

**Minutes of 1110th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 21.4.2016 and 26.4.2016**

Present

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 Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

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

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Mr C.W. Tse

Assistant Director (Regional 3), Lands Department

Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Director of Planning

Mr K.K. Ling

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Secretary

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Absent with Apologies

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr T.Y. Ip

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam (21.4.2016 a.m. and 26.4.2016 p.m.)

Mr Louis K.H. Kau (21.4.2016 p.m. and 26.4.2016 a.m.)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Miss Anissa W.Y. Lai (21.4.2016 a.m.)

Ms Karen F.Y. Wong (21.4.2016 p.m.)

Ms Wendy W.L. Li (26.4.2016 a.m.)

Mr K.K. Lee (26.4.2016 p.m.)

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 21.4.2016 :

Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)	Chairman
Mr Michael W.L. Wong	
Professor S.C. Wong	Vice-chairman
Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang	
Professor K.C. Chau	
Mr Sunny L.K. Ho	
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam	
Dr F.C. Chan	
Mr David Y.T. Lui	
Mr Peter K.T. Yuen	
Mr K.K. Cheung	
Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung	
Dr C.H. Hau	
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	
Dr Lawrence K.C. Li	
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu	
Professor T.S. Liu	
Miss Winnie W.M. Ng	
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	

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

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

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

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TY/27

(TPB Paper No. 10085)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

Declaration of Interests

2. The Secretary reported that two of the amendment items (Items A1 and A2) were for a proposed public housing development to be undertaken by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK) were consultants of HD. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Mr H.F. Leung

(<i>as Director of Planning</i>) | - being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA |
| Mr K.K. Ling

(<i>as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department</i>) | - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Building Committee of HKHA |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - being an alternate representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA

] having business dealing with HKHA and
] AECOM |

- | | |
|--|--|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu |] having business dealing with HKHA
] |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - having past business dealing with HKHA and
business dealing with AECOM |
| Dr C. H. Hau | - having business dealing with AECOM |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - having past business dealing with HKHA,
AECOM and MMHK |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - his spouse being an employee of HD but not
involved in planning work |
| Professor S.C. Wong
(Vice-chairman) | - being the Chair Professor and Head of the
Department of Civil Engineering of the
University of Hong Kong where AECOM had
business dealing with some colleagues and had
sponsored some activities of the Department
before |

3. Members noted that Mr H.F. Leung, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau whose interests were direct, and Mr Ivan C.S. Fu and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members also noted that Professor S.C. Wong, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Dr C. H. Hau's interests were indirect and agreed that they should be allowed to stay in the meeting. Members agreed that those members who had declared direct interests should be invited to leave the meeting.

[Mr K.K. Ling, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left the meeting at this point.]

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Dr F.C. Chan arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

4. The Chairman said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but 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 representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The following government representatives, and the representers/commenters 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 Fannie F.L. Hung | - Senior Town Planner/Kwai Tsing (STP/KT) |
| Miss Annie H.Y. Wong | - Town Planner/Kwai Tsing 1 (TP/KT1) |

HD and its consultants

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Ms Portia K.H. Yiu | - Chief Planning Officer (CPO) |
| 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 | - Principle 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

R2 - Rachelle Ng

R222 - Adrian Ng

Mr Chow Cheuk Hin

- Representers' representative

R7 / C187 - Hoi Ki

R225 - Ka Wei

R295 / C170 - Chow Lai Shan

C2 - Owners' Committee of Rambler Crest

R461 / C172 - Chan Wai Yip

Mr Chan Wai Yip

- Representer/Commenter and representative
of Representers/Commenters

R15 - Ng Wing Tsz

R165 - Ho Chai Wang

Ms Ng Wing Tsz

- Representer and Representer's
representative

R37 - Chan Cheuk Kit, Jackie

Mr Chan Cheuk Kit, Jackie

- Representer

R39 - Leung Sui Ki

Ms Leung Sui Ki

- Representer (Attending only)

R78 - Ng Sun Man

R712 - Lee Kin Wai

Mr Lee Kin Wai

- Representer and Representer's
representative

R162 - Cheung Tat Ming

Mr Cheung Tat Ming

- Representer

R178 / C60 - Wong Long Yee

R347 / C75 - Wong Po Leung

Mr Wong Po Leung

- Representer/Commenter and representative of Representer/Commenter

R199 / C130 - Sze Po Kan

R238 / C192 - Sze Po Ying

R486 / C191 - Lau Fung Lin

R662 / C131 - Sze Kwok Wing Wingo

Mr Sze Po Kan

- Representer/Commenter and representative of Representers/Commenters

R260/C80 - Fung King Chung, Jerome

R521/C10 - Chiu Long Chi

R525/C32 - Chiu Ying Yuen

Mr Chiu Ying Yuen

- Representer/Commenter and representative of Representers/Commenters

R283 - Lo Cho Sam

R937 - Luk Siu Kuen

Ms Lo Cho Sam

- Representer and Representer's representative

R302 - Kan Hon Pun

Mr Kan Hon Pun

- Representer

R335 - Lo YuenTing

R336 - Ng Chi Wah

R785 / C306 - Ho Oi Lam

R960 / C136 - Au Yeung Man

C135 - Wong Chun Nam

R394/C1- Poon Chi Shing

Ng Chi Wah

- Representer

Mr Poon Chi Shing (Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) Member - Representer/Commenter and representative of
Representers/Commenters

R341 - Cheng Wing Fai

R510 - Cheng Chun Wah

Mr Cheng Chun Wah - Representer and Representer's representative

R377 - Ng Lai Wan

Ms Ng Lai Wan - Representer

R516/C65 - Ngai Ying Chuen

Mr Ngai Ying Chuen - Representer/Commenter

R541 - Ng Yik Ling Winnie

Ms Ng Yik Ling Winnie - Representer (Attending only)

R619 / C59 - 王朗豐

C140 - Tsz Choi Wa

R748 / C345 - Ma Yuk Chu Judy

Ms Ma Yuk Chu Judy - Representer/Commenter and representative of Representer/Commenters

R840 - Yeung Shiu Ting

Mr Poon Chi Shing (K&TDC Member) - Representer's representative

R901- Youngspiration

Mr Johnathan Ip]

Miss Law Wan Yin] Representer's representatives

Mr Forrest Kam]

R924 - Cheung Wai Ming

- Representer

Mr Cheung Wai Ming

R940 - Lau Yuk Hang Alberto

Mr Lau Yuk Hang Alberto - Representer

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

- (a) the government representatives would first brief Members on the background, and the representers/commenters or their representatives would be invited to make oral submissions in turn according to their numbers then;
- (b) to ensure the efficient operation of the hearing, each representer/commenter or their representative should be allotted 10 minutes for their oral submission. 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;
- (c) a question and answer (Q&A) session 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
- (d) after the Q&A session, the hearing on the 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 Board would deliberate on

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

the representations/comments in closed meeting, and inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

7. The Chairman then invited the representative of PlanD to brief Members on the representations and comments.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Fonnie F.L. Hung, STP/KT, made the following main points as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10085 (the Paper) :

Background

(a) on 7.8.2015, the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY/27 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. The major amendments were:

(i) Amendment Items A1 and A2 : rezoning of a site from "Open Space" ("O") to "Residential (Group A)4" ("R(A)4") (Item A1) and two pieces of land from an area shown as 'Road' to "R(A)4" (Item A2) for the proposed public rental housing (PRH) development;

(ii) Amendment Items B1, B2 and C : rezoning of two pieces of land from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") and "O" to areas shown as 'Road' (Items B1 and B2 respectively), and a site from an area shown as 'Road' to "G/IC" (Item C) to reflect the existing uses;

The Site and its Surrounding Area

(b) The proposed PRH site (the Site) was on Government land and was vacant. It comprised sloping area covered with vegetation and two platforms. A nullah (drainage reserve) lied in the middle of the Site;

- (c) to the immediate north was a petrol filling station (PFS) and to the further north and west across Tsing Yi Road is Mei King Playground, two high-density residential developments namely Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate, and Tsing Yi Institute of Vocational Education (IVE). To the east were Rambler Crest and CT9. To the south were land for port back-up uses;

OZP Amendments

- (d) on 14.5.2015, K&TDC was consulted on the rezoning proposal and it passed a motion requesting the re-planning of the Site and the proposed PRH development should be shelved until there was comprehensive planning for supporting transport, environmental and community facilities;
- (e) on 17.7.2015, after considering various factors, including land use, demand for public housing, traffic and transport, environment, trees felling/compensation, air ventilation, visual impact, provision of open space and community facilities, as well as K&TDC's comments, the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) agreed to amend the Tsing Yi OZP mainly to facilitate the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road;
- (f) on 7.8.2015, the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27 incorporating the proposed amendments was exhibited for public inspection for two months. K&TDC was further consulted on the proposed amendments by circulation on 18.9.2015 and there was no comment received. On the same day, a public forum was held with locals. Their concerns were similar to those raised by the presenters and commenters. In particular, the locals expressed strong views on site suitability, the impact of the PRH development at a site originally planned for open space development, and questioned the results of the technical assessments;
- (g) a total of 961 representations and 350 comments were received upon

expiry of the statutory plan publication periods on 7.10.2015 and 20.11.2015 respectively. Among the 961 representations received, all opposed the draft OZP for public housing development except R1. All the 350 comments supported the adverse representations opposing the Site for public housing development on similar grounds;

The PRH Development

(h) the Site, with an area about 4.29 ha, was subject to a maximum domestic/non-domestic plot ratio of 6/9.5 and a maximum building height of 140mPD. The proposed PRH development would provide about 4,000 flats with estimated population of 11,800. Taking into account the local comments, the number of blocks was proposed to be reduced from five to four. In addition to the preliminary proposal of kindergarten and Neighbourhood Elderly Centre, HD was considering to incorporate more community facilities including Integrated Support Service for Persons with Severe Physical Disabilities, Day Care Centre for the Elderly, Residential Care Home for the Elderly, Special Child Care Centre, and Early Education and Training Centre which would be subject to further study. HD would continue to liaise with relevant departments on the provision of adequate community and welfare facilities;

Major Grounds of Representations, Representers' Proposals and Responses

Supportive Representation (R1)

(i) the major grounds of the supportive representation and PlanD's responses, as detailed in paragraphs 4.2.1 and 6.3.1 to 6.3.4 of the Paper respectively, were summarised below:

(i) the proposed PRH development could be used as re-housing site for the residents of Cheung Ching Estate which should be re-developed to provide more public housing;

- (ii) the provision of parking spaces, commercial use, and wet market should be increased;
- (iii) mini-bus routes as well as frequency and routes of bus service should be increased;
- (iv) an elevated road connecting Tsing Hung Road/Rambler Crest and Tsing Yi Bridge/Kwai Tsing Bridge to and from Kowloon should be built, and Tsing Yi Road should be widened;
- (v) the responses to the above grounds and proposals were:
 - the supportive view was noted;
 - HKHA did not have redevelopment plan for Cheung Ching Estate at this moment;
 - parking spaces would be provided in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) as agreed by TD;
 - TD would closely monitor the public transport services in the area before and after population in-take, and would include necessary bus service enhancement measures in annual bus route planning. TD would strengthen the existing green mini-bus (GMB) services, if required;
 - Tsing Hung Road and Rambler Crest were already connected to Tsing Yi South Bridge via Tsing Yi Road with a bypassing lane (underpass), there was no plan for a separate flyover;

Adverse Representations (R2 to R961)

- (j) the major grounds of the adverse representations and PlanD's responses, as detailed in paragraphs 4.2.2 and 6.3.5 to 6.3.48 of the Paper respectively, were summarised below:

Land Use

- (i) the Site was the open space reserved for residents nearby as compensation for the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate due to the construction of CT9;
- (ii) inadequate provision of open space in Tsing Yi;
- (iii) the responses to the above grounds were:
- Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) advised that they had no development programme for the subject “O” site;
 - based on the requirement of HKPSG, there was a surplus of open space provision in Tsing Yi district;

Site Suitability

- (iv) The PRH development would be affected by the pollution from CT9 and the sewage treatment works nearby;
- (v) other suitable sites in areas such as the Northern, Southern and South-western Tsing Yi, and the temporary car park sites in Tsing Yi, etc. should be identified;
- (vi) the responses to the above grounds and proposals were:
- the proposed PRH was considered compatible with the

surrounding residential and educational developments,;

- although the Site was in close proximity to CT9 and port backup land, the assessments carried out had confirmed that residential development was technically feasible and environmentally acceptable with the adoption of appropriate mitigation measures;
- Tsing Yi South was mainly used for port back-up uses, and not suitable for housing development;
- the Port 2030 Study completed by the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) in 2014 suggested to develop multi-storey car park and multi-storey complex in Tsing Yi South to enhance port development;
- Northern Tsing Yi comprised mainly mountains which were not suitable for residential development;

Layout

- (vii) the building gaps between the proposed housing blocks were narrow;
- (viii) the responses to the above ground were:
 - with enhancement of the design, the no. of blocks had been reduced from five to four. Building gaps would be increased from 15m - 36m to 15m - 60m;
 - building separation between the proposed development and the surrounding developments would be maximised. The distance from Rambler Crest to the closest building block would be increased 55m to 60m;

Traffic

- (ix) the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) had underestimated the traffic demand which was based on insufficient days of traffic surveys and inappropriate survey locations of the public transport services for the assessment;
- (x) the proposed PRH development bringing additional population would impose adverse traffic impacts on the public transport services which were already insufficient;
- (xi) there was nil consultation with the public transport providers for their services to meet the future demand;
- (xii) the responses to the above grounds were:
- the TIA had taken into account the additional population of the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road and the planned and committed developments in the vicinity of the Site;
 - TD advised that the TIA had been done in accordance with the Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM) and on-site surveys, the TIA was acceptable in-principle;
 - there would be no adverse traffic impact induced by the proposed PRH development;
 - according to the TIA, the current ratio of flow to capacity (V/C ratio) of the four road junctions in the vicinity would still perform at acceptable levels with reserved capacities. The most busy road junction was the northern roundabout at the Tsing Yi Interchange. With the proposed PRH development in place, the junction operation performance

would only change from 0.624 to 0.789 during the AM peak and from 0.552 to 0.678 during the PM peak;

- there were more than 20 franchised bus and scheduled minibus routes in the vicinity, which could cater for the additional demand arising from the proposed PRH development;
- to tie in with the policy of using railway as the backbone public transport mode, a new bus or GMB feeder route between the proposed PRH development and Tsing Yi Railway Station could be considered;
- extension of the existing bus route from Mayfair Gardens to Tsing Yi Railway Station to the proposed PRH development was also a viable option;
- for the provision of public transport infrastructure, it was proposed to reserve an on-street lay-by at Tsing Yi Road for two buses and two GMBs for possible expansion of public transport services in future;
- apart from providing bus lay-bys, the footpath along Tsing Yi Road would also be widened;

Environment

- (xiii) the proposed PRH development would impose adverse environmental impacts on noise and air quality, and affect the ecology of the natural stream, temperature, hygiene and natural light of the surroundings;
- (xiv) the responses to the ground on noise impact were:

- the Director of Environmental Protection advised that the proposed PRH development was not anticipated to have insurmountable environmental problem;
- according to the Broad Environmental Assessment (BEA), the proposed PRH development with suitable mitigation measures would not have adverse environmental impacts;
- HD was conducting an Environmental Assessment Study (EAS) comprising air quality and noise impact assessments with a view to identifying the necessary mitigation measures;
- existing road traffic noise mitigation measures such as low noise surfacing at Tsing Sha Road and noise barriers were implemented;
- appropriate noise mitigation measures including architectural fins, acoustic windows and setback of building blocks would be explored and implemented to mitigate the noise impact;

(xv) the responses to the ground on air quality were:

- the vehicular emission complied with the buffer distance of 5 to 20m as required under the HKPSG and no adverse air quality impact was anticipated;
- as regards industrial emission, appropriate odour treatment measures had been fully adopted by the Tsing Yi Preliminary Treatment Works (TYPTW) operator and the PFS was required to install the Phase II vapour recovery system. No adverse air quality impact was anticipated;

(xvi) the responses to the ground on ecological impact were:

- according to the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), there was no record of species of conservation importance at the Site;
- the Drainage Services Department (DSD) advised that the water channel bisecting the Site was a nullah instead of a natural stream;

Tree Felling

(xvii) the landscaping of about 1,800 trees within the Site of the proposed PRH development would be removed;

(xviii) the responses to the above ground were:

- the existing trees within the Site were grown after relocation of the oil depot and industrial uses in 1990s;
- the existing trees were mainly common species with average form and low amenity, some of them were of poor health;
- tree felling application and compensatory tree proposal would be submitted in accordance with the requirements under Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 7/2015 on Tree Preservation for government projects;
- compensatory trees and shrubs planting proposal would match and be compatible with the newly built residential environment and the adjacent site condition;

Air Ventilation

- (xix) the proposed PRH development would impose adverse impacts on air flow;
- (xx) Rambler Crest located between the existing hotels and the proposed PRH would suffer from poor ventilation performance;
- (xxi) the responses to the above grounds were:
- the no. of blocks of the proposed PRH would be reduced from five to four to improve air ventilation and visual impacts;
 - the air ventilation assessment (AVA) revealed that the proposed PRH development would impose negligible impact on the breezeway of Rambler Crest. Adverse impact on Rambler Crest was not expected under major prevailing wind directions;
 - the ventilation performance of Mayfair Gardens, Mei King Playground, Tsing Yi IVE, and Cheung Ching Estate would be partially affected;
 - substantial effort had been made to alleviate the potential impact by incorporating mitigation measures including preserving the existing breezeways/air paths and optimising building separations, and the deterioration of ventilation performance could be deemed not significant in view of the effect on local air ventilation performance which was reduced from 0.21 to 0.19;
 - according to the AVA, the annual site wind velocity ratio

(VR) with the development and the annual local wind VR would reduce from 0.20 to 0.19. The summer site wind VR would reduce from 0.24 to 0.20 and local wind VR would reduce from 0.21 to 0.19;

Visual

- (xxii) the proposed PRH development would block the views of Rambler Crest and imposing adverse visual impact;
- (xxiii) no photomontage was provided in the assessment from the viewpoint of the Rambler Crest's podium towards the proposed PRH development;
- (xxiv) the responses to the above grounds were:
- according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines regarding the selection criteria of vantage points in Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), sites which were accessible by the public should be chosen in order to protect public view;
 - photomontages from various public viewpoints were prepared to illustrate the possible visual impact of the proposed PRH development. When viewed from longer distance viewpoints including Lai King Estate and Sai Shan and some medium range viewpoints including Nam Wan Tunnel Kai Tsing Bridge, the proposed development would result in insignificant visual impact on the public viewers. From some short or medium range viewpoints including Tsing Hung Road Playground and Mei King Playground, the visual openness would be partly blocked. However, the visual impact arising from the proposed PRH development would be mitigated by providing visual

corridors and greening measures;

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

Potential Risk

- Petrol Filling Station

(xxv) the Site would be subject to potential hazard induced from the PFS adjoining;

(xxvi) the responses to the above grounds were :

- the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS) advised that there was no Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) supply at the concerned PFS. The concerned PFS was not classified as a Potential Hazard Installation (PHI) and the Site did not encroach onto any Consultation Zone of the PHIs;
- the Director of Fire Services (DFS) advised that the PFS would not impose fire safety impact on the proposed PRH development;

- Drainage Reserve Area

(xxvii) the Site which was on a slope would be subject to potential risks with the large amount of water flowing down during the rainy season, and the construction works on the drainage reserve within the Site;

(xxviii) according to the HKPSCG, structures should not be permitted on drainage reserve;

(xxix) the responses to the above grounds were :

- regarding the large amount of water flowing down from the slope during the rainy seasons, DSD advised that the stormwater from the catchment area could be conveyed to the stormwater drains along Tsing Hung Road and the existing nullah;
- proper drainage system would be proposed at design stage by HD, and the proposed drainage connections would be submitted to DSD for approval;

Building on Slope

(xxx) sloping terrain was not suitable for massive scale housing development as high construction, maintenance and management cost would be expected;

(xxxi) the proposed development would impose potential adverse impact on the foundations or slope works of nearby residential developments;

(xxxii) the responses to the above grounds were :

- the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) advised that the Site was not subject to natural terrain hazard and the existing geotechnical features had no past instability record. CEDD confirmed that the proposed PRH development would not impose insurmountable geotechnical problem on the surroundings and proper design could cater for the foundations and slopes in the surroundings;
- housing development on slopes was not uncommon in Hong Kong. The layout of the domestic blocks and ancillary structures would be designed to optimise the land

use and to achieve a cost-effective solution;

Supporting Facilities

(xxxiii) the existing retail facility and the community facilities were insufficient;

(xxxiv) the responses to the above grounds were :

- there would be approximate 4,000m² gross floor area of commercial centre within the proposed PRH development to cater for the population increase and the surrounding development. Pedestrian access was proposed to enhance the connectivity with Mayfair Gardens;
- in addition to the preliminary proposal of kindergarten and Neighbourhood Elderly Centre, HD had considered to incorporate more community facilities as mentioned in paragraph 8 (h) above;

Proposals

(k) the representers' proposals and PlanD's responses, as detailed in paragraphs 4.2.2 (q) and (r) and 6.3.49 and 6.3.50 of the Paper respectively, were summarised below:

- (i) the "O" zoning of the Site should remain unchanged;
- (ii) the responses to the above proposal were that the Site was vacant and the Government had no programme for developing the Site for open space. Besides, Tsing Yi had surplus existing and planned provision of open space. The Site was identified for residential purpose to help meet the housing needs in the next decade;

- (iii) the development intensity and building height of the proposed development should be reduced;
- (iv) the responses to the above proposal were that it was technically feasible and environmentally acceptable to develop the Site for PRH development with the intensity of domestic/non-domestic plot ratio of 6/9.5 and maximum BH of 140 mPD. The proposed PRH development would not generate unacceptable impacts;

PlanD's Views

- (l) the supportive view of R1 was noted; and
- (m) R2 to R961 were not supported and the Plan should not be amended to meet the representations.

9. The Chairman then invited the representers/commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

R2 - Rachelle Ng

R222 - Adrian Ng

10. Mr Chow Cheuk Hin made the following main points :

Procedural Matter

- (a) he was a resident of Rambler Crest. He was aggrieved by the notification procedures of the subject hearing as the meeting date was changed without giving sufficient notification period. The sudden change of hearing date from 1.4.2016 to 21.4.2016 and 26.4.2016 had affected the attendance of those who intended to join the hearing meeting. Besides, it was improper and unfair that the representers/commenters received the Paper just a few days before the hearing meeting. The soft

copy of the Paper was only sent to him via email one day before the meeting as he had not provided a postal address. The representatives/commenters were not given sufficient time to understand the content of the Paper;

- (b) he noted in the Paper that the major development parameters of the proposed PRH development including no. of blocks, no. of flats, and estimated population were revised without any prior local consultation. Those revisions were not minor in nature and would affect the layout and orientation, etc. of the development which would require further assessment on the various impacts;

Traffic Aspect

- (c) the TIA prepared for the proposed PRH development concluded that the traffic demand induced by the additional population could simply be absorbed by increasing the frequency of existing bus routes. Such conclusion which had under-estimated the traffic demand, was based on insufficient and wrong date of traffic survey and inappropriate survey location of the public transport services. Only one working day just before the Easter holidays was chosen to conduct the survey for public transport demand in Cheung Wang Estate, which seemed to be done deliberately to obtain lower patronage figures. The survey location at the bus stop near Ching Tao House of Cheung Ching Estate was not a suitable place to count patronage for different bus/GMB routes. As such, the findings of the TIA were neither valid nor reliable as the traffic data collected was inadequate and inaccurate. The TIA was therefore not acceptable;
- (d) the existing public transport services were seriously inadequate to serve the residents of Tsing Yi South. Additional population to the area would further aggravate the traffic problem. The traffic concerns had already been conveyed to PlanD's representatives during the local forum on 18.9.2016. However, the final TIA attached to the Paper had only

revised the planned population and the traffic data adopted were all the same as before, thus their concerns had not been addressed;

- (e) according to the Hong Kong Annual Digest of Statistics of 2014 published by the Government, the ratio of employed persons to population was 51.87%. Based on the previous estimated population of 11,600 for the PRH development at Tsing Hung Road, the employed persons at the Site would be 6,017. As the school-age population was 17.67% of the population, the number of students at the Site would be 2,050. If 50% of the additional population needed to use public transport, the passenger demand within an hour during the morning peak hour would be about 4,917, which was almost three times of the estimated passenger demand of 1,861 as stated in the TIA. The TIA had under-estimated the traffic demand;
- (f) there was no guarantee that the traffic issues could be addressed after occupation of the development. According to the TIA report, the estimated passenger demand of 1,861 required the carrying capacity of 16 buses. Implementation of public transport enhancement measures, in particular the increase in frequency was difficult. He questioned whether the proposed solution by adjusting the existing frequency had been or would be agreed by THB as THB had been very cautious in granting for increase in frequency and route of buses in view of the road capacity of the wider territory, especially those routes connecting to the already congested urban area. It was THB's policy to allow increase in frequency for a route which had an average occupancy rate of over 85%;
- (g) roads in Tsing Yi South were very congested and had serious traffic problems for a long time. Residents in the area near the Site usually needed to wait for several buses for boarding during the morning peak hour. According to TD's public transport service re-organisation plan in 2015, there were route diversion for No. 948, 948P and 948X which connected Tsing Yi to Hong Kong Island. Upon the diversion, 948P

would by-pass Tsing Yi South to shorten the travel time of the route by 10 minutes. Such arrangement was illogical resulting in a downgrade in service as the route had by-passed the closest bus stop for residents of Rambler Crest. Besides, Tsing Yi South was surrounded by many logistic, port-back up, and vehicle park facilities which had generated a lot of container vehicular traffic. Road traffic would paralyzed in case of traffic accident;

Site Suitability

(h) many of the representatives had suggested that the Government should find other suitable sites in Tsing Yi North. While PlanD had indicated that Northern Tsing Yi, which comprised mainly mountains, was considered not suitable for residential development, the Site with slopes at a gradient of at least 20 to 38 degree was however proposed for PRH development. He questioned the contradictory site selection criteria adopted by PlanD;

Potential Risk

(i) a PFS was located to the north of the Site. According to Section 3 of Chapter 12 of the HKPSG, a PFS 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 were only low-rise. However, PlanD only conveyed DEMS's advice that there was no Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) supply at the PFS and it was not classified as a Potential Hazard Installation (PHI) which was discussed in Section 4 instead of Section 3 the Chapter. PlanD seemed to have mixed up the requirements in two different sections of the HKPSG;

(j) while there were adverse comments regarding the potential impacts on the drainage reserve, the government representative just responded that the drainage reserve would not be adversely affected, despite that structures of any kind should not be permitted on drainage reserve in accordance with Chapter 7 of the HKPSG;

Other Aspects

- (k) according to newspaper reports in 2015, the housing target set by the Chief Executive could not be met. In order to meet the target, the programme of the subject PRH development had been advanced whilst the various technical assessments had not been carried out in a professional manner; and
- (l) it was noted that about 4,000m² of commercial floor area were proposed within the PRH development to cater for the population increase and to enhance the provision of retail facilities in the area. By making reference to the commercial centre of Rambler Crest, which was also of about 4,000m² in floor area for the provision of a small amount of retail facilities, the proposed commercial centre was considered insufficient to serve the neighbourhood.

11. The Chairman said that the earlier presentation made by the representative of PlanD was intended to brief Members on the background on the OZP amendments, details of the representations/comments, and PlanD's responses. The presentation did not represent the position of the Board. After hearing all the oral submission from the representatives/commenters, the Board would deliberate on the representations/comments and make a decision on the OZP.

R7 / C187 - Hoi Ki

R225 - Ka Wei

R295 / C170 - Chow Lai Shan

C2 - Owners' Committee of Rambler Crest

R461 / C172 - Chan Wai Yip

12. Mr Chan Wai Yip made the following main points :

- (a) he was the representative of the Owners' Committee of Rambler Crest and requested the Board, as an independent statutory body, to consider the amendments to the OZP in a fair and objective manner. The residents of

Rambler Crest, Mayfair Garden and the nearby residential developments had raised strong objection to the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road. An important role of the Board was to optimise the land use and to designate uses at suitable locations. Planning was not just for building homes for the people but to provide a better place for them to live and work in;

Site Suitability

- (b) the Site was previously considered not suitable for residential use nor any other developments and was used as a buffer for surrounding residential developments such as Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate against the port back-up uses to the east. Rambler Crest, which was zoned “Commercial” on the OZP, also acted as a buffer from the CT9 to help reduce the impacts on the nearby residential developments. The planning intention for the Rambler Crest site was for hotel and commercial development including service apartments for short stay, however, the approved service apartment development was subsequently converted into residential flats which deviated from the planning intention and lease conditions;
- (c) the residents of Rambler Crest were already suffering from the adverse impacts of CT9, which included, air pollution and glare impact. He did not consider that a wider building separation from 56m to 60m of the Site from Rambler Crest could mitigate the glare impact of CT9. It was wrong to put another 12,000 people into the area to share the suffering. Worst of all, the BEA did not include the adverse impacts caused by CT9 to the proposed PRH development in the assessment;

Public Consultation and Hearing Arrangement

- (d) the K&TDC was consulted on the rezoning proposal of the Site in May 2015 with a very brief paper of a few pages and details of the proposed PRH development were not available. The K&TDC objected to the proposed amendments to the OZP unanimously and a motion requesting

the Government to re-plan the use of the Site in a comprehensive manner taking into account the traffic, environmental and community facility aspects was passed by the K&TDC in the meeting. Notwithstanding the objection, the proposed amendments to the OZP were submitted to the Metro Planning Committee of the Board on 17.7.2015 for consideration shortly after the DC meeting without taking into account their objection and requests nor reverting to K&TDC for further consultation. During the two-month statutory plan publication period, it was only after the repeated requests from the locals that the government representatives agreed to attend a local forum on 18.9.2015. PlanD's representatives at the forum reiterated that there was no other site in Tsing Yi which was suitable for residential use and assured the locals that their concerns were noted and would be responded to. However, no written response from PlanD had been received so far;

- (e) he considered that there was no need to arrange the hearing meetings in such a rush as more time should be allowed for local consultation, and to properly conduct the technical assessments. There was no urgency to approve the OZP amendments;
- (f) the sudden change of hearing date with a short notice had affected the original plan and hence the attendance of many representatives/commenters. He wondered whether it was a strategy to discourage the representatives/commenters from attending the hearing. Besides, it was improper and unfair that the voluminous Paper was delivered to the representatives/commenters just a few days before the hearing meeting;
- (g) the local residents were aware of the revision in major parameters of the PRH scheme only after they had received the Paper. In particular, the change of the scheme from five blocks to four blocks was substantial and required further local consultation, although it appeared that such change was made to address air ventilation problem instead of responding to public comments. Those residents who did not raise objection to the

previous development scheme might object to the revised scheme as the additional population and flats would have implications on transport and supporting facilities. Such information asymmetric was unfair to the representatives/commenters and a decision on the OZP based on that might be subject to judicial review. Besides, sufficient information on the revised scheme had not been provided in the Paper, whilst the parameters and layout of the latest housing development were only reflected in the TIA and AVA reports. The local residents worried that there might be other hidden information about the project, which might affect their living environment and had not yet been disclosed;

Adverse Impacts

- (h) the residents of Rambler Crest did not oppose public housing development. However, Tsing Yi South where there were mainly port back-up facilities was not suitable for residential development. There was no buffer/barrier for the southern end of the proposed PRH development against the impact of CT9, and future residents there might be exposed to health risks. Moreover, CT9 was not included in the on-going environmental assessment for the proposed development. In addition, the Site would be affected by the vehicle emission on the surrounding roads and nuisance from the nearby sewage treatment works. The measure of simply revising the layout and orientation of building blocks of the proposed development might not able to mitigate all the adverse impacts;
- (i) Rambler Crest had been exposed to glare from CT9. The hotel development of Rambler Crest could only shield part of the light pollution, but not much on the noise nuisance. The proposed PRH development, which was only 60m away from Rambler Crest, would be subject to similar adverse impacts from glare, air and noise pollution. While the residential flats of Rambler Crest had been provided with appropriate mitigation measures such as double-glazing window and central fresh air intake to mitigate the nuisances of CT9, it was doubtful

that similar measures would be provided in the PRH development;

- (j) the TIA was not acceptable due to insufficient survey data and improper assessment methodology. A number of newly planned/approved residential developments, such as two new PRH blocks in Cheung Ching Estate, the residential site at Sai Shan Road and student hostel development of Tsing Yi IVE, were not included in the TIA. In addition, the proposed multi-storey car park and multi-storey port back-up complex to the south of the Site would also have demand for public transport facilities. The demand for public transport facilities was thus under-estimated. Moreover, bus frequency and bus route could not be adjusted so easily since the routes were connected to other urban areas;
- (k) while there was no objection that the visual impact of the PRH development should be assessed from public viewpoints, in view of its close proximity, the PRH development would definitely cause adverse visual impact to Rambler Crest. The viewpoint from Lai King Estate which was far away from the site was ridiculous;

Supporting Facilities

- (l) the provision of community facilities including fire station, hospital, clinic and police station was inadequate in the Tsing Yi district. PlanD's response that the provision of hospital beds was on a regional basis and the residents of Tsing Yi could use the hospital facilities in the adjacent districts such as Tsuen Wan and Kwai Chung was not a solution as there were also deficits in those areas. The residents of the PRH development probably could not afford private hospitals;

Potential Risks

- (m) the site would be subject to risks including the potential hazard from the adjacent PFS, carrying capacity of the existing nullah, and geotechnical stability in relation to building on slope, etc. The proposed development would also impose potential adverse impact on the foundations/slope

works of the nearby developments. While the final EAS was still in progress, HD was already conducting site investigation works. Geotechnical investigation was required prior to any proposed development on the site. In addition, high construction cost was expected due to the special design and construction requirements and the proposal would not be cost-effective; and

- (n) if the OZP amendments were approved, the residents would probably proceed to apply for judicial review to challenge the Board's decision. He requested the Board not to be used as a tool for the Government to achieve the housing target as there were other sites in Tsing Yi which were suitable for residential use.

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

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

13. R37 made a request to make his oral submission first, explaining that this had been agreed by R2. The Chairman said that the Board would generally speaking be prepared to facilitate the proposed arrangement if it was agreed by other representers/commenters. Noting that there was no objection from other representers, the Chairman gave permission for R37 to make his oral submission first.

R37 - Chan Cheuk Kit, Jackie

14. Mr Chan Cheuk Kit, Jackie made the following main points :

- (a) he was a resident of Rambler Crest. The proposed PRH development could be proceeded only after the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures on the traffic, environmental, visual and air ventilation aspects had been confirmed. The technical assessments conducted so far were not acceptable. The hearing meeting was a waste of his time as he had just learnt from the presentation by the government representative that the

scheme of the proposed PRH development had been revised;

- (b) with regard to the visual impact, although a wider building separation ranging from 15m to 60m had been proposed, the minimum width of 15m remained the same. The reason given by PlanD's representative at the meeting that no photomontage from the viewpoints of Rambler Crest and the nearby residential developments had been provided as they were not public viewpoints was not acceptable. The viewpoint taken at Lai King Estate did not make any sense; and
- (c) high construction cost would be expected for building on slopes. While Rambler Crest was provided with appropriate environmental mitigation measures to reduce the air and noise impacts, it was doubtful if similar measures would be provided in the PRH development in view of the additional cost incurred.

R15 - Ng Wing Tsz

R165 - Ho Chai Wang

15. Ms Ng Wing Tsz made the following main points :

- (a) she was a resident of Rambler Crest. She was aggrieved by the change of the meeting date as her husband was unable to attend the meeting. Besides, the hearing document was voluminous and complicated, there was insufficient time for her to study the details in just a few days;
- (b) the proposed PRH development at the Site was in conflict with PlanD's Mission and Values. PlanD's Mission was to make Hong Kong a better place to live and work in, but an additional population of about 12,000 was however planned in an the area where there were many problems affecting the living environment. On PlanD's value on 'Proactive and Facilitating' by facilitating the implementation of suitable development projects, the proposed PRH development should have

already been dropped upon the receipt of 960 adverse representations. On the value on ‘Open and Accountable’ by encouraging the community to be involved in the planning process and being accountable to the community, she did not understand how PlanD could still proceed with the proposal and submit the amendments to the OZP to the Board for consideration when there was unanimous objection from the K&TDC. On the value on ‘Effective and Efficient’ by providing planning systems and frameworks that were user friendly and enabling development that would benefit the community to proceed expeditiously, the proposed development was not in line with the requirements and guidelines set out by PlanD in relation to building on slope and developments near PFS;

- (c) the Paper only concluded that the proposed development was technically feasible and there would be no insurmountable technical problems, however, the technical assessments had yet to be finalised;
- (d) as regards the visual impact, no photomontage from the viewpoint of Rambler Crest, which had a large population and would be affected mostly by the proposed development, was provided. It was unbelievable that viewpoint was taken from Lai King Estate;

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

- (e) air pollution would cause adverse health impact to the nearby residents. While there were currently insufficient air movements in Rambler Crest, she find it hard to understand why there would be insignificant impact on Rambler Crest when four additional blocks were erected in front of it;
- (f) the TIA conducted was based on insufficient and inappropriate day of traffic survey and inappropriate survey locations of the public transport services and was thus not satisfactory. Ching Tao House was not the mostly used bus stop for residents of Rambler Crest, as they would walk further to the bus stop at Ching Hong Road for better chance for boarding.

The suggested extension of the bus route to the proposed PRH development would not solve their problem as the new bus stop would not be close to Rambler Crest and the other bus routes were either far away and did not have much capacity even if the frequency would be increased; and

- (g) with the aid of a visualiser, Ms Ng showed an aerial photo of Tsing Yi and indicated that there were other sites in Tsing Yi North which were suitable for residential development. Besides, there were suitable sites in other parts of Hong Kong, such as the Fanling Golf Course which was a large piece of land of 170 ha but serving only a small group of people.

16. Noting that there was no objection from other representers, the Chairman gave permission for R341/R510 to make their oral submission.

R341 - Cheng Wing Fai

R510 - Cheng Chun Wah

17. With the aid of a portable document format (pdf) presentation and audio recording, Mr Cheng Chun Wah made the following main points :

- (a) while the street lights along the Site near the PFS would cause glare to the future residents up to the middle floors of the PRH development, the glare from CT9 which was operating 24 hours a day would adversely affect the daily lives of most residents as shown in the photos taken at the night before the meeting at 8:00 and 11:30 p.m. The PRH development would also be affected by the three hotels of Ramble Crest stretching out like a wall and being lit up round the clock; and
- (b) the first residential development in the vicinity of the container terminal, Lai King Estate, was occupied in 1975 long before introduction of the Noise Control Ordinance. At present, the closest residential development to the container terminal was Rambler Crest which was

occupied in 2004. Three blocks of hotel development, which were non-noise sensitive receivers, were erected along the site boundary facing CT9 as a noise buffer. The noise level at flats of Rambler Crest located in the upper floors, however, were still exposed to the noise caused by operation of the container terminal. One of the locations selected for baseline noise measurement in the BEA was not appropriate and the assessment result on noise impact was not reliable. He considered that a location at a higher level should be chosen for noise assessment to obtain a more accurate result. He then showed the noise levels recorded by him in the surrounding areas, which would cause serious nuisance to the future residents of the Site; and

- (c) in view of the glare and noise nuisances mentioned above, he objected to the proposed PRH development.

R78 - Ng Sun Man

R712 - Lee Kin Wai

18. Mr Lee Kin Wai made the following main points :

- (a) public transport was an important means of transport for the residents of Tsing Yi South. The TIA prepared by the Government was based on insufficient and inappropriate day/time of traffic survey and inappropriate survey locations of the public transport services. For example, the traffic survey for route No. 948 was carried out during peak hours in early morning and 12 buses were observed with 3 to 10 minutes' intervals. Most of the buses observed were almost fully occupied at the bus stop near Ching Tao House. The buses in the second half of the survey period had more capacity for boarding and lowered the average occupancy rate. He considered that it might be due to the fact that two of the buses arriving at the bus stop were just a minute apart;
- (b) Tsing Yi Road near Ching Tao House was a two-lane dual carriageway

with low noise surfacing. With many large and long vehicles using the road, maintenance works were frequent and under such situation, only one lane in each direction could be used and would result in regular traffic jam; and

- (c) an article in Economic Daily on 19.4.2016 already mentioned the possible approval of the proposed PRH development as the EAS was already accepted by the Government. It appeared that the release of such information intended to pre-empt the decision of the Board. He requested the Board to reject the scheme and request the Government to re-assess all the possible impacts of the development.

R162 - Cheung Tat Ming

19. Mr Cheung Tat Ming made the following main points :

- (a) as PlanD's representative in the earlier presentation did not provide any feasible solution to address the local concerns, he considered that the hearing meeting was meaningless and a waste of the representer/commenters' time. His mission in attending the meeting was for justice and fairness. While he supported the provision of more PRH units for those in need, he considered that the rights and well being of the others should not be neglected; and
- (b) the 10-minute presentation time allotted to each representer/commenter was not fair. He also queried if Members had received the hearing document well in advance for consideration. Finally, he requested the Board to follow their conscience in considering the OZP amendments in a professional manner and to reject the amendments.

R178 / C60 - Wong Long Yee

R347 / C75 - Wong Po Leung

20. Mr Wong Po Leung made the following main points :

- (a) it was unfair that the Paper for the hearing was received by the presenters/commenters a few days before the meeting and he learnt that some residents even received the document the day before the meeting;

Traffic Aspect

- (b) he lived in Tsing Yi previously and became a resident of Rambler Crest for 12 years. The public transport facilities in Tsing Yi South had long been insufficient to meet the needs of the local residents. During the morning peak, most of the residents could only get on the fourth bus to school or work. Transit to the railway station by GMB was required and they sometimes needed to wait for more than 30 minutes to get onto a GMB;

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

- (c) the traffic of the whole area would paralyzed if there was any traffic accident on the nearby roads. There was a vehicle breakdown in the week before and the resulting traffic congestion was terrible. His son was almost late for an open examination because of the traffic jam. The survey on public transport facilities was done on an inappropriate day and the assessment was not accurate. In the local forum on 18.9.2016, no solution to address the traffic concern could be provided by PlanD's representatives;

Building on Slope

- (d) the Site on a sloping topography was not suitable for residential use, and there were potential risks of landslide. The Kotewall Road, Kai Liu, Sau Mau Ping and Kwun Lung Lau incidents were not coincidence as the

developments were all built on slopes. The Paper only stated that no insurmountable problem was anticipated for the proposed development. He questioned if it was still worthwhile to proceed with the development even the safety aspect was not ascertained;

Supporting Facilities

- (e) in view of the substantial population size of the PRH development, the proposed 4000 m² of commercial floor space would not be sufficient to cater for the need of the future residents. The situation would be similar to that of the Rambler Crest which only had a few shops, eating places and a supermarket;
- (b) as regards the provision of recreational facilities, there was only the Tsing Hung Road Playground nearby which was inadequate to meet the requirement of the additional population. Besides, the proposed PRH development would affect about 1800 existing trees which, though said to be of common species, still had value and could enhance the air quality;

Impact Assessment

- (c) the additional population would not only generate additional demand for transport, commercial and recreational facilities, they might also cause security concern to Rambler Crest which was adjoining the Site; and
- (d) if the impact assessments on various technical concerns were not yet confirmed, the proposed development should be abandoned. The role of the Board was to plan with justice, rationality and conscience.

21. At the request of Mr Cheung Tat Ming (R162) and with the Chairman's permission, Mr Cheung supplemented one more point relating to adverse impact on tree felling. He said that the trees at the Site had been providing some purifying effects to mitigate the pollutants generated by the vessels in the nearby waters.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui returned to join this session of and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

R199 / C130 - Sze Po Kan

R238 / C192 - Sze Po Ying

R486 / C191 - Lau Fung Lin

R662 / C131 - Sze Kwok Wing Wingo

22. Mr Sze Po Kan made the following main points :

- (a) the Government only aimed to meet the housing target and did not care about the impacts so caused. The traffic impact to be brought about by an additional population of more than 11,000 was substantial. Assuming that 1,800 people of the new population would go to work, it was doubtful whether the existing public transport facilities could cater for the additional demand of the area. Tsing Yi South Bridge was the only exit for residents in Tsing Yi South to the urban area. Any traffic accident would affect the operation of emergency vehicles and the residents' journey to work;
- (b) the proposed PRH development would affect about 1800 existing trees which also had life and could provide greenery to the community;
- (c) air ventilation in the area was already very poor with the existence of three wall-like hotels at Rambler Crest. The proposed PRH development would aggravate air ventilation problem and the effectiveness of the solution of widening the building gap was questionable.
- (d) the proposed PRH development would impose adverse visual impact on Rambler Crest. The reason for not preparing photomontages from the viewpoint at Rambler Crest which was not a public viewpoint was not acceptable;

- (e) the TIA did not include the new/proposed developments in the area and the assessment was not accurate. The decision maker should not just make reference to data, the local residents' real life experience which reflected the actual situation in the area was more relevant; and
- (f) he was disappointed that despite over 900 objections were received, PlanD still considered that the proposed PRH development should be proceeded with due to the housing need.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:00 p.m.]

23. The meeting was resumed at 2:15 p.m. on 21.4.2016.
24. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting :

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

Professor S.C. Wong Vice-chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

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 of Lands (Regional 3)
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Presentation and Question Sessions (Cont'd)

[Open Meeting]

25. The following government representatives, and the representers/commenters 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 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 Asia Limited (Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant) |
| Mr Chris K.S. Leung | - | Transport Planner, Mott McDonald 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) |
|---------------------|---|---|

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R162 - Cheung Tat Ming

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------|
| Mr Cheung Tat Ming | - | Representer |
|--------------------|---|-------------|

R178 / C60 - Wong Long Yee

R347 / C75 - Wong Po Leung

Mr Wong Po Leung - Representer/Commenter and Representative
of Representer/Commenter

R199 / C130 - Sze Po Kan

R238 / C192 - Sze Po Ying

R486 / C191 - Lau Fung Lin

R662 / C131 - Sze Kwok Wing Wing

Mr Sze Po Kan - Representer/Commenter and Representative
of Representers/Commenters

R260/C80 - Fung King Chung, Jerome

R521/C10 - Chiu Long Chi

R525/C32 - Chiu Ying Yuen

Mr Chiu Ying Yuen - Representer/Commenter and Representative of
Representers/Commenters

R283 - Lo Cho Sam

R937 - Luk Siu Kuen

Ms Lo Cho Sam - Representer and Representer's Representative

R302 - Kan Hon Pun

Mr Kan Hon Pun - Representer

R335 - Lo YuenTing

R336 - Ng Chi Wah

R785 / C306 - Ho Oi Lam

R960/C136 - Au Yeung Man

C135 - Wong Chun Nam

R394/C1- Poon Chi Shing

Mr Ng Chi Wah - Representer

Mr Poon Chi Shing - Representer/Commenter and Representative

of Representers/Commenters

R377 - Ng Lai Wan

Ms Ng Lai Wan - Representer

R516/C65 - Ngai Ying Chuen

Mr Ngai Ying Chuen - Representer/Commenter

R619 / C59 - 王朗豐

C140 - Tsz Choi Wa

R748 / C345 - Ma Yuk Chu Judy

Ms Ma Yuk Chu Judy - Representer/Commenter and Representative
of Representer/Commenters

R840 - Yeung Shiu Ting

Mrs Tam Yeung Shiu Ting - Representer

Mr Poon Chi Shing - Representer's Representative

R901- Youngspiration

Mr Johnathan Ip]

Miss Law Wan Yin] Representer's Representatives

Mr Forrest Kam]

R924 - Cheung Wai Ming

Mr Cheung Wai Ming - Representer

R940 - Lau Yuk Hang Alberto

Mr Lau Yuk Hang Alberto - Representer

26. The Chairman extended a welcome to the government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives. He then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to give their oral submissions.

R283 - Lo Cho Sam

R937 - Luk Siu Kuen

27. Ms Lo Cho Sam made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Rambler Crest. Although her flat was not facing proposed PRH site (the Site), she came to voice out the problem of the proposed development;
- (b) the existing road network and public transport services could not cater even for the current demand of the existing residents, let alone the further increased population. Residents were queuing at the bus stop at Ching Tao House at 7am and could not board their first bus arrived. There were also a large number of workers from the CT9 and hotel guests to compete with the residents for the public transport services. The problem would be further aggravated with the completion of the two Public Rental Housing (PRH) blocks near Ching Tao House and the residential site at Sai Shan Road. The roads in Tsing Yi South were very congested and there was only one access road to Rambler Crest, emergency vehicles might have difficulties to reach them in case of accidents;
- (c) CT9 operated 24 hours a day and generated noise and glare nuisances to the surrounding developments. Despite her flat was facing the hotels which served as a noise screen, she was still disturbed by the operational noise of CT9. The proposed PRH development had no other development to serve as a noise screen and would be subject to more severe environmental impacts. The Petrol Filling Station (PFS) next to the Site would also pose fire/explosion risk to the proposed PRH development;
- (d) a lot of residents in Rambler Crest and Mayfair Gardens had raised strong objection to the proposed PRH development. She expected that if the rezoning was approved, complaints to Ombudsman and judicial reviews against the Board's decision would be made;

[Mr C.W. Tse returned to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (e) the Site was important to the existing residents. It was a rescue place in case of fire hazard in the PFS. The existing trees at the Site were in good conditions, instead of poor health as suggested by PlanD, and formed a greenery strip/breathing space as well as an environmental buffer for the nearby residential developments against the glare, noise, dust and air pollution impacts of CT9;
- (f) Tsing Yi had a high proportion of elderly residents relying heavily on medical services, and the medical facilities in the area could not cope with the existing demand, let alone the further demand brought by the additional population;
- (g) she doubted that the slopes at the Site with gradients of up to 38 degrees could be developed for residential use as the residents were once advised by the Government that the slopes were not suitable even for open space development. The three hotels to the east of her block had already obstructed the air ventilation and it would be more worse with the proposed PRH to the west;
- (h) the impacts of the proposed PRH development were mainly from its population. The reduction of five blocks to four blocks without lowering the population would not ameliorate its impact; and
- (i) she requested the Board to visit the Site to understand better the problems and make a fair decision.

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

R260/C80 - Fung King Chung, Jerome

R521/C10 – Chiu Long Chi

R525/C32 – Chiu Ying Yuen

28. Mr Chiu Ying Yuen made the following main points :

- (a) his family and the family of his daughter were living in Rambler Crest. His grounds of objection were set out in paragraphs (a), (b), (e), (l), (m)

and (p) of Annex C of the Paper and he would elaborate more on the aspects affecting his living;

- (b) first of all, the meeting arrangement was not acceptable in that (i) they were required to register at 9:00 a.m. and might need to wait for the whole day before making the oral submission as no specific time slots were allocated to them; (ii) the hearing originally scheduled for 1.4.2016 was just a few days before the long Easter Holidays, and many residents could not attend the hearing because of their planned trips outside Hong Kong. The Secretariat should already know that there were many representations and comments for the subject Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), and should arrange more hearing sessions in the first place; and (iii) many representatives/commenters did not receive the Paper seven days before the hearing as stated in the Board's guidance notes for attending the hearing and hence had insufficient time to understand the content of the Paper which was very voluminous;
- (c) the proposed PRH development would affect the four basic necessities of life, i.e. clothing, eating, living and travelling. For clothing, it would obstruct the penetration of sunlight and air flow and hence prolonged the time for drying washed clothes. For eating, the existing eating places could not cope with even the existing demand, let alone the additional people brought in by the proposed development. The additional population would also drive up the price of the food in the only market in Tsing Yi which would incur greater cost to him;
- (d) for living, they were enjoying an open view to the city which would be replaced by the proposed PRH blocks in close proximity. As air flow and sunlight penetration would be obstructed by the proposed development, he needed to turn on air conditioners and lights and pay more for the increased electricity consumption. The additional population would also bring security and safety concerns to the local community. The Site was an environmental buffer for Mayfair Gardens/Cheung Ching Estate/Rambler Crest against the pollution from CT9/Tsing Yi Road. Felling of the trees and the proposed residential use

at the Site would lead to deterioration of the air quality in the area, affecting the physical and mental health of the residents;

- (e) for travelling, the public transport services could not cope with the current demand and he needed to stand all along his bus ride to the food market in Sham Shui Po. With the population intake of Ching Chun Court, the already insufficient public transport services would be subject to further demand and unlikely could cope with the additional population from the proposed PRH development;
- (f) as he understood, 11 blocks were originally planned for Mayfair Gardens but three blocks in the south were replaced by a playground to provide a buffer distance to the PFS. The current proposal to develop residential blocks next to the PFS had ignored the safety of the future residents;
- (g) one of the reasons for tourists to choose the hotels in Tsing Yi was the pleasant environment nearby which would however be adversely affected by the proposed PRH development. The business environment of the hotels and Hong Kong would deteriorate which was against the Government's current policy to promote business; and
- (h) in conclusion, the proposed PRH development at such a small site would have adverse impacts in terms of air quality, visual, traffic, hazard and business environment. It would divide society and provoke strong objection from local community. He strongly objected to the proposed rezoning and requested Members to consider the rezoning in a prudent manner.

29. Mr Chiu Ying Yuen then read two letters from his son-in-law (R260/C80) and his daughter (R521/C10) to the Board which had the following main points :

R260/C80

- (a) he objected to the proposed PRH development as the Government had ignored the impacts of the proposed PRH development on the existing residents and the environment, and deliberately avoided the monitoring of

the Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) and direct communication with local stakeholders;

- (b) he only received the voluminous Paper with a lot technical assessments and figures/data on 16.4.2016. The cover of the technical reports indicated that those technical assessments were completed in March or February 2016 which illustrated that the PRH development proposal had not taken into consideration the technical assessments. The scale and details of the proposed development were predetermined and the consultants were then asked to conduct the assessments to justify the proposal. Such approach would be subject to judicial review;
- (c) the Government did not allow sufficient time for public consultation. The DC consultation paper on the proposed development had only a few pages without details of the proposal and was issued a few days before meeting. The key information such as development scale, building heights, separate distance with Rambler Crest, and supporting facilities were only made available to the residents bit by bit subsequently;
- (d) in contrary to that stated in the Paper or the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), the traffic condition in the area was very problematic. The traffic was significantly increased due to the completion of the logistic centre nearby and there were on-going road works at Tsing Yi Road since 2014 requiring the closure of a lane in each traffic direction. Residents had to wait 15 to 20 minutes for minibus during the morning peak and in case of accidents, no minibus would be available;
- (e) the TIA report came to a conclusion that the provision public transport services was not a concern, apparently, on the basis that there were many bus routes serving the area. The actual situation was that Rambler Crest residents relied on only two green minibus (GMB) routes during the morning peak. It was also doubtful whether the capacity of Tsing Yi Road north could cope with the increased traffic due to the additional population;

- (f) the Site was not suitable for residential use. Rambler Crest equipped with double-glazing windows and central fresh air intake to mitigate the noise nuisance of CT9. The Site was located closer to CT9 and should be subject to more severe noise impact. By proposing a PRH development at the Site, the Government had ignored the mental and physical health of the future PRH residents;
- (g) the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS) had scaled down the open space development in the locality significantly to the existing Tsing Hung Road Playground on the ground that the slopes of the Site was not suitable for large-scale development, not because the Site had no use;
- (h) it was not appropriate to decide that the open space at the Site should not be retained solely on the basis of its low utilization rate. It was not necessary for the residents to walk into the Site for utilization. The tree clusters at the Site could enhance the visual amenity and air quality of the area;
- (i) he was disappointed with the meeting arrangement in that the meeting date was changed casually, and doubted whether the change was due to that the technical reports had not yet completed, rather than too many attendees as informed by the Secretariat. He requested the matters be investigated and he would follow it up;
- (j) there were a number of sites available in Tsing Yi South, such as the area along Nam Wan Kok and Nam Wan, and the open-air car parks along Cheung Fai Road;
- (k) as the Government did not consult the local stakeholders on the proposed development, he did not believe the Government would provide the enhancement and improvement measures as committed; and
- (l) he requested Members to consider the rezoning proposal in prudent manner to fulfill the Board's mission of promoting the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community, and to bring about a better organized, efficient and desirable place to live and work in. He

also made complaints on matters relating to the delay in delivering the Paper, not following the established practice in preparing the proposal, and the delay in finalization of the TIA and Environmental Assessment Study (EAS) reports;

R521/C10

- (m) her family deferred their trips outside Hong Kong to 20.4.2016 to 4.5.2016 in order to attend the hearing originally scheduled for 1.4.2016, but was informed only on 24.3.2016 that the hearing had been rescheduled. She then requested the Secretariat to reschedule the hearing to another day but in vain, and was told to write up a script for her representative to speak at the hearing;
- (n) the Paper was received on 16.4.2016 afternoon, rather than seven days before meeting as indicated in the Secretariat's letter issued to them earlier. If the reason for rescheduling the hearing date was only due to too many attendees, the Paper should be issued together with the Secretariat's letter dated 22.3.2016. She believed that the actual reason for rescheduling the hearing was that the technical reports could not be completed in time;
- (o) the technical reports were in English without any Chinese translation and it was difficult for a layman to comprehend the reports and write up a script for her representative to speak at the hearing in such a short time. She requested the Board to withdraw the rezoning proposal as the consultation process was not fair;
- (p) her grounds of objection were already stated in her submissions and she would like to emphasize her grave concern on the public transport services problem in the area. She needed to wait for a long time for GMB route No. 88F and might wait for 30 minutes when there were a lot of hotel guests and inclement weather. The road works at Tsing Yi Road also prolonged the GMB from 5 minutes normally to 10 - 15 minutes. It took her 1.5 hours to get to work in the Hong Kong Island. It illustrated the capacity of the public transport services was saturated and could not cater for more population. Unlike Tsing Yi North, Tsing Yi South did

not have any large scale open space. The tree clusters at the Site were needed to abate pollution of CT9 and the roads; and

- (q) she requested the Board to consider whether the proposed PRH development could fulfill the Board's mission. She welcomed the Board to use the open-air carparks to build park, sports grounds and recreational facilities for improving the living environment of the residents, but not any rezoning proposal that would deteriorate the living environment and harm the health of the residents.

30. Mr Chiu Ying Yuen passed the two letters to the Secretariat for Members' reference.

R302 - Kan Hon Pun

31. Mr Kan Hon Pun made the following main points :

- (a) he moved in Rambler Crest because of its nice setting with the greenery nearby despite its location was not so convenient. He was only aware of the rezoning proposal from the newspaper, and even the Owners' Committee (OC) of Rambler Crest was not aware of it at that time;
- (b) he then understood that the rezoning proposal was objected to by the K&TDC, and expected that the government representatives would take initiative to consult Rambler Crest residents as they were the main local stakeholders. The government representatives only came to the local forum on 18.9.2015 after the residents' repeated requests. At the local forum, the government representatives could not answer the residents' questions, and there were no representatives from TD and the bus/GMB operators to address the residents' traffic concerns. At the local forum, HD's consultant informed the residents that traffic survey was conducted, but such survey had not involved DC members and the Rambler Crest OC. The findings of the survey were not representative as the survey was conducted preceding Easter Holidays without much school and worker traffic;

- (c) he needed to take bus to his working place in Kowloon but the buses just bypassed the bus stop near Rambler Crest even as early as 7:00 a.m. He doubted the conclusion of the TIA that there was no public transport services problem in the area, and also expected that the situation would be very worse when the 11,800 residents of the proposed PRH development moved into the area with 6,000 more people queuing at the bus stop;
- (d) for visual impact, he was living in upper floor and enjoying open view. The proposed PRH development would be only 60 m away and he could only have views through the few narrow gaps between the proposed PRH blocks;
- (e) K&TDC already rejected the rezoning proposal. For a proper consultation, the Government should amend the rezoning proposal and consult DC and the stakeholders again, and if necessary further amend and consult. However, the rezoning proposal was submitted to the Board without further consultation;
- (f) given that the port industry was declining and there was an urgent need to meet the housing demand, the sites planned to be developed for multi-storey carpark and multi-storey complex for port development in Tsing Yi South should be considered for residential use. The existing tree clusters at the Site served as a city lung. Many trees in the Country Park were also common species with low amenity value as those in the Site, but the Country Park would not be developed for housing use;
- (g) he was not objected to PRH development but the Site was not suitable as it would have adverse impacts on the existing residents. The photomontages of the proposed PRH development in the Paper were prepared at vantage points far away from the Site while the PRH blocks would be located in front of his flat obstructing the air flow and sunlight penetration; and
- (h) Members were requested to consider the views of the residents, and had a visit to the Site to understand their concerns. The Board should make a decision based on the residents' views.

[Mr Sunny L.K. Ho left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R335 - Lo YuenTing

R336 – Ng Chi Wah

R785 / C306 - Ho Oi Lam

R960 / C136 - Au Yeung Man

C135 - Wong Chun Nam

R394/C1- Poon Chi Shing

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

Meeting Arrangement

- (a) the meeting arrangement was not acceptable. Some residents had taken leave from work and changed their travelling plans in order to attend the hearing originally scheduled for 1.4.2016. Even more hearing sessions were needed due to the large number of attendees, the Board could still hold a hearing session on 1.4.2016 for some representatives/commenters;
- (b) he was both a representative and a commenter but still had not received the Paper at the day and had to borrow it from a colleague in the DC. It was stated in the Board's guidance notes for attending the hearing that the Paper should be delivered seven days before the hearing. If the Paper was not ready, the Board should defer the hearing;

DC Consultation

- (c) the number of PRH blocks had reduced from five to four and the location of the vehicular ingress/egress in the proposed development had also been changed. Such substantial changes should be reverted to K&TDC for consultation prior to submission of the rezoning proposal to the Board. Moreover, for the DC meeting on 14.5.2016, the K&TDC consultation paper for the proposed PRH development, with only three pages, was received three days before the meeting without giving sufficient time for DC members to consider it. The K&TDC therefore objected to the rezoning proposal unanimously at the meeting;

- (d) K&TDC did not object to all PRH developments. For example, the proposed PRH development at Lai King Estate, HD had attended K&TDC meeting twice allowing five-month time for K&TDC to discuss/consider the proposal and proactively consult local residents to address their concerns;
- (e) the views of K&TDC were misquoted in the Paper. Paragraph 33 of the Paper stated that K&TDC was further consulted on the gazetted amendments to OZP by circulation of a paper on 18.9.2015, and there was no comment received from K&TDC. However, that paper was not seeking DC members' views on the proposed PRH development, but informed DC members that they could submit written submission to the Board. It was not correct for PlanD to state that K&TDC members did not have any comment on the rezoning proposal. Before the gazettal of the OZP, he and another K&TDC member made an announcement at a K&TDC meeting in July 2015 on their dissatisfaction to PlanD for not providing any further information on the rezoning proposal since its last submission in May 2015. In fact, a number of K&TDC members had also submitted adverse representations to the Board in respect of the rezoning proposal;
- (f) in the PlanD's presentation, it was stated that K&TDC supported the port back-up uses in Tsing Yi South. However, some DC members did suggest using those sites, instead of the Site, for housing development. Such information had not been conveyed to the Board;
- (g) it was the Board's guidelines to request the Government to consult relevant DC on rezoning proposals prior to submitting them to the Board for consideration. However, for the current rezoning proposal, K&TDC was informed rather than consulted. For a proper consultation, instead of just circulating a paper before the close of the 2015 DC session, the Government should propose an agenda item in the current DC session for the amendments to the OZP to be discussed at K&TDC meeting;

- (h) for previous development proposals in general, the Government first submitted the draft proposals to DC and DC members would gather local views on the draft proposals. The local views were then relayed to the departments for amending the proposals and the amended proposals would be further submitted to DC for consideration. The Government did not follow the established practice in the current rezoning proposal;
- (i) the development of the existing Tsing Hung Road Playground was funded by K&TDC. While DLCS was consulted on the development programme for the open space at the Site, K&TDC had not been consulted whether they had plan for the open space development. K&TDC had once considered to develop the open space by itself but did not proceed due to its budget constraint. It did not mean that K&TDC would not the Site for open space use in the future;

Traffic Concern

- (j) the residents had reasons to raise grave concerns on the public transport services. K&TDC had agreed to various development projects including Shek Foon House in Shek Lei and Kwai Luen Estate in Kwai Fong. The bus/GMB operators still had not yet implemented enhancement measures for their services related to the proposals, despite TD had kept pushing them. Under such circumstances, it was the residents who suffered most;
- (k) he doubted about the conclusion of the TIA report that there was no concern on the public transport services in the area. DC had made repeated requests to TD to improve the public transport services and the TD responded that they had difficulties to push the bus/GMB operators for enhancing the services as the patronage of the hotel guests was subject to great fluctuation;
- (l) the section of Tsing Yi Road to the south of Sai Shan Road would change from two-lane to one-lane traffic, which would result in serious traffic blockage in case of any traffic accidents. A vehicular ingress/egress for the proposed PRH development was added at Tsing Hung Road. He doubted whether the TIA had assessed the very busy traffic at Tsing Hung

Road during the morning peak. In relation to the development of container-related use at Tsing Hung Road, the roundabout at the junction of Tsing Yi Road/Tsing Yi Hong Wan Road would need to be modified and such modification works had not taken into account the additional traffic arising from the proposed PRH development;

Development Cost

- (m) he claimed that HD would develop public housing sites at whatever costs. Under such circumstances, the Government should develop the open space sites in Tsing Yi North and the ex-CT10 site, rather than the Site which was the only open space in Tsing Yi South;

[Dr F.C. Chan left this session of the meeting at this point.]

Noise Impact

- (n) 10% of the PRH units would be subject to the noise impact exceeding the noise standard. The information of the location of that 10% PRH units had not been submitted to K&TDC for consideration. As he understood, it was not acceptable to have residential development proposals subject to noise impact exceeding 70dB(A);
- (o) Rambler Crest was designed as a noise screen for residential developments nearby, and equipped with fresh air intake and double-glazing windows. He doubted whether the proposed PRH development could have such mitigation measures, and whether the noise level at the PRH development would be acceptable;

Visual Impact

- (p) a photomontage of the proposed PRH development should be prepared at the vantage point at the podium of Rambler Crest which was open to the public and frequently visited by hotel guests and workers nearby. Such request was also made by residents at the local forum on 18.9.2015, and no such vantage point was included in the Paper;

Tree Felling and Air Quality Impact

- (q) 1,800 trees at the Site would be felled. Those trees, even were common species, could serve as a buffer for the residents against the air pollution of CT9. According to a Legislative Council paper, the Government stated that over the past three years, the air quality of Kwai Tsing was similar to the districts on both sides of Victoria Harbour, such as Sham Shui Po and Kwun Tong. A higher level of Sulphur Dioxide concentration was recorded in Kwai Tsing, which was probably due to the emission of the container vessels at the nearby port. He doubted whether it was possible not to allow the future PRH residents to open their windows as in the case of Rambler Crest, and also suspected that the reduction of the number of the proposed PRH blocks might be due to the air pollution problem;

Open Space and Government, Institution or Community (GIC) Facilities

- (r) it was stated in the Paper that there was basically no shortfall in open space and major community facilities in the district. However, nearly all the open space and GIC facilities were located in Tsing Yi North and the residents needed to take bus to get there. It was also stated in the Paper that the shortfall in 1,166 hospital beds could be met by the hospital facilities in the adjacent districts. According to the information newly released by the Hospital Authority, utilization rate of Yan Chi Hospital was 144% while that for Princess Margaret Hospital, Pok Oi Hospital, Caritas Hospital and Queen Elizabeth Hospital was 120%. He doubted whether those hospitals could still cater for the shortfall in Tsing Yi;
- (s) regarding the GIC facilities provided in the proposed PRH development. Cheung Ching Estate, Cheung Hong Estate and Cheung Fat Estate already had Neighbourhood Elderly Centres. He also believed that the residents in Tsing Yi southwest area did not need Integrated Support Service for Persons with Severe Physical Disabilities, Day Care Centre for the Elderly, Residential Care Home for the Elderly, and Special Child Care Centre, and Early Education and Training Centre to be provided in the proposed PRH development. They had voiced out the same view at the K&TDC meeting, but no amendment was made to the GIC facilities to be provided;

Traffic Impact

- (t) a traffic survey was conducted on 31.3.2015 at Cheung Wang Estate because it had 4,000 PRH units, which was similar to the proposed PRH development and could be used to estimate the traffic flow generated. However, Cheung Wang Estate had a large number of new immigrants who might go back to the Mainland during the survey period. Also, given that local residents had queries about why the traffic survey was conducted on 31.3.2015 at the local forum, HD should conduct another survey to address the concern, but did not do so. K&TDC had conducted traffic survey over 10 years, not only one year. For survey conducted by K&TDC, it would be conducted for five days covering weekdays, Saturdays and public holidays;
- (u) it was doubtful whether the TIA report had included the impact of a private residential development proposed near Cheung Wang Estate on the service of GMB route No. 42A. The TIA report also did not cover the following aspects: (i) future PRH residents would need to cross the vehicular ingress/egress of Rambler Crest to go to the nearest bus stop for GMB routes bounding for Kowloon, which would induce more pedestrian-vehicle conflict and prone to accident; and (ii) future arrangement of the traffic lights. Due to a traffic light at Tsing Yi Road, the traffic could tail back to Cheung Hong Road/Sai Shan Road when there was a long passenger queue at the bus stop requiring longer time for the boarding/alighting of passengers;
- (v) there was no justification provided in the TIA report for conducting traffic survey for GMB route No. 88G (Rambler Crest - Kwai Fong MTR Station), but not also route No. 88F (Rambler Crest – Tsing Yi MTR Station). Although the TIA report pointed out that some bus routes already could not cater for the demand, it had not mentioned that all the buses were already very packed;

PFS

- (w) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), high-rise residential development should not be located near PFS. He doubted whether the proposed PRH development would not be subject to any hazard concern. Any explosion and fire accidents in the PFS might block the only access road to Rambler Crest;

Nullah and Odour Concern

- (x) there was no information to illustrate how the four PRH blocks would be connected without affecting the nullah. Despite that the existing residential developments was 60m away from the nullah, there were constant complaints from the residents about its odour nuisance. He doubted whether the odour impact would be acceptable for the proposed PRH development which would be immediately next to the nullah, especially the air flow in the lower floors would be obstructed as mentioned in the AVA report;
- (y) regarding the central refuse collection chamber with refuse handling system within the proposed PRH development, complaints on the odour nuisance had been received for a similar facility in Cheung Wang Estate. A package of improvement measures was implemented but still could not mitigate the odour nuisance satisfactorily;

Technical Studies

- (z) despite concerned departments had advised that there was no insurmountable problem for the proposed PRH development, it was stated in the Paper that the mitigation measures or a number of technical issues needed further studies. He considered that all the technical issues should be first resolved prior to submitting the rezoning proposal to the Board for consideration; and
- (aa) in conclusion, the Board should not make a hasty decision and he requested the Board to withdraw the rezoning proposal. The rezoning proposal should be reverted to K&TDC for consideration and time should

be allowed for DC members to consult the locals. If the provision of the open space was assessed on the basis of the whole Tsing Yi, all residents in Tsing Yi, not only Rambler Crest, should be consulted. He considered the views of K&TDC and locals were not respected and the technical assessments were not comprehensive and reliable.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R377- Ng Lai Wan

33. Ms Ng Lai Wan made the following main points :

- (a) she purchased the existing flat because of the greenery setting in the front. Her grounds of objection were set out in paragraphs (e), (f), (l), (m) and (p) of Annex C of the Paper;
- (b) during the morning peak, it was very difficult for her to take both GMB routes No. 88F and 88G. Route No. 88G had more frequent services, but could be stuck in a traffic jam at the roundabout near Kwai Fong MTR station for 15 minutes. She therefore mainly took GMB route No. 88F to Tsing Yi MTR station but usually needed to wait for the second or third bus arrived for boarding. If there were many hotel guests waiting, she might wait for the fourth bus. As GMB route No.88F was at a service interval of 10 - 20 minutes, and that took her 1.5 hours to travel to her office in the Central;
- (c) it was also very difficult to take bus. For bus route No. 42A, even before 8:00 a.m. on Sundays, she needed to wait for the second bus for boarding and had to cram herself on the very packed bus. Even the frequency of the bus/GMB services could be increased, she doubted whether the road capacity could cope with the increased traffic as the Tsing Yi south bridge always had traffic congestion. For travelling to home after work, she would go to Kwai Fong MTR station to take GMB route No.88G and also needed to wait up to three GMBs;

- (d) she moved in Rambler Crest because of the good air quality there. Felling of the trees and the proposed development at the Site would reduce the Oxygen concentration level and increase the air temperature in the locality and she might need to turn on air conditioner which would trigger her breathing problem;
- (e) the TIA was conducted at Cheung Wang Estate which did not have hotel guests, students and workers of the logistic centres nearby as in the case of Rambler Crest and was also next to a bus terminus with guaranteed boarding;
- (f) there were limited shopping facilities in the area which could not cater for the existing demand. Even a shopping mall would be provided in the proposed development, it could unlikely cater for the demand;
- (g) Tsing Hung Playground was used by many children during evening and Sundays, and was not of low utilization rate as stated by the Government; and
- (h) in conclusion, she did not object to PRH development, but the proposed PRH development at the Site was separated from her flat by only a road, which would result in a very congested environment. She requested the Board to reject the rezoning proposal.

R516/C65- Ngai Ying Chuen

34. With the aid of photographs illustration, Mr Ngai Ying Chuen made the following main points :

- (a) he took leave from work to attend the current hearing session and wished the Board could make a fair decision;
- (b) while other representatives had already covered his main concerns, he would elaborate more on the traffic problem in the area. It was common that an accident in the area would result in widespread traffic blockage in Tsing Yi that lasted for hours. During the morning peak, they needed to

wait for the third bus for boarding and had to squeeze into the very packed bus. There was always a long queue for the GMB at the bus stop of Rambler Crest. Given the current experience encountered by residents, they were not convinced by the conclusion of the TIA report that the existing public transport services would be able to absorb the additional demand generated by the proposed PRH development;

- (c) the technical assessments conducted for the proposed PRH development were very crude. It was stated that there was no geotechnical problem at the Site. In fact, it still needed further investigation and study to conclude the geotechnical features were up to the safety standards. A lot of extra public money was spent in a number of infrastructure projects such as the Express Rail Link, due to the crude technical assessments;
- (d) the Government had guidelines for not allowing development near nullah and high-rise development near PFS, and there was no justification provided in the current rezoning for not following those guidelines. For fair and open governance, those guidelines should be amended before the PRH development was proposed. The current chaotic situation in society was due to that the Government had ignored the interests and views of the community; and
- (e) one of the core values of Hong Kong was the adherence to the rule of law and the proposed PRH development did not follow the law. Rejection of the rezoning proposal was not only to protect the benefits of Rambler Crest, but also the core value of Hong Kong;

R748/C345 - Ma Yuk Chu, Judy

35. Ms Ma Yuk Chu, Judy, made the following main points :

- (a) she came out not only to defend the interests of Rambler Crest but also that of the future PRH residents;
- (b) the open space at the Site was planned to act as a buffer area between the nearby residential developments and CT9. DLCS shelved the open space

development plan at the Site because the slopes within the Site would have geotechnical hazard concern and incur high development costs, and the low utilization rate of Tsing Hung Road Playground, but it still served as a buffer area;

- (c) she needed to take GMB route No.88F to work place in Tsing Yi and did not understand why HD's consultant did not assess the capacity of that route, which should be more problematic than route No. 88G. It was not fair not to assess the capacity of route No. 88F as future PRH residents would definitely use that route, either for work or daily necessity. She once left home at 8:00 a.m. to take GMB route No. 88F to her office near Tsing Yi Police Station and arrived there at 8:45 a.m., while the walking time from home to work should be around 20 minutes. The residents had reflected their views to the DC members that the frequency of GMB route No. 88F was not enough, but no improvement had been made so far. The traffic survey conducted by HD's consultant on one day only was not reliable;
- (d) on 13.2.2013, the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office said that allowing development on slopes with a gradient of 25 degrees would have danger and incur high construction and maintenance costs. The Civil Engineering Development Department (CEDD) would critically review developments to be built on slopes to ensure those developments would be safe. She could not understand why CEDD considered that there was no geotechnical hazard concern for the propose development at the Site. The ex-Chief Secretary had publicly given credits to the satisfactory slope stabilization works done by the Government in the past. She considered that the Government was no longer concerned about slope safety, and requested that the slopes at the Site be kept intact;
- (e) the tree cluster at the Site acted as a green lung for Rambler Crest, Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate. The compensatory tree planting elsewhere for trees felled at the Site could not serve the purpose. Felling of the trees was also contradictory to the principle of environmental protection promulgated by the Government;

- (f) provision of a shopping mall in the proposed development would not benefit the existing residents. The shopping mall in Rambler Crest, which was similar in scale to that proposed in the PRH development, was largely patronized by the hotel guests nearby and the residents needed to compete with them. The price of the food in Tsing Yi Market was higher than other areas. Additional population would further drive up the price;
- (g) the podium of Rambler Crest was accessible to the general public, hotel guests and workers nearby. The future PRH residents might also use the podium and posed safety concern to Rambler Crest residents;
- (h) regarding medical facilities, she had an experience in 12 years ago that her daughter needed to wait six hours in emergency unit of Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Further increase in population would aggravate the problem of insufficient medical facilities in the area;
- (i) according to the issue dates shown on the technical reports, the technical assessments were completed in March 2016. It implied that the reason for not holding the meeting on 1.4.2016 originally scheduled for was that the reports had not yet been completed. She did not understand why the technical assessments could not be conducted earlier. It was difficult for her to take leave from work twice, i.e. on 1.4.2016 and the current day;
- (j) the air quality in the area was poor, and the whole Kwai Tsing area was covered by haze even at 7:00 a.m. because of the dust and suspended particles blowing from the Mainland. The proposed four PRH blocks would further obstruct the air flow and sunlight. While Rambler Crest residents might be possible to turn on air conditioners to abate the heat and traffic noise, future PRH residents might not afford such option. The glare impact of CT9 was so significant that it disturbed the sleep of residents, and the Site, being closer to CT9, might be subject to more severe impact;

[Professor S.C. Wong returned to this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (k) according to the information from the Commissioner of Police, there were 441 accidents annually in Tsing Yi and 8% higher than that in 2013. The traffic of Tsing Yi was paralyzed if there was congestion at Tsing Yi Roundabout No.1. It was frequent to have rupture in the sewerage near Tsing Yi city centre which required emergency repair works causing traffic congestion and inconvenience to the residents. If HD and PlanD considered that there was no traffic problem, they should provide information on which and how many bus routes and what mitigation measures would be provided and commit to deliver the mitigation measures;
- (l) for visual impact, the podium in Rambler Crest was a public open space with a lot of hotel guests taking photographs there. The PRH blocks would block the scenery, and the area would no longer be attractive to the hotel guests.
- (m) she hoped that the Board would critically review whether the Site was suitable for the PRH development. There were 1,200ha brownfield sites which should be developed, instead of the Site. Similar to the current rezoning proposals, the technical feasibility of the brownfield sites could be ascertained by technical assessments to be conducted later.

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

R840 - Yeung Shiu Ting

36. Mr Poon Chi Shing said that as Mrs Tam Yeung Shiu Ting, the representer of R840, had already left the hearing, he would read out a letter written by Mrs Tam which had the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Rambler Crest, and was surprised to find out that Rambler Crest was a service apartment when she bought it in 2009. As she understood, the open space at the Site was to compensate to the residents for such mismatch of land use. Rambler Crest needed to have central fresh air intake to mitigate the noise, and special windows to filter

the glare impact of CT9. Any development in the area should be equipped with the same mitigation measures. She did not understand why the Government overturned its original plan and commitment of providing the open space at the Site to compensate the mismatch;

- (b) it was unreasonable for Mei Foo Sun Chuen, which was similar to Rambler Crest in its proximity to container terminal, had a large park to act as a buffer while the only small open space reserved for Rambler Crest was proposed for residential use; and
- (c) she claimed that HD had indicated that they would develop the PRH blocks at the Site at whatever costs. It would be the taxpayers, not only residents of Rambler Crest and Mayfair Gardens, to pay the bills.

R901- Youngspiration

37. Upon the request of Mr Johnathan Y.S. Ip, the Chairman agreed to exercise flexibility and extend his speaking time to 20 minutes, but reminded him to keep his presentation concise and relevant to the amendments to the OZP. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ip made the following main points :

Alternative Sites

- (a) he proposed several alternative sites for the Board to consider for housing development. They were located in the uphill area in Tsing Yi with two sites next to oil depots at Nam Wan and Nam Wan Kok, one next to Ching Wah Court, one next to Mount Haven and one near North West Tsing Yi Interchange. Using the same criteria for assessing the suitability of the proposed PRH development at the Site, their proposed alternative sites should also be considered suitable in that (i) they could accommodate five or more blocks of 140mPD; (ii) they were not in proximity of PFS; (iii) they would have the same traffic impact; (iv) insufficient supporting and community facilities were not a problem; (v) no air ventilation impact; (vi) slopes in those sites were not an issue; and (vii) it was acceptable to have visual openness ratio decreasing from 60% to 10%;

- (b) they were not really proposing those alternative sites for residential use, but intended to illustrate what's wrong of the assessments of the current rezoning proposal. It demonstrated that the so-called data was inconsistent to the common understanding; the conclusion based on such data was hard to say correct; and if the data did not reveal the truth, it was not the data's fault, but the people who collected and handled them. He considered that the reason for receiving a large number of adverse representations to the OZP was that the information related to the capacity of traffic infrastructures, air ventilation and greening presented by the Government was not correct. He doubted the assumptions/model adopted and comprehensiveness of the assessments undertaken. He requested that the Board to critically review whether the information presented by the Government or that of the representers/commenters was the actual situation. He had visited the area and took the concerned bus routes in the morning and considered the situation presented by residents was the actual one. He also asked whether the Board and the government representatives had visited the Site;

Public Consultation

- (c) there was procedure issue in the proposed rezoning. For example, Youngspiration only knew the number of blocks was reduced from five to four;
- (d) Youngspiration sent out about 100 questionnaires to the local residents regarding the rezoning proposal, and more than 90% of the returned questionnaires objected to the rezoning. The views of the interviewees were written down and their voices were recorded in a CD, which were submitted to the Board;
- (e) referring to a foam board used by Youngspiration for collecting the views of local residents at bus stop for GMB to Kwai Fong on the use of the Site, he said that four options as shown on the foam board were offered to the local residents which were to use the Site as market, library, recreational park and other opinions. About half of the respondents opted for open

space and half opted for other opinions with mainly ‘maintain the status quo’ expressed. No respondent asked for residential use at the Site;

- (f) there was insufficient time for public consultation. The proposed development could affect the living environment of the residents for more than 20 years, but the residents had less than one day to go through the Paper with about 200 pages. The purpose of urban planning was to make a pleasant living for people, instead of meeting housing target. Every resident in the area was concerned with the rezoning proposal, although not many residents could attend the hearing due to work commitment;

Technical Issues

- (g) he doubted whether the Site with the slopes, which was considered not suitable for open space development, could be developed for residential use. The Government had guidelines to require extra safety assessment for slopes with gradients of 15 to 20 degrees. He asked whether and when such assessment had been conducted and if so, the report should be accessible to the public;
- (h) the Government should use the public money prudently. It was not reasonable to develop PRH at the Site which had slopes that would incur more development costs. He doubted whether the Government had surveyed each tree in the Site or just taken a few samples; and
- (i) the traffic, infrastructure and environmental problems in the district should be resolved first before developing new PRH. As long as there was no solid planning on the mitigation measures to be provided, Youngspiration would maintain their objection to the rezoning proposal.

R924- Cheung Wai Ming

38. Mr Cheung Wai Ming made the following main points:

- (a) his grounds of objection were similar to those presented by other representatives/comments. Residents spent time and money to attend the hearing session and mostly presented their views in a sensible manner. He

hoped that Members would accept their views. The Paper was compiled by various departments and he believed that Members did not understand the whole Paper;

- (b) the Tsing Yi Interchange near Tsing Yi Bridge south was modified several times and it had 12 exit/entrance points connecting other areas over Hong Kong. A lot of the heavy and long container trucks (exceeding 70 feet long) used the Tsing Yi Interchange. The Tsing Yi Interchange could not be further expanded due to geotechnical constraint. A recent incident had already led to traffic blockage in Tsing Yi South and Tsing Yi North. There were a lot of infrastructure networks and pipelines under the Tsing Yi Interchange which needed frequent repairing and maintenance works, leading to closure of some lanes and serious traffic congestion;
- (c) his proposal for locating PRH blocks in Tam Kon Shan, where there were plenty of government lands, was not accepted and was given the reasons that there were slopes and also environmental assessment was needed to be conducted. He considered the real reason was that those sites were reserved for high value development rather than PRH development; and
- (d) Mayfair Gardens had a high proportion of children and elderly who needed recreational facilities for physical and mental health; otherwise, there would be a greater pressure on the medical facilities. The only recreational facilities in Tsing Yi were Tsing Yi Park at Tam Kon Shan in Tsing Yi North, which were not sufficient.

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

R940- Lau Yuk Hang Alberto

39. Mr Lau Yuk Hang, Alberto made the following main points:
- (a) he had no sufficient time to study the Paper in details, and would like to respond to Annex II of the Paper;

- (b) the Paper stated that no alternative sites in Tsing Yi could be used for residential use. However, there were two large open-air car parks at Cheung Fai Road located away from the existing residential cluster and were suitable for the PRH development. He suspected the two sites were reserved for logistic development, but the port industry in fact was declining and the sites should be used for other purposes. It was also stated in the Paper that Tsing Yi North were considered not suitable for residential use as it comprised mainly slopes and was located near industrial uses. He asked why the Site with slopes could be used for residential development. The industrial factory buildings along Cheung Fai Road, which were largely vacated or used as warehouses, should be also considered for PRH development;
- (c) the four PRH blocks of up to 140mPD were very massive and created a walled type development. With the four PRH blocks, Rambler Crest would be sandwiched between developments. He asked why there would not be any air ventilation concern;
- (d) Tsing Yi was close to the port and affected by the emission of the container vessels. The 1,800 trees at the Site, even they were common species, could filter the polluted air by absorbing Carbon Dioxide and suspended particles. Felling of trees would seriously affect the health of the residents;
- (e) there was no clinic in Rambler Crest and residents needed to take a 20-minute bus ride to the clinic in Tsing Yi town centre. It illustrated that Tsing Yi South did not have sufficient supporting facilities and the community facilities to be provided in the PRH development did not have any definite development programme. There would be a substantial increase in the population, the deficiency in community facilities would affect thousands of families;
- (f) during the peak hours, they needed to wait several buses for boarding and the buses were very packed. There were two GMB routes in Rambler Crest but always had long waiting queues as they also served

hotel guests and workers nearby. Even a new bus route would be provided for the PRH development, he doubted whether it could cope with the increased population of 11,800. The future PRH residents would then use the GMB stop in Rambler crest and compete with them for the already insufficient services; and

- (g) in conclusion, he considered that if the problems related to environment, traffic and supporting infrastructure could not be first resolved, the Site should not be developed for other uses including the proposed PRH development.

40. As the presentation from government's representatives, and the representers/commenters/their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the question-and-answer (Q&A) session. The Chairman briefed 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 representers/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 that they might not necessarily agree with the responses of others.

Originally Planned Open Space Use at the Site

41. The Vice-chairman asked whether (a) the originally planned open space at the Site was a compensation for the environmental nuisance to the nearby local residents; and (b) DLCS had any programme for the open space development at the Site. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, said that according to a paper submitted to the Metro Planning Committee of the Board in 1991 in relation to, among others, the proposed rezoning of the Site to "Open Space", the open space was to provide active and passive recreational facilities for Tsing Yi residents as well as to serve as a buffer area between Mayfair Gardens/Cheung Ching Estate and the Container Terminal No. 9 (CT9). DLCS confirmed that they had no development programme for open space at the Site. In response to a Member's question, Mr Chau said that DLCS had not indicated explicitly to give up the Site

for open space development, but had no objection to rezoning the Site for the proposed PRH development.

42. A Member asked if the Site was developed for residential use, whether there would be other environmental mitigation measures to serve the same buffer area function for the residential developments nearby. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that whether or not the Site was developed for residential use, the distance between Mayfair Gardens/Cheung Ching Estate and the CT9 remained unchanged and therefore the Site could still serve as a buffer area for the nearby residential developments. In addition, the Rambler Crest, which included hotels and service apartments in design, acted as the major noise/glare screen for Mayfair Gardens/Cheung Ching Estate against the environmental nuisance of CT9.

PFS

43. The Vice-chairman asked what the planning considerations under HKPSG for residential development near PFS were. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the concerned PFS had no filling facilities for the liquefied petroleum gas (LPG), and therefore was not a potentially hazardous installation. Based on the preliminary block layout for the proposed PRH development prepared by HD, there would be a separation distance of about 40 m between the PFS and the nearest residential block, which was in line with the requirement of HKPSG in that such PFS should preferably be located in relatively open areas. In the urban areas of Hong Kong, it was not uncommon for a PFS located much closer to the residential developments. Moreover, the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services and the Director of Fire Services did not consider that there would be any risk and fire safety concerns arising from the PFS for the proposed residential development.

Nullah within the Site

44. In response to the Vice-chairman's question on the development constraints arising from for the nullah within the Site, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the Site was large enough to accommodate four PRH blocks without the need to build over the nullah.

45. A Member asked what measures would be taken to mitigate the odour nuisance of the nullah if it remained uncovered. In response, Ms May S.S. Yeung, Architect, HD, said that apart from an emergency vehicular access and a fire exit running over the nullah/

drainage reserve, there would not be any buildings over the nullah/drainage reserve. DSD had no objection to the proposed layout of the PRH development and would take up the maintenance and repair responsibility of the nullah to ensure it would function properly.

Traffic Impact

46. The Vice-chairman asked whether it was appropriate to conduct traffic survey on 31.3.2015, which was close to the Easter Holidays. In response, Mr Chris K.S. Leung, HD's consultant, said that 31.3.2015 was not a public holiday and the Easter Holidays were from 3 to 7 April 2015. The survey conducted on 31.3.2015 was to gather information on the demand on various routes to facilitate forecast of the public transport services demand. It was conducted at Cheung Wang Estate which was a development similar to the proposed PRH development in terms of flat number and location in relation to the nearest railway station. Despite the survey was conducted a few days before Easter Holidays, its findings were useful for analysing the demand for different bus/minibus routes. Traffic surveys were also conducted on 29.1.2015 and 28.4.2015 respectively to quantify the vehicle traffic flows in the vicinity of the Site and to analyse the utilization rate of the existing routes of the franchised bus and minibus near the Site.

47. A Member asked whether it was a frequent phenomenon in the recent years to have traffic blockage in Tsing Yi due to accidents. In response, Mr Chris K.S. Leung said that TIA was for assessing the traffic impact under normal circumstances, but not for the scenario of accidents. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau supplemented that the subject senior traffic engineer in TD responsible for Tsing Yi district was not present at the hearing session, and information on the frequency of such traffic blockage in the recent years was not in hand. He would report back to the Board at the hearing session on 26.4.2016, if necessary.

48. A Member and the Chairman asked whether the TIA had considered the traffic impact of the container industry and special characteristics of container trucks. In response, Mr Chris K.S. Leung, said that the TIA had already taken into account the traffic flow of the container industry in the forecast and concluded that all the key junctions would still have spare capacities to cope with the demand. In addition, with reference to Transport Planning and Design Manual, factors had been applied to long vehicles like container trucks which took up larger road space and longer turning time in assessing the junction capacities in the TIA.

Public Transport Services

Current Situation

49. The Chairman asked Mr Poon Chi Shing (R394) to elaborate his proposed enhancement measures to the bus/GMB operators to improve the current situation. In response, Mr Poon said that the GMB operator had been specifically requested to improve the services of the routes No.88G (Rambler Crest - Kwai Fong MTR Station) and 88F (Rambler Crest - Tsing Yi MTR Station) for the Rambler Crest residents. Both TD and the GMB operator said that they could not ascertain the service demand as the guests of the three hotels in Rambler Crest would also use the GMB service and the volume of that patronage was subject to significant fluctuation. In view of the demand for public transport services would further escalate when the logistic centres/port back up uses in Tsing Yi South were completed, he had requested the Government to improve the public transport services, but no measures had been implemented so far. He considered that if enhancement measures had been provided, the residents might not raise such strong objection to the proposed PRH development.

50. A Member asked about the current situation of the public transport services near the Site. In response, Mr Honson H.S. Yuen, CTO/NTSW, TD, said that according to TD's survey conducted in January 2016 at the GMB stop at Rambler Crest, during the morning peak (7:00 to 9:00 a.m.), the frequency of GMB routes No.88F and 88G was on average of a 5-minute interval. For route No. 88F, there were 15 times that one to 15 waiting passengers could not board their first minibus arrived, but could board the next bus with the longest waiting time of around 10 minutes. For route No. 88G, there were 17 times that one to 20 waiting passengers could not board their first minibus arrived, but could board the third minibus with the longest waiting time of around 11 minutes.

51. In response to the Chairman's question, Ms Ma Yuk Chu Judy (R748/C345) said that it took her over 30 minutes to walk from Rambler Crest to Tsing Yi MTR Station. According to her experience, the frequency of GMB route No. 88F during the morning peak was 10 to 15 minutes, rather than 5 minutes as mentioned by TD's representative, and sometimes passengers needed to wait for 30 minutes for boarding.

Impact of the Proposed PRH Development

52. In response to a Member's enquiry on the impact of the waiting time for the two GMB routes upon completion of the proposed PRH development, Mr Honson H.S. Yuen said that as the GMB routes No.88F and 88G could no longer cope with the increased population in future, a new GMB route would be planned to serve the area. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the details of the new GMB route, Mr Yuen said that the details would be worked out nearer to the completion of the proposed PRH development, but it would likely cater for short trips to nearby districts, such as Tsuen Wan and Kwai Chung, or to the nearest MTR station as feeder services.

53. Mr Chris K.S. Leung supplemented that there were also franchised bus routes in the locality of the Site bounding for the railway stations in the vicinity, which had the potential and capacity to service the proposed development. In particular, the bus route No. 249M embarking from Mayfair Gardens to Tsing Yi MTR Station could also extend its service to the Site as mentioned in the TIA Report.

54. In response to a Member's enquiry on how the public transport services could be improved if the PRH development was implemented, Mr Poon Chi Shing (R394) said that TD's survey conducted in January 2016 was not the peak season for the hotels in Rambler Crest and might not reflect the worst scenario. As the area of Rambler Crest was the last stop for the bus/GMB bounding for the railway stations/other areas and during the peak hours, he expected that the minibuses and buses would be fully occupied no matter how frequent they would be. The problem could only be resolved if special bus routes were provided to embark from the locality of Rambler Crest, but the operator might not consider such routes financially viable.

Environmental Impact

55. In response to two Members' enquiry on the environmental impacts of the operation of CT9 on the proposed PRH development, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the EAS being conducted had already assessed various environmental issues and recommended appropriate mitigation measures. Ms May S. S. Yeung supplemented that HD would conduct further studies on the micro-climate, such as indoor/outdoor temperature and sun lighting, at the proposed PRH development to improve its living environment.

56. Another Member asked whether a residential development proposal subject to road traffic noise impact exceeding 70dB(A) was acceptable. In response, Mr Wong Yuk Ming, HD's consultant, said that the standard for road traffic noise impact at residential development, i.e. 70 dB(A), was set out in HKPSG which was for planning purpose rather than as a statutory requirement. In general, a mitigated noise compliance rate of 90%, as in the proposed PRH development, was considered acceptable. Moreover, HD would strive for a higher noise compliance rate during the detailed design stage of the PRH development.

57. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the design of the windows of the proposed PRH development to mitigate the noise impact, Mr Wong Yuk Ming said that the PRH units would use acoustic windows which could be opened to allow fresh air intake and mitigate the noise nuisance at the same time.

Development Cost

58. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Ms May S. S. Yeung said that the exact development cost was not available as the design of the proposed PRH development was still refining. However, the Site did not present any exceptional difficulties and its development cost should be comparable to other PRH developments.

GIC, Open Space and Retail Facilities

59. In response to a Member's enquiry on how the shortfall in hospital beds could be addressed, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that hospital was a regional facility and he understood that Kwong Wah Hospital and Princess Margaret Hospital were planning for redevelopment/expansion to cope with the demand in the region.

60. In response to another Member's enquiry, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau confirmed that with reference to Attachment XI to the Paper, the assessment of the provision of GIC facilities and open space was based on the cumulative total of the population of 210,000 in the district. It was concluded that the provisions of all the local GIC facilities and the open space would be sufficient to meet the HKPSG requirements based on the planned total population including those of the proposed PRH development and other forthcoming residential developments.

61. A Member and the Chairman enquired, respectively, how the size of the proposed shopping mall in the PRH development was determined and what facilities would be provided there. In response, Ms May S. S. Yeung said that the appropriate size of the shopping area, i.e. an internal floor area of 2,400 m², was worked out by their retail consultant, and shops like eating places, clinic, bakery, etc would be provided in the shopping area.

Block Layout

62. A Member asked whether it was feasible to reduce the building height of the proposed Block 4 in front of Rambler Crest, or to delete the block by transferring its GFA to the remaining three blocks further away. In response, Ms Yeung said that in order to fully utilize the permitted development potential of the Site, four blocks would need to be built close to the maximum building height restriction of 140mPD on the OZP. It was not possible for the remaining three blocks to accommodate all the GFA of Block 4 (over 1,000 units) without exceeding the building height restriction.

63. As Members did not have any further questions, the Chairman said that the hearing procedure on the day had been completed. He thanked the presenters, commenters and their representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would deliberate on the representations in their absence after completing all the hearing sessions, and would inform the presenters and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

64. The hearing session was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.