

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:05 a.m. on 27.10.2016.
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

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West),  
Transport Department

Mr Samson S.S. Lam

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)  
Environmental Protection Department

Mr C.W. Tse

Assistant Director/Regional 3, Lands Department

Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

**Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 1 (Continued)**

[Open Meeting]

3. The Chairman said that it was the third day of the hearing meeting for the further representations in respect of the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27 which commenced on 25.10.2016.

4. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests as shown on the PowerPoint were reported in the first hearing session on 25.10.2016 (Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the minutes of 25.10.2016). No further declaration of interests had been received from Members since then.

5. The Chairman noted that reasonable notice had been given to the further representers, representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing. Other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the further representers, representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

**Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)**

6. The following government representatives, and the further representers, representers or 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 & West Kowloon (DPO/TWK) |
| Ms Cherry C. H. Yuen  | - Town Planning Graduate/Kwai Tsing                            |

*Housing Department (HD)*

- Ms Emily W.M. IP - Planning Officer (PO)  
Ms May S. S. Yeung - Architect (A)  
Mr Chow Kwok Sang - Civil Engineer (CE)

**Further Representers, Representers and their Representatives**

F94 - 葉有珍

F95 - 李浩榮

F405- 林燕玲

- Ms Cheung Kwei Lan - Further Representers' representative

F192 - Li Ki Keung

F345 - Ng Chi Tong Victor

F402 - Luk Yee Ling

F403 - 李偉剛

F404 - Cheung Kwei Lan

F410 - Cheng Suk Man

F412 - Wong Tsz Yui

F427 - 林雪芳

F501 - Lau Kit Ling

R318 - Siu Mo Yu Dela

- Mr Lau Cheuk Man - Further Representers' and Representer's representative

F210 - 許弟

F258 - 鄧源

F307 - David Li

F335 - 聶雪梅

R198 - Chan Lai Ming Angel

R491 - Chan Wai Han

R700 - Kiang Chun Wah

- Ms Chan Wai Han - Representer, Further Representers' and Representers' representative

F283 - 徐蘭英

F387 - 何伯樂

Ms Wong Suet Yin ] Further Representers' representative  
Ms Chong Wai Fan ] Further Representers' representative (Attending only)

F379 - 李朗秋

F513 - Hui Yuk Sang

F1155 - 曾淑芬

Mr Hui Yuk Sang - Further Representer and Further Representers'  
representative

7. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He said that the representatives of PlanD would first brief Members on the background, and the further representers/representers or their representatives would be invited to make oral submissions. He said that to ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each further representer/representer or their representatives would be allotted 10 minutes for their oral submission. The further representers/representers had been informed about the arrangement before the meeting. There was a timer device to alert the further representers/representers or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire and when the allotted time limit was up. After the oral submission, there would be a Question and Answer (Q&A) session in which Members could direct their questions to government representatives or further representers/representers or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the meeting on the day would be adjourned. After hearing all the oral submissions from the further representers/representers/commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the further representations in closed meeting, and inform the further representers/representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

8. The Chairman then invited the representative of PlanD to brief Members on the further representations.

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, repeated the presentations which were made in the morning session of the meeting on

25.10.2016 as recorded in paragraph 11 of the minutes of 25.10.2016.

10. The Chairman then invited the further representers, representers and their representatives to elaborate on their representations.

F94 - 葉有珍

F95 - 李浩榮

F405- 林燕玲

11. Ms Cheung Kwei Lan made the following main points :

- (a) she welcomed the proposal to rezone the northern portion of the original representation site from “Residential (Group A)4” (“R(A)4”) zone to “Open Space” (“O”) but had concerns on the proposed development of three blocks of public rental housing (PRH) in the remaining “R(A)4” zone as it would cause significant adverse impacts. Although the Government claimed that technical assessments had been conducted to ascertain the feasibility of the proposed PRH development and there would be no insurmountable technical problems, she challenged such recommendations and did not believe that the adverse impacts could be mitigated in the short term;
- (b) as the size of the original “R(A)4” zone was reduced by about half, she wondered how the proposed PRH development could accommodate the long list of community facilities including kindergarten, elderly centre, integrated support service for persons with severe physical disabilities, early education and training centre, as well as retail and transport facilities as proposed;
- (c) the site were subject to adverse environmental impact and glare nuisance and was not suitable for residential development. The future residents of the proposed PRH development would be aggrieved by the poor living

environment. Development should be taken place at suitable site and identification of housing site should be more conscientious. There were other sites such as the brownfield sites in Wang Chau, Yuen Long which were suitable for housing development. It was not fair that the Government allowed incompatible uses to continue in the brownfield sites but took away the large green area from the residents Mayfair Gardens, Cheung Ching Estate and Rambler Crest for PRH development. Suitable sites and vacant land were also available in Tsing Yi North, for example the Tsing Yi Northeast Park near the shipyards;

- (d) the injection of an additional population of 6,500 from the proposed PRH development would impose further burden on the demand of public facilities in the area and there was inadequate provision of open space and playgrounds for children in the neighbourhood. The original representation site was previously zoned “O” and reserved for open space development for the residents of Mayfair Gardens, Rambler Crest and Cheung Ching Estate. Rezoning of the site to “R(A)4” for PRH development would adversely affect both the existing and future residents;
- (e) the existing trees on the site had provided a breathing space for local residents. While the residential flats of Rambler Crest had been provided with central fresh air intake system to mitigate air pollution, the electricity charges incurred was very high. It was doubtful whether the future residents of the PRH development could afford the electricity expenses;

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (f) most local residents of Rambler Crest could not afford private cars. There were always long queues waiting at bus and mini-bus stops in the area and it was very difficult for the residents of Rambler Crest to get onto public transport. The roads near the roundabout outside Rambler

Crest were always partially closed for road works which resulted in regular traffic jam. Residents in Rambler Crest usually took a longer commuting time for going to work;

- (g) the original representation site provided a buffer for noise and glare impacts from the operation of Container Terminal No. 9 (CT9) and she was not convinced that the future residents of proposed PRH development would not be affected by noise and glare pollution; and
- (h) she therefore requested the Board to re-consider the zoning of the remaining "R(A)4" zone seriously. It should not be used for development of PRH and should be retained as "O" zone for the extension of the local open space to provide recreation and cycling facilities for the enjoyment of local residents.

F210 - 許弟

F258 - 鄧源

F307 - David Li

F335 - 聶雪梅

R198 - Chan Lai Ming Angel

R700 - Kiang Chun Wah

R491 - Chan Wai Han

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Chan Wai Han made the following main points :

- (a) she was a resident of Rambler Crest and she welcomed Amendment Item A as the reduction in site area for the PRH development would probably bring less traffic problems. However, as the existing public transport facilities and community facilities were already insufficient, the injection of an additional population of 6,500 would overload those facilities. Besides, she was not aware of any implementation plan on traffic

improvement measures by the Government to address the existing traffic problems;

- (b) with some photos showing (i) the long queue in the taxi waiting area at Rambler Crest which was taken at 9:30 a.m. after the morning peak hour on 4.10.2016; and (ii) the crowded condition at the green mini-bus (GMB) stop at MTR Kwai Fong Station to the Rambler Crest at 7:30 p.m. right after the evening peak on 24.10.2016, she said that the existing public transport services was inadequate to meet the need of existing residents. The long waiting time took her at least half an hour for a journey which should normally last about 8 to 9 minutes only. The long travel time had taken away a lot of her family time;
- (c) the planning intention of the original representation site was an open space serving as a buffer between CT9 and the nearby residential developments. The remaining “R(A)4” zone which was subject to adverse impacts on glare, noise, air quality and air ventilation and located on a slope and next to a petrol filling station was not suitable for any residential development. She was not against public housing development and understood that there was a long waiting list for PRH. However, the proposed PRH development should be developed in a right place with an acceptable living environment;
- (d) she showed another photo taken outside Ching Tao House, Cheung Ching Estate to demonstrate the traffic congestion caused by the frequent road works at the northbound land of Tsing Yi Road which was the major route to connect with Tsing Yi south bridge to access the urban area. Such traffic blockages had often affected the work and school journeys. She quoted that the remaining work of the proposed extension/improvement work for the existing bus stop outside Ching Tao House was not further pursued due to the presence of two tree stumps near the bus stop. In contrast, she wondered why the Government would consider the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone

which involved substantial tree felling acceptable;

- (e) there was serious noise nuisance at Rambler Crest from the adjoining roads and aircrafts in the air-path overhead, and she had to close all the windows most of the time. It was anticipated that the future resident of the proposed PRH development would be exposed to a similar level of traffic and aircraft noise nuisance. Adverse environmental impacts would affect the study environment and health of the next generation. Most residents wanted to move out but just unable to afford to change their property;
- (f) supporting facilities in the area was also inadequate, for example, she had to visit areas outside Tsing Yi to do shopping/buy groceries for her families. There were insufficient retail outlets in Rambler Crest and nearby areas to meet the local demand. A photo taken during the last typhoon incident on 21.10.2016 was showed to demonstrate the lack of adequate transport, recreation and retail supporting facilities for the hotel guests of the adjoining hotels in Rambler Crest. That would damage the tourism industry which was an important sector of the economy of Hong Kong;
- (g) referring to the minutes of meeting of the Traffic and Transport Committee of Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) held on 16.4.2015, it was noted that DC members were concerned about the additional pressure on the existing public transport services arising from the proposed relocation of the Transport Department's (TD) Vehicle Examination Centre to Tsing Yi as it would bring in an additional 200 workers into the Tsing Yi area. Together with the additional 6,500 people from the proposed PRH development, she worried that traffic congestion and the current under-provision of public transport facilities would be further worsened; and
- (h) she wished to reflect the insufficient provision of transport and other

supporting facilities in Tsing Yi and requested the Board to take note of their concerns and worries on the proposed PRH development.

F283 - 徐蘭英

F387 - 何伯樂

13. Ms Wong Suet Yin made the following main points :
- (a) she was an elderly living in Mayfair Gardens and should not have to travel such a long way to attend the hearing session. However, she really wanted to express her views on the proposed PRH development for Members' consideration. She welcomed Amendment Item A which proposed to rezone part of the "R(A)4" zone back to "O" but expressed strong grievance against the Board's decision not to revert the whole site back to serve as a buffer between Mayfair Gardens and CT9. The designation of the original representation site as an environmental buffer for Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate was a decision made by the Board in 1991 in order to screen the noise, air and light pollution generated from CT9. The remaining "R(A)4" zone was not suitable for any type of development as people should not be allowed to stay there for long hours;
  - (b) she had been living in Tsing Yi since early 1980's and the living environment then was very pleasant and she could have an unobstructed view from her flat to as far as Mei Foo, Lamma Island and had enjoyed the sea view. The only problems then were the close proximity of the residential development to the oil depots and insufficient transport network. The living environment had been further improved after the relocation of the oil depots in the late 1980s/early 1990s;
  - (c) the industrial/residential interface problems in the past were not very serious as the industrial establishments were separated from the residential developments by the hills. However, with the operation of

CT9 and other related logistic uses which generated noise and air pollution in the area, and together with the odour nuisance from the surrounding industrial uses, residents of Mayfair Gardens suffered from many health problems recently. The Government was urged to address the adverse air quality problem of the area;

- (d) residents of Mayfair Gardens had already suffered from serious air pollution problem. The building rehabilitation work of Mayfair Gardens which started a few years ago had further aggravated the problem. While the renovated building had attracted new business investment, the increasing number of eating places brought more nuisances. There were many outsiders visiting the eating places in Mayfair Gardens, the odour and smoke vent emission and hygiene problems such as rats had caused much nuisance to the residents of Mayfair Gardens;
- (e) she showed a video clip taken from a building at the the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Tsing Yi) (the Tsing Yi IVE) to demonstrate that the original representation site proposed for PRH development was not sizeable and would be subject to excessive noise nuisance from CT9;
- (f) she showed some photos to demonstrate the insufficient capacity of the existing road in the vicinity of Mayfair Gardens including Sai Shan Road. She said that the private residential development site near Sai Shan Road had brought a number of construction vehicles which sometimes blocked the road and prevented the buses from accessing to the bus terminal. That might result in tailing back of vehicles to other road near Mayfair Gardens. There were also incidents of illegal on-street parking of large vehicles and even dangerous goods vehicles near Mayfair Gardens thus prohibiting the on-street loading/unloading activities of other vehicles such as school buses. In view of the above, the carrying capacity of the existing road network would not be able to cope with the traffic demand generated by the proposed PHR development;

- (g) the provision of public transport facilities was very problematic, there were often long queues waiting for public transport at the bus/mini bus stops outside Mayfair Gardens. The additional population from the proposed PRH development would further overtax the already inadequate public transport facilities; and
- (h) the Government had the role to provide a better place to live in for the next generation who would serve the future economy of Hong Kong. She thus urged the Board to carefully analyse the rationale behind the Government's commitment to provide a buffer area for the residential developments. Moreover, the adverse traffic and environment impacts of the proposed PRH development should also be seriously considered.

F379 - 李朗秋

F513 - Hui Yuk Sang

F1155 - 曾淑芬

14. Mr Hui Yuk Sang made the following main points :

- (a) he moved into Tsing Yi since 1990 and he just wanted to share his personal experience as a local resident over those years with Members. Tsing Yi South had long been having traffic problems. He had to go home on foot many times through Tsing Yi south bridge. Since the relocation of industries to the Mainland in the mid 1990s and opening of a new bridge, the road conditions had been improved due to decreased container vehicle traffic in the area instead of improvements in the road network. Notwithstanding the improvement, any traffic jam at Texaco Road in Tsuen Wan would block the traffic flow of the bridge and the road network of Tsing Yi South would be paralyzed. Similarly, any traffic jam in Kwai Chung Road would paralyze the traffic flow from Tsing Yi South to the Kowloon central. The continued population growth including the additional 6,500 people from the proposed PRH

development and the development of additional logistic facilities would bring in more vehicular traffic and overload the road capacity;

- (b) the local residents of Tsing Yi South mainly relied on road transport as the area was not close to MTR station. The lack of an efficient public transport services in Tsing Yi South had been reflected in the property prices. For example, the building age of Rambler Crest was only 11 years, but the property price was about 20% lower than the nearby Greenfield Garden, the building age of which was about 30 years;
- (c) most residents in Rambler Crest would not open their window to avoid the dust and noise nuisance of CT9. They were subject to noise nuisance from the night operation of CT9 and whistling of the container vessels at night, and the activities/clamouring of the guests in the adjoining hotels in the early morning. Moreover the logistic centre building to the south of Rambler Crest was another major source of light pollution for the residents;
- (d) there were severe shortages of recreational facilities in Tsing Yi South. While he was not aware of any facilities of significant scale in the area, the Paper stated that there were adequate open space and recreational facilities in Tsing Yi, probably due to the inclusion of Tsing Yi Park, Tsing Yi Sports Ground, and a large park next to Ching Tai Court in the assessment. However, the above facilities were all located in Tsing Yi North and far away from Rambler Crest. As the residents of Rambler Crest had already spent long travelling hours daily to work/school, they would not afford extra time to visit parks and other recreational facilities located far away from their residence;
- (e) there was an existing bus route No. 42A from Cheung Hang Estate to Jordan serving the Tsing Yi South area. However, it was common that the residents of Rambler Crest were unable to get onto the bus in the morning peak hours and they had to take green mini-bus (GMB) from

Rambler Crest either to the MTR Kwai Fong Station or Tsing Yi Station. The normal waiting time for GMB to MTR Kwai Fong Station was about 15-20 minutes in the morning peak while that for GMB from Kwai Fong Station to Rambler Crest was at least 20 minutes in the evening peak. The long waiting time for public transport was a serious concern of the local residents. His family member had previous experience on waiting for three to four buses of bus route No. 42A at 10:00 p.m. at Mei Foo before being able to board the bus. Although the bus company promised to increase the frequency of bus route No. 42A to compensate for the reduced services of bus route No. 43C, the improvement just lasted for a short period only;

- (f) the green buffer now covered with trees at the remaining “R(A)4” zone was very precious to the residents of Ramble Crest and thus should be retained. According to the Paper, the existing trees in the remaining “R(A)4” zone were mainly common species of low amenity value and some were even in poor form. However, the findings were based on a very crude survey, and a detailed tree survey should be conducted;
- (g) while it was noted from the Paper that there would be no insurmountable technical problem for the proposed PRH development on the remaining “R(A)4” zone, he had doubts on the real meaning of no insurmountable problem;
- (h) the traffic condition at Tsing Kwai Road was problematic and had caused some hazards to the pedestrians in that the long waiting queue at the bus stop had taken up the entire footpath forcing the pedestrians to walk along the carriageway. The additional population to the area was not just 6,500 from the proposed PRH, but also other proposed residential developments including the new private residential development at Sai Shan Road and the subsidized housing near Cheung Ching Estate. The capacity of the existing infrastructure and public transport facilities which was overloaded already could not support the future population. There

was also insufficient supporting facilities such as wet market; and

- (i) he was not against PRH development and it was unfortunate that he was not qualified to be a PRH residents. He was not anti-government but he just wanted to express his views and share his experience. In conclusion, he objected to the amendment for building three blocks of PRH on the remaining “R(A)4” zone which should be used for open space development.

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

F192 - Li Ki Keung

F345 - Ng Chi Tong Victor

F402 - Luk Yee Ling

F403 - 李偉剛

F404 - Cheung Kwei Lan

F410 - Cheng Suk Man

F412 - Wong Tsz Yui

F427 - 林雪芳

F501 - Lau Kit Ling

R318 - Siu Mo Yu Dela

15. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Lau Cheuk Man made the following main points :

- (a) he had been a resident of the Mayfair Gardens for over 10 years. He came to the meeting to express his views on the proposed amendment, which only proposed to rezone part of original representation site to “O” but retained the remaining part of the “R(A)4” zone for PRH development. He objected to the proposed amendment on the ground that the proposed development would cause adverse impacts on the surrounding areas;

- (b) referring to Enclosure VIII of the Paper which stated that the traffic impact imposed on the concerned road junctions in the vicinity of the remaining “R(A)4” zone would be further reduced. The Government should note that the major local concern was not on traffic congestion, but rather on the provision of public transport services, i.e. whether they could get onto a bus or not. The Paper stated that the public transport demand would be reduced proportionally for the proposed PRH development in a reduced site area. However, the Government’s response was that TD together with the relevant public transport operators would ‘closely monitor’ the population in-take of the proposed PRH development and would ensure adequate public transport services were provided;
  
- (c) according to his experience in dealing with government departments, they would not accept a general response of ‘closely monitor’ from others if mitigation measures and actions were required. They often asked for a well-defined trigger level. He was therefore greatly disappointed with TD’s response. He considered that upon reaching the trigger level, action should be taken but it was not clear in the response of TD what and when the action would be taken. Whether it would be extending the existing bus/GMB routes or to increase the frequency of the existing services. If the Government was committed to ensure adequate provision of public transport facilities, there was no reason why the Government needed to wait until the population in-take before taking any action. He wondered why the mitigation measures were targeted for the future residents of the proposed PRH development while the residents of the existing developments including Rambler Crest, Cheung Ching Estate, Mayfair Gardens and the new residential developments nearby were neglected. Immediate remedial actions would be required if inadequacy in the existing public transport facilities was observed instead of waiting for the future population;
  
- (d) there was always a large number of residents waiting at the bus stop off

Mayfair Gardens for GMB route No. 88C. For a journey of 7-10 minutes either to MTR Tsing Yi or Kwai Fong stations, the waiting time for a bus/GMB would be usually 20 minutes. As for the residents of Rambler Crest, he understood that their waiting time for GMB route No. 88G would usually take more than 30 minutes. He wondered how the Government could state that the existing public transport facilities were considered adequate. It appeared that the waiting time factor was ignored in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) conducted for the proposed PRH development. It took into account only the survey data for demand of bus service conducted at Cheung Ching Estate and Cheung Wang Estate. The problem was further shown in the TIA Report which had just counted the number of passengers left in the queue waiting for GMBs. The findings of the survey at Tsing Yi Road revealed that there were not much passengers waiting at the bus stop at Ching Kwai House/Ching Tao House, but it was because most residents of Mayfair Garden usually preferred to wait for buses at the previous stop at Ching Wai House, in order to get a higher chance to board the buses;

- (e) based on paragraph C 3.2.2 in Appendix C of the TIA Report, the overall carrying capacity of the franchised bus routes was capable to accommodate the passenger demand in the a.m. peak period, whilst the occupancy of the mini-bus had almost achieved 100% at the surveyed location. It was assumed that the reduce scale of the proposed PRH development would induce less traffic impact. The assumption was not acceptable as the existing traffic condition was already unsatisfactory and would not be able to sustain an additional population. Another problem regarding the TIA conducted was related to the principle of 'fallacy of composition'. He had doubts on whether the three new proposed developments in the area were all taken into account in the TIA. It appeared to him that the assessment covered only individual projects and not the whole area;
- (f) he was a supporter of a social services organisation which served amongst

others, the homeless. The organisation provided assistance to homeless and new immigrants by helping them to move into PRH flats. If a site was not suitable for residential purpose, the opportunity cost for such use would be high and it might even aggravate the existing problems. Public transport services should be seen as a network in addition to their provision at specific point. The Government should also take into consideration whether the residents in Cheung Hong Estate could board a bus when the buses were already full at Mayfair Gardens;

- (g) he had reviewed how to enhance the existing bus facilities near Mayfair Gardens. He considered relocating the bus stop at Cheung Hong Estate would reduce the possibility of the bus jam at Chung Mei Road. The current location of the bus stop at Cheung Hong Estate outside the cooked food stalls was too close to the junction of Ching Hong Road and Chung Mei Road and would create tail-back situation easily when more than one bus stopped there. If the bus stop could be relocated further inward along Chung Mei Road, more buses would be allowed to stop there. The only drawback of such proposal would be the loss of the current weather protection by the footbridge structure at the existing location;
- (h) the increased residential developments in Tsing Yi South would have consequential impact on the residents in Tsing Yi North. The Government should consider developing Tsing Yi North where there were still land for further development and the area was within walking distance of MTR station. He wondered if the rationale for developing the PRH development in Tsing Yi South was that the Government preferred to reserve the sites in Tsing Yi North for development of luxury private housing;
- (i) referring to paragraph 4.9 of the Paper, which stated that with the proposed rezoning to “O” zone and greening ratio of 30% at the reduced PRH site, the planning intention of providing landscaping and recreation facilities could ‘by and large’ be maintained, he was very disappointed by

the claim of 'by and large' maintained the original planning intention as 'by and large' in his profession meant only meeting about 80 to 90% of the target. Besides, it was not talking about intention, it should be about the outcome;

- (j) he had the following observations on PlanD's proposed reasons for not supporting the further representations as set out in paragraphs 6.2 (b) and (c) of the Paper :
  - (i) referring to paragraphs 6.2 (b), it stated that the reduced site was suitable for PRH development with no insurmountable problems, and there was no strong planning justification for the proposed rezoning of the site from "R(A)4". He considered that the statement 'there was no strong planning justification' had reflected that the Government would just ignore the local residents' views even though they had put much effort in putting up their argument;
  - (ii) noting from paragraphs 6.2 (c) which stated that the statutory and administrative procedures in public consultation on the zoning amendments had been duly followed, he considered that the Government should not merely follow the standard procedures, it was more important to ensure that the consultation had been carried out satisfactorily and effectively; and
- (k) lastly, he requested the content of his oral submission should be properly recorded in the minutes as far as practicable.

16. As the presentation from the government's representatives, further representers/representers and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairman invited questions from Members.

### Traffic Aspects

17. A Member asked whether the roundabout located to the north of Rambler Crest was the only route to Kowloon via Tsing Yi south bridge and whether there were any proposed improvement measures to alleviate the existing traffic problems and to enhance the current insufficient public transport services in the area. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide showing the road network, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, said that most container vehicles would use the direct route from Tsing Yi south bridge to Tsing Yi Road (lower section) for accessing CT9 (and vice versa) and it was not necessary for the container vehicles to pass through Tsing Yi Interchange. Most of the local traffic would use Tsing Yi Road (upper section) via Tsing Yi Interchange and Tsing Yi south bridge to Kowloon. As regards public transport facilities, there were more than 20 bus/GMB routes serving Tsing Yi South. Based on the findings of the traffic survey during peak hours, while most of the mini-buses were fully occupied, there was still spare capacity for buses at the last stop before entering Tsing Yi south bridge. To cater for the additional population from the proposed PRH development, preliminary service improvement proposals would be either increasing the service frequency of existing buses or increasing the number of routes for buses and providing additional new GMB service connecting the proposed PRH development with MTR station. For the provision of public transport infrastructure, four on-street bus/mini-bus lay-bys along Tsing Yi Road were reserved to cater for the need in future. Mr Chau further said that the new housing developments at Ching Chun Court, Sai Shan Road together with the subject PRH development, would lead to an additional population of about 10,000. There might be a need to comprehensively review the provision of public transport facilities for the area.

18. In response to the Chairman's question on whether concrete proposal of increasing the number of bus routes and frequency of public transport services was available at the current stage, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the proposal had not been finalised. TD being the transport authority would closely monitor and review the local traffic condition and level of public transport services nearer the time, when the new housing developments were about to complete.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui left this session of the meeting at this point.]

19. A Member asked whether TD would increase the frequency or routes of the bus/GMB for the area before the population in-take of the proposed PRH development if the existing provision was found not satisfactory, and whether there was an existing cycling track in the area for the purpose of recreation rather than as a transport mode. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau replied that based on the existing traffic review, the existing bus service was considered adequate while the GMB services were operating close to capacity. He understood that TD had been closely monitoring the existing public transport service and an annual review of public transport services would be conducted. The representative of TD would provide more detailed information on public transport facilities in the later hearing session. Mr Chau further said that there was no existing cycling track planned in the area. Mr Chow Kwok Sang, CE of HD supplemented that the TIA was done in accordance with Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM). According to the survey of the TIA, number of passengers left in the queues waiting for GMB routes No. 88C and 88G were very few.

20. A Member requested PlanD to confirm if the TIA had taken into account all other planned/committed developments in the area and considered that even if the TIA was conducted on the basis of an agreed technical manual, the day to day experience of local residents was essential. The same Member requested more information on the trigger level for taking action and the proposed action to be carried out to address the local residents' concern on the inadequate provision of public transport services. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that he would liaise with TD to provide more information on the trigger level and action to be taken which would be provided in the later hearing session. Moreover, Mr Chow Kwok Sang confirmed that the TIA with its design year of 2025 had already included all the planned/committed developments in the area.

21. In response to the same Member's question on whether the provision of new buses/GMB stop for the PRH development would be acceptable, Mr Lau Cheuk Man, further representers' and representer's representative, said that it would depend on the type of bus/GMB services to be provided for the proposed PRH development. While the traffic problem might be alleviated to a certain extent if new bus route, say to Kwai Fong via Tsing Yi south bridge, were introduced to serve the development, he was worried that the proposed stop might only serve as an additional stop for the existing bus routes e.g. No. 249M. As regard whether the addition of a new bus stop at the proposed PRH development would

further aggravate the existing problem, additional information was required for further assessment.

22. In response to a Member's question on whether there were other alternative modes of transport in the area, such as travel on foot or by ferry, Mr Lau Cheuk Man said that the option of walking was not feasible in view of the presence of many road crossings and the air pollution problem in the area. Moreover, most residents would not choose to walk to MTR station which would take of at least 20 minutes as they needed to be properly dressed for work and the weather condition would be another major concern since most of the footpaths were not covered.

23. Noting that a number of representers/further representers had indicated that the existing roads were always partially closed for road works, a Member requested the Government to provide the information relating to road work on Tsing Yi Road, including number and duration in the past year. Moreover, the Member further asked about the estimated number of workers and construction vehicles for the proposed development during the construction period. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said he would further liaise with TD for the required information, which would be provided for Members' reference in the later hearing session. He added that based on the TIA findings, there were space capacity at various road junctions in the vicinity of the proposed PRH site. Mr Chow Kwok Sang said that the traffic flow during the construction period would not be significant and approval for construction of run in/out of the construction site required prior approval from TD and the Police. He would provide the required information for the Board's consideration in the later hearing session.

#### Environmental Aspects

24. A Member asked for more details of the proposed mitigation measures for the proposed PRH development, including (i) the effectiveness of the acoustic windows in mitigating noise while allowing air ventilation, (ii) any view corridor to be provided, and (iii) mitigation measures against the potential glare impact. In response, Mr Chow Kwok Sang said that the acoustic window was a new measure adopted by HD in recent years. While allowing natural ventilation, it had been proven to be effective in noise mitigation in other

PRH developments. HD was confident to achieve 100% traffic noise compliance for the proposed PRH development. Ms May S. S. Yeung, A of HD supplemented that the proposed acoustic window would meet the requirements of the natural lighting and ventilation under the Buildings Ordinance. The provision of view corridor would follow the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines which required a minimum building separation of 15m. She further said that the layout of the proposed PRH development would also take into account the need to minimize the potential glare impact from CT9.

25. In response to a Member's questions on whether a similar fresh air intake system which was currently used in Rambler Crest would be adopted in the design of proposed PRH development, and whether consideration would be given to providing subsidy to the future residents who would be required to use air-conditioning to mitigate noise impact. Ms May S. S. Yeung said that with the advancement in building technology, there were now other options to address noise impacts other than provision of air-conditioning system and/or double-glazed window. For example, the use of acoustic window and acoustic balcony might be more cost effective and could still fulfil the requirement of noise compliance. On the provision of subsidy for using air-conditioning, it was a policy matter and she was not in a position to advise.

26. In response to another Member's questions, Ms May S. S. Yeung, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide showing the typical configuration and section of acoustic balcony, explained the design principle and operation of the acoustic balcony and said that the balcony area would be additional to the internal floor area under the allocation standard.

27. A Member expressed appreciation on the attendees' care and concern about the living environment of the future PRH residents. The Member suggested that information such as the design and operation of acoustic balcony to address the concerns raised by the further representers and representers in the hearing sessions should be presented in a more systematic way and with some visual illustration for easy understanding of Members and other attendees.

28. As Members did not have any further questions, the Chairman said that the hearing procedure on the day had been completed. He thanked the further representers/representers and their representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would continue the hearing session next week.

[This session of the meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.]