proposal was a clear signal to the Government that the people did not want to have the proposed development at the Site as it was inappropriate and problematic; and
- (g) the development pace of Tsing Yi South was so fast that the infrastructural provision could not cope with the developments. As a result, traffic problems emerged and the health of the residents were put at risk. The Board should consider carefully what a good planning for people should be.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left this session of the meeting at this point.]

#### C77 – Yeung Kam Fook

36. Mr Yeung Kam Fook made the following main points:

- (a) due to the presence of oil depots in the area in the past, four originally planned residential blocks of Mayfair Gardens were omitted when the development was built. He wondered if those four residential blocks could be built at Mayfair Gardens after the development of the Site for PRH;

- (b) the distance between the Esso PFS and the housing blocks of the Site was very close. There were previously cases in Hong Kong that PFSs would be relocated because they were too close to residential use;
- (c) he always had to compete with the hotel guests for minibus when he went to work. Although the Government had said that the frequency of minibus service could be increased, not many people were willing to be minibus drivers and the current minibus drivers were generally old; and
- (d) he used to support the Government on all polices. If the development proposal was to be pursued at the Site, he would oppose the Government in future.

37. As the presentations of the presenters, commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the question and answer (Q&A) session. The Chairman briefed the attendees that the Q&A session was for Members to better understand the amendments to the OZP and the subject matters of the concerns of the representations/comments. Members would raise questions and the Chairman would invite the presenters/commenters/their representatives and/or the government's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board, or for cross-examination between parties, although it was understandable they might not necessarily agree with the responses of others.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng returned to join and Professor S.C. Wong left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

#### *Environmental Impact*

38. In response to the enquiry from a Member when the EAS for the proposed development was undertaken, Mr Hong Wing Kit, SCE, HD, said that an initial EAS based on the latest design scheme of the proposed PRH development had been undertaken. HD was liaising with EPD on how the design of the scheme could be refined to improve the environmental performance of the development. It might take some time to finalise the EAS as the analysis of a large amount of environmental data was necessary. The results of the

initial EAS were largely the same as the broad environmental assessment results presented in the Paper.

39. Noting that a representer had mentioned that the noise standard for RCHE should be 55dB(A) but not 70dB(A) as for normal housing accommodation, the Chairman asked if the information was correct and if there were design measures to ensure that the proposed RCHE at the Site could comply with the noise standard. In response, Mr Steven K.H. Tang, environmental consultant of HD, said that according to the HKPSG, only the diagnostic rooms and wards in a RCHE were subject to the noise standard of 55dB(A) for road traffic noise whilst that for domestic premises was 70dB(A). In response to a further enquiry from a Member on the noise standard for kindergarten, Mr Tang said that it was 65dB(A) for road traffic noise source. In response to the Chairman, Mr Ng Ka Ho (R919/C185) said that the noise standard of 55dB(A) for road traffic noise should apply to hospitals, clinics, convalescences and RCHEs according to the HKPSG but not only to the diagnostic rooms and wards of RCHEs.

40. In response to a Member's request to further clarify the noise standard for RCHE, Mr Steven K.H. Tang confirmed that if the proposed RCHE within the Site was only for residential care purpose without any diagnostic room or ward, its noise standard for road traffic noise source should be 70dB(A).

41. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the noise standard under the HKPSG referred to the transient noise level or the persistent noise level, Mr Steven K.H. Tang said that for road traffic noise source, the noise level measured was the average level in a one-hour period, whilst for a fixed noise source, such as CT9, it was the average noise level in a half-hour period.

42. Noting that Blocks 1 to 3 of the proposed PRH development would be subject to direct environmental impact from CT9 and the logistic uses in the south, a Member asked if there was any estimation on the additional electricity fee that would be incurred to each flat if the residents had to rely on air-conditioning as a mitigation measure. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, PlanD, said that Rambler Crest was planned as a buffer for shielding the residential developments of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate from the noise and glare impacts of CT9. As Rambler Crest was immediately abutting CT9, its

service apartment units were equipped with mechanical ventilation system and acoustic insulation glazing and were shielded by the linear hotel blocks in front as environmental mitigation measures. As regards the part of the Site not screened by Rambler Crest, it was located over 300m away from CT9. The preliminary findings of the EAS conducted by HD indicated that the predicted traffic noise level of some of the flats at the Site would exceed the noise limit of 70dB(A) but over 90% of the flats could comply with the noise limit when provided with noise mitigation measures. Appropriate noise mitigation measures such as acoustic windows, architectural fins and building orientation would be explored with a view to meeting the noise standard as far as possible. The acoustic windows were designed to consist of two glass panels, which enabled them to screen out noise while letting air in.

43. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Steven K.H. Tang clarified that with appropriate noise mitigation measures in place, over 90% of the total number of flats in the proposed development could comply with the noise standard of 70dB(A) based on the latest scheme design. One of the possible noise mitigation measures was the installation of acoustic windows which was recognised by EPD as an effective means in reducing about 4dB(A) to 8dB(A) of the noise level in general.

44. The Chairman asked whether those flats not meeting the noise standard in the current scheme design could be identified specifically, and whether there would be measures to help improve the noise mitigation performance of those flats. In response, Mr Hong Wing Kit said that while the design of the proposed development was being refined, the maximum noise level of 73dB(A) was not too bad as compared with other public housing sites developed by HD. HD would target to have 100% compliance with the noise standard through further enhancements during the detailed design stage.

45. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether glare impact of CT9 had been assessed in the preliminary EAS for the proposed PRH development, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the EAS did not include assessment on glare impact. However, as the Site was over 300m away from CT9, the glare impact on the Site was comparatively less than that on Rambler Crest.

46. Noting that the environmental assessment conducted for the proposed development was not a statutory environmental impact assessment (EIA) required under the

Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO), a Member asked: (1) whether the environmental assessment was conducted in accordance with the same standards as required for a statutory EIA; (2) what were the assessment criteria on the results of the environmental assessment so conducted; (3) what would be the responsibility on the Government if eventually the flats could not achieve 100% compliance with the noise standard; (4) whether environmental management and audit (EM&A) would be carried out after completion of the proposed development as in a statutory EIA process. Noting also that EPD had not provided specific comments on the broad environmental assessment report prepared by HD as it was only a desktop study without the presentation of substantial environmental data, the Member questioned if the environmental impacts should be re-assessed upon the availability of more concrete environmental data.

47. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that as the proposed PRH development was not a designated project under the EIAO, the environmental assessment conducted was not following the procedures and technical standards as set out in the EIAO Technical Memorandum. Nevertheless, it was conducted in accordance with the requirements of EPD. For noise mitigation, EPD would take into consideration the site conditions and the scheme design and require the achievement of 100% compliance with the noise standard for all flats as far as possible. HD as the project proponent had the duty to comply with the technical requirements of EPD. With regard to the broad environmental assessment submitted to EPD, they considered that the proposed PRH development was not anticipated to have insurmountable environmental problem. HD was liaising closely with EPD on the EAS to see how their scheme design could be refined and the final EAS had to be endorsed by EPD. Mr Hong Wing Kit supplemented that although EPD did not have a strict requirement on 100% compliance with the noise standard, HD was optimistic about the full compliance with the noise standard in the subject project as the predicted maximum noise level of 73dB(A) would not be difficult to mitigate.

48. Noting that the EAS conducted for the proposed development did not cover the assessment of the glare impact from CT9 but the Site was indeed affected by glare from CT9, a Member asked whether the development proposal would incorporate any design measures to mitigate the possible glare impact. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that as there was a considerable distance between the Site and CT9, which was similar in distance between the residential developments and the container terminal in Lai King areas of Kwai Chung, the

glare impact was not expected to be significant. As such, no specific glare impact mitigation measures would be provided in the development.

49. In response to a Member's question on whether the construction of single-aspect building blocks at the Site could be an option to mitigate the environmental impacts from CT9, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that although the use of single-aspect building design was effective in mitigating noise impact from CT9, HD was exploring some better building designs which could comply with the noise standards.

#### *Traffic Impact*

50. Noting that Tsing Yi was mainly connected to the main urban area by the north and south bridges, a Member asked if the capacities of the two bridges could sustain all the planned developments in Tsing Yi and whether there was any long-term planning on the use of alternative modes of transport, e.g. ferry or bicycle, to facilitate residents going to the urban area. In response, Mr Patrick K.H. Ho, SE/KT, TD, said that Tsing Yi was well connected to its surrounding districts by roads, with Tsing Yi North and South Bridges connecting Kwai Chung, Stonecutters Bridge connecting West Kowloon, Ting Kau Bridge connecting Northwest New Territories and Tsing Ma Bridge connecting Lantau. If there was accident in any of the external roads, people could still use alternative routes to access other districts. There was no current plan to build a new external road for Tsing Yi. Based on the results of the TIA conducted for the proposed PRH development, which had taken into account the traffic generation from the committed and planned developments nearby in Tsing Yi, Tsing Yi South Bridge was still not reaching to its full capacity upon completion of the developments.

51. Noting that Mr Chau Man Hon (R589/C342) had mentioned that the workers of the newly opened Mapletree Logistics Hub would very often compete with the residents of Rambler Crest for public transport services, the Chairman asked Mr Chau when the conflicts would occur most often. In response, Mr Chau said that Mapletree Logistics Hub operated 24 hours a day. As their workers worked in shifts, they competed with the residents for public transport services all the time.

52. In response to a Member's enquiry on the general traffic movements of container

vehicles in the area, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau explained with a site plan that when container vehicles and other heavy vehicles came to Tsing Yi from Tsing Yi South Bridge, they would turn left and travel down the lower section of Tsing Yi Road direct to CT9, the adjacent logistics centres and the oil depots further south. Other vehicles going to the residential developments adjacent to the Site and Tsing Yi IVE would go to the upper section of Tsing Yi Road after passing by the Tsing Yi Interchange. With such a road design, vehicles to CT9 and the industrial area and those to the residential area would largely be separated. In response to the Chairman, Mr Poon Chi Shing (representative of R373 and others) said that as the sites at Tsing Hung Road to the immediate south of Rambler Crest had been developed for logistic use in recent years, more and more container vehicles were using Tsing Hung Road and creating greater noise and air impacts on Rambler Crest. Besides, the traffic accidents involving container vehicles quoted by other representers earlier in their presentations all happened in the upper section of Tsing Yi Road, which demonstrated that container vehicles were actually making use of that part of Tsing Yi Road and they were not separated from the vehicular traffic of the residential area as pointed out by Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau. Mr Ng Ka Ho (R919/C185) supplemented that many container vehicles were making use of the upper section of Tsing Yi Road as they needed to go to Tuen Mun and Yuen Long districts via Tsing Hong Road and Ting Kau Bridge or to the Esso PFS.

53. Noting that some representers/commenters considered that the conduct of the traffic survey on 31.3.2015 was inappropriate as it was a day before long holidays and that the survey results might not be accurate, a Member asked if the methodology of conducting the traffic survey and the survey results were proper. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the traffic survey conducted on 31.3.2015 at Cheung Wang Estate was to help estimate the demand of the proposed development on public transport services. Based on the survey result, it was estimated that the proposed development would have a passenger demand of about 1,800 persons for one peak hour during the morning on the public transport services, which was equivalent to about 4,000 to 5,000 persons per morning. Such a result was consistent with the overall design population of the development. It also revealed that by adjusting the frequency of the existing routes, the existing public transport services would be able to absorb the additional demand generated by the proposed development. An on-street lay-by for buses and minibuses would also be provided at Tsing Yi Road to cater for any future expansion of public transport services. Mr Chris K.S. Leung, traffic consultant of HD, supplemented that the public transport services demand survey was carried out in accordance

with the Transport Planning and Design Manual and the conduct of the survey in one day was in compliance with the normal practice. The survey results obtained had been compared with the similar monitoring data of TD and were found to be consistent. Cheung Wang Estate was selected as the location for conducting the survey as its nature, size and physical characteristics of the surroundings were similar to those of the proposed PRH development. In response to the Chairman, Mr Ng Ka Ho (R919/C185) said that according to his estimate which was based on the statistical data of the Census and Statistics Department, about 8,800 persons out of the anticipated population of about 13,000 in the proposed PRH development had to go to work or school, and about 50% of them (i.e. 4,400 persons) would use public transport services during the busiest AM peak hour. The estimate of HD's traffic consultant on the public transport services demand did not coincide with his estimate.

#### *Tree Felling*

54. A Member asked whether the felling of about 1,800 trees on the Site would need to be compensated and, if affirmative, how the felled trees would be compensated. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 7/2015 on Tree Preservation for government projects had set out a host of tree preservation considerations, such as tree species, height, trunk diameter, crown spread, amenity value, health, form and structural conditions, suitability for transplanting and conservation status, for the project departments to consider before deciding whether a tree should be preserved, transplanted or felled. Ms May S.S. Yeung, Architect, HD, supplemented that HD would comply with the greening requirements of the planning brief and endeavour to maximise compensatory tree planting proposal on the Site as far as practicable.

#### *Site Suitability*

55. Noting that the Site was subject to environmental and traffic impacts and that some representers/commenters had pointed out that sites in Tsing Yi North were more suitable for housing development than the Site, a Member asked if sites in Tsing Yi North had been considered for the said development. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that sites in Tsing Yi North were generally covered with natural vegetation. There were also existing industrial uses in Tsing Yi North and the traffic impact for housing development

there had not been assessed. As such, there was no current plan for large-scale housing development in Tsing Yi North. However, subject to technical assessments being carried out to ascertain no insurmountable impacts on the environmental, traffic, visual, air ventilation, landscape and other aspects, sites in Tsing Yi North might be considered for housing development in future. As regards the Site, it had previously been occupied by oil depots in the 1990s. There were two existing platforms in the Site and its vegetation emerged after the relocation of the oil depots. Given the pressing demand for housing land and that the proposed PRH development at the Site was not incompatible with its surrounding environment and would not result in insurmountable impacts, the Site was considered suitable for housing purpose.

56. In response to the same Member's question on whether another site at Fung Shue Wo Road to the northwest of Tsing Yi Park could be used for housing development, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau illustrated with some past aerial photos that the site was all along a natural slope covered with dense vegetation. It was different from the Site which had been formed into platforms and occupied by oil depots before.

57. Noting that some representers/commenters had mentioned that there were 13 sites identified for housing development in Tsing Yi, a Member asked if the Site was one of those 13 sites, and whether there was an overall programme to guide the development of the sites. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said it was the government policy to identify suitable sites throughout Hong Kong for housing development and those 13 sites were identified in Kwai Tsing district under the endeavour. K&TDC had been consulted on the Government's intention of developing those 13 potential sites for housing purpose. The rezoning of some of the sites, including those at Tai Wo Hau, Lai Kong Street, Cheung Wan Estate and Sai Shan Road for public and private housing developments, had been considered by the Board. The rezoning proposals for some more sites would be submitted to the Board for consideration upon the completion of relevant feasibility studies.

#### *The Site and Surrounding Land Use*

58. In response to a Member's enquiry on the planned use of the site to immediately south of the Site and Rambler Crest, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the site was currently used as temporary container vehicle park and container storage. According to the Hong

Kong Port Master Plan 2030, the site was proposed for the development of a multi-storey car park to enhance port development in the long term subject to detailed feasibility study.

59. In response to a Member's question on the changes of the surrounding areas of the Site since 1997, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau referred to an aerial photo of 1992 and said that the Site and the area to its south were occupied by oil depots at that time while the site of CT9 was still yet to be reclaimed from the sea. Later on, the oil depots were relocated and CT9 was planned and constructed. Rambler Crest was developed as a screen building for CT9, and the area to the south of Rambler Crest was turned into logistics and container-related uses. Mei King Playground was also developed and the Site had become a piece of vegetated vacant land.

60. The same Member asked whether it would be more appropriate from the land use planning point of view to retain the Site, which was well covered with vegetation, as a buffer to separate the container terminal and related back-up uses, industrial depots and oil depots to its south from the residential uses to its north. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that Rambler Crest was developed as a buffer to shield the residential uses to its northwest from the environmental impacts of CT9. If it could be demonstrated that the proposed PRH development at the Site would not generate unacceptable impacts, there should not be problem with using the Site for housing development.

61. A Member asked whether it had been recorded in any government document that the Site as a buffer was a compensation to the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Tsing Estate due to the construction of CT9 as alleged by some representers/commenters. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the Site was vegetated as a landscape buffer, but it was not a compensation area as there was no concept of compensation in planning terms. In response to the Chairman, Ms Amy Cheung (R575) said that according to paragraph 7.7.4 of the Explanatory Statement of the approved Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/26, the open space in front of the existing residential development at Mayfair Gardens would provide a variety of recreational facilities to the residents and the students of the adjacent technical institute, and also served as a buffer area between the residential developments and the container terminal.

#### *The Development Proposal*

62. In response to a Member's enquiry on building height, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the building height of Rambler Crest was about 143mPD whilst the maximum building height of the proposed PRH development was 140mPD.

63. In response to the Chairman's enquiries on the scale and location of the proposed commercial centre and the floor space of the proposed RCHE within the Site, Ms May S.S. Yeung said that the proposed GFA of 4,000m<sup>2</sup> for the commercial centre did not include the GFA of welfare facilities, including the RCHE. The commercial centre would be located near Blocks 2 and 3 of the development and would have more than one storey of floorspace. As requested by the Social Welfare Department, a RCHE with a net operational floor area (NOFA) of about 1,100m<sup>2</sup> providing 100 places would be provided within the Site.

64. In response to a Member's questions on the design population for Block 4 of the proposed development and its percentage of the total population of the whole development, Ms May S.S. Yeung said that Block 4 would provide about 1,200 flats for accommodating a population of about 3,000, which was about 25% of the total population of the development.

65. In response to a Member's question on whether the Government had considered the option of abandoning the construction of Block 4 at the Site to meet the proposal of some of the representers, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that in view of the need to increase housing supply and optimise development potential of suitable housing sites, the Site should be developed in accordance with the maximum plot ratio under the OZP if the proposed development would not result in insurmountable impacts.

66. Noting that some representers/commenters had pointed out that the construction works of the proposed development might affect the drainage reserve within the Site, which should be free from building structures, the Chairman asked whether the drainage reserve would be affected. In response, Mr Hong Wing Kit said that drainage reserve was a common feature encountered in public housing sites. HD had already conducted an on-site inspection with the Drainage Services Department (DSD) on the drainage reserve and had agreed with DSD on the required arrangement for maintenance access. No residential blocks of the proposed development would sit on the drainage reserve.

67. In response to a Member's question, Mr Hong Wing Kit said that the drainage

reserve within the Site would remain to be an open channel in future as requested by DSD. Appropriate safety measures would be implemented to prevent residents trespassing into the drainage reserve.

68. A Member asked whether Block 4 of the proposed development could be shifted westwards to span over the drainage reserve so that it would be located farther from Rambler Crest. In response, Ms May S.S. Yeung said that in addition to the drainage reserve, there were also a waterworks reserve and some high-voltage underground electricity pipelines in that area. As such, it was difficult to lay the foundation of building and might not be feasible to relocate Block 4 to that location. Only internal access would be constructed over the drainage reserve under the scheme design.

69. A Member asked if the penetration of sufficient sunlight to the flats was a consideration in the design of the proposed development. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that while there were no planning standards on sunlight under the HKPSG, the building separation between the proposed development and Rambler Crest was over 60m which was not small.

70. In response to a Member's question on whether the locations of Block 4 and the commercial centre in the proposed development could be swapped, Ms May S.S. Yeung said that the currently proposed location of the commercial centre was near the junction of Tsing Yi Road and Sai Shan Road. The area reserved for the commercial centre was inadequate to accommodate the much larger footprint of Block 4. It was also infeasible to increase the height of Blocks 2 and 3 to accommodate the floor area of Block 4 as the Site was subject to a building height restriction.

71. Noting that Block 4 might not be deleted wholly, a Member asked whether the south-eastern wing of Block 4, which was most proximate to Rambler Crest, could be taken out from the design of the scheme. In response, Ms May S.S. Yeung said that as there were a considerable number of flats in the south-eastern wing of Block 4, the deletion of that wing would mean that the development potential of the Site could not be optimised.

72. In response to a Member's question on whether the building height restriction under the OZP could be increased so that the height of Blocks 2 and 3 could be increased to

accommodate the floor area of Block 4, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the building height restriction of 140mPD as stipulated in the OZP had taken into consideration the height profile of the surrounding developments and environment. The proposed relaxation of the building height restriction should be supported by relevant technical assessments on visual, air ventilation and environmental impacts.

*Grounds of Supportive Representation*

73. Noting that a representer had mentioned that there was some misunderstanding in the only supportive representation to the OZP amendments, a Member enquired on the content of the supportive representation. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the supportive representation (i.e. R1) indicated support to Amendment Items A1 and A2 on the grounds that the proposed PRH development at the Site could be used for re-housing the residents of Cheung Ching Estate which should be redeveloped, the provision of parking spaces, commercial use and wet market in the proposed development should be increased, the number of bus and minibus routes should be increased, a new elevated road should be built and Tsing Yi Road should be widened. However, HKHA had no plan to redevelop Cheung Ching Estate and the building of the proposed elevated road was considered not necessary. Nevertheless, the proposals to increase the provision of facilities could be considered and TD would closely monitor the public transport services in the area.

*Public Consultation*

74. Noting that K&TDC had expressed concerns on the zoning amendments in May 2015 when they were first consulted by PlanD and requested the PRH development proposal to be shelved until there was comprehensive re-planning, and that the second consultation to K&TDC in September 2015 was only by way of circulation of a consultation paper, a Member enquired if it was the usual practice for PlanD to consult DC through circulation of paper. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau explained that as it was already approaching the end of the last term of K&TDC in September 2015 and there was no more DC meeting pending the new DC Election, K&TDC Paper No. 30/2015 to further consult the DC members on the zoning amendments was sent to members on 18.9.2015 by circulation.

75. As Members had no more question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing on

the day was completed. He thanked the government's representatives as well as the representers, commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would deliberate the representations in their absence on another day and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. They left the meeting at this point.

76. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 6:55 p.m.