

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 1.11.2016.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

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

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West)
Transport Department
Mr Samson S.S. Lam

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

Assistance Director/Regional 1
Lands Department
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

3. The Chairman said that the meeting was a continuation of the hearing of the further representations in respect of the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY/27 commenced on 25.10.2016.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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

Housing Department (HD)

Ms Emily W.M. Ip - Senior Planning Officer (Atg.)

Ms May S.S. Yeung - Architect

Mr Chow Kwok Sang - Civil Engineer

Further Representers, Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

F694 – Lau Fung Lin

R199 / C130 – Sze Po Kan

R238 / C192 – Sze Po Ying, Siena

R486 / C191– 劉鳳蓮

R662 – 施國榮

C238 – 關明輝

Mr Sze Po Kan - Representer and Commenter, Further
Representer's, Representers' and
Commenters' representative

F776 – 曾碧峰

F809 – Ma Man Fei

F1160 – Chau Siu Fai

R171 – Owners' Committee of Rambler Crest

R379 – Tsoi Leung Fai

C291 – Wong Hei Long

C292 – Chien Pui Shan Eva

C293 – Tang Chui Woon

C297 – Tung Kit Ching

C299 – 張岩

C300 – Wong Pan

C306 – Ho Oi Lam

C309 – Leung Chu Sang

C313 – Au Yeung Siu Leung

Mr Au Yeung Siu Leung - Commenter, Further Representers',
Representers' and Commenters'
representative

- Mr Patrick Chu - Further Representers', Representers' and Commenters' representative
- F1099 – 李春生
- F1111 – Leung Cheuk Wah
- F1113 – Chung Wai Fong
- R295 – Chow Lai Shan
- Ms Chow Lai Shan - Representer and Further Representers' Representative
- F1169 – 梁志強
- F1179 – Ho Tat Yin
- F1522 – 陳桂屏
- F1641 – Leung Kwong Ming
- F1727 – 林鴻傑
- F1736 – 魏財就
- F1741 – 曾維珠
- F1743 – 周儉成
- F1750 – Cheng Ka Wa
- F1826 – 馮家耀
- Mr Leung Kwong Ming - Further Representer and Further Representers' Representative
- Ms Chong Wai Fan - Further Representers' Representative

6. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He said that the representatives of PlanD would first brief Members on the background, and the further representers/ representers/ commenters or their representatives would be invited to make oral submissions. He said that to ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each further representer/ representer/ commenters or their representatives would be allotted 10 minutes for their oral submission. The further representers/ representers/ commenters had been informed about the arrangement before the meeting. There was a timer device to alert the further representers/ representers/ commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire and when the allotted

time limit was up. After the oral submission, there would be a Question and Answer (Q&A) session in which Members could direct their questions to government representatives or further representers/ representers/ commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the meeting on the day would be adjourned. After hearing all the oral submissions from the further representers/ representers/ commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the further representations in closed meeting, and inform the further representers/ representers/ commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

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

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, repeated the presentations which were made in the morning session of the meeting on 25.10.2016 as recorded in paragraph 11 of the minutes of 25.10.2016.

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

F694 – Lau Fung Lin

R199 / C130 – Sze Po Kan

R238 / C192 – Sze Po Ying, Siena

R486 / C191– 劉鳳蓮

R662 – 施國榮

C238 – 關明輝

10. With the aid of some plans and news articles shown in the computer, Mr Sze Po Kan made the following main points:

- (a) he requested to have a verbatim record of his oral submission;
- (b) proposed Amendment Item A to rezone the northern portion of the “Residential (Group A)4” (“R(A)4”) zone to “Open Space” (“O”) zone (the further representation site) on the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27

was welcome. However, the remaining “R(A)4” zone for the proposed PRH development should also be rezoned to “O” so as to maintain its original function of being a buffer zone for Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate arising from the construction of CT9;

- (c) the traffic impact assessment (TIA) for the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road was conducted based on incomplete/unrealistic information. It underestimated the traffic impact and the conclusion of the report was unacceptable. He had the following queries on the TIA report:
- (i) the traffic condition in case of accidents had not been taken into account. Given Tsing Yi south bridge was the only exit for residents in Tsing Yi South to the urban area, any traffic accident would result in serious blockage and paralyse the traffic in the area;
 - (ii) the assumption that the overall population in the area would reduce from 66,450 in 2016 to 62,750 in 2026 as shown in table 4.5 of the TIA report at Appendix VI of TPB Paper No. 10085 (Enclosure I of the Paper) was unrealistic;
 - (iii) two committed/planned residential developments in the vicinity had not been taken into account, including a home ownership scheme (HOS) of Ching Chun Court and a proposed private residential development at Sai Shan Road to the west of Mayfair Gardens, which would accommodate a total population of about 2,800;
 - (iv) the estimated traffic generation of some 1,000 passenger trips for public transport services at the AM peak hours by the proposed PRH development with an additional population of about 14,000 was unreasonably low;
- (d) he was a resident of Rambler Crest. Currently, the residents of Rambler Crest needed to wait for five to six green mini-buses (with average

frequency of a 5-minute interval) for boarding at AM peak hours. Besides, as the bus stop near Rambler Crest was the last stop before entering Tsing Yi south bridge, the residents often had to wait for three to five buses before they could squeeze onto the bus. Given there were a number of housing estates along the bus route, they usually needed to walk to the bus stops towards the front of the route for better chance of boarding. He doubted if it was technically feasible to resolve the problem merely by increasing the frequency of bus services as the increase in number of buses would also occupy the road and further aggravate the traffic congestion problem;

- (e) as the traffic condition in the area was unsatisfactory at the moment, he did not agree with the conclusion of the TIA that the traffic condition would be acceptable after the population in-take at the original representation site as well as the committed/planned residential developments in the vicinity;
- (f) in response to a Member's question raised in the previous hearing session on whether cycling was feasible for transit to nearby railway stations, he had conducted two cycling test runs from Rambler Crest to Tsing Yi and Kwai Fong railway stations. On his way to Kwai Fong station, he needed to pass through Tsing Yi south bridge which was unsafe for cyclists due to busy traffic with an average speed of 70km/hour whereas the footpath of the bridge was very narrow with many obstacles. It took him 44 minutes to go halfway of Kwai Fong station, which was longer than travelling by car which would only take 10 minutes to reach Kwai Fong station. The test run demonstrated that those "technically feasible" measures might not be practicable; and
- (g) converting the junction of Tsing Yi Road and Sai Shan Road to a signalised junction could not improve the traffic condition which was adversely affected by the vehicles entering/leaving the nearby petrol filling station (PFS) and the long vehicles parking near the cul-de-sac of Tsing Yi Road.

F776 – 曾碧峰

F809 – Ma Man Fei

F1160 – Chau Siu Fai

R171 – Owners' Committee of Rambler Crest

R379 – Tsoi Leung Fai

C291 – Wong Hei Long

C292 – Chien Pui Shan Eva

C293 – Tang Chui Woon

C297 – Tung Kit Ching

C299 – 張岩

C300 – Wong Pan

C306 – Ho Oi Lam

C309 – Leung Chu Sang

C313 – Au Yeung Siu Leung

11. With the aid of some photographs and plans shown in the visualiser, Mr Au Yeung Siu Leung made the following main points:

- (a) he requested to have a verbatim record of his oral submission;
- (b) proposed Amendment Item A to rezone the northern portion of the “R(A)4” zone to “O” zone on the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27 was welcome. However, the remaining “R(A)4” zone for the proposed PRH development should also be rezoned to “O” so as to maintain its original function of being a buffer zone for Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate arising from the construction of CT9. Residential development within the buffer zone should be avoided;
- (c) the shortage of housing supply in particular in the New Territories was mainly due to the immigrants from the Mainland, including those under the one-way permit scheme, children born in Mainland but attending local schools in Hong Kong, as well as Mainland students participating in Hong Kong’s undergraduate and postgraduate curriculums with subsidies from the Government. The Government should have a

better population control;

- (d) he used to live in a building without proper sewage facilities in Wan Chai when he was young, and had to endure air pollution and noise nuisances. He foresaw that the future residents of the proposed PRH would face more severe problems, including pollution from CT9 and sewage treatment plant, noise nuisances and air pollution from major roads, potential hazards from PFS, as well as traffic, air ventilation and glare problems as the PRH would be built on an area used to be a buffer zone for CT9;
- (e) many of the future PRH residents would be elderly. Besides, a number of social welfare facilities for the elderly and persons with severe physical disabilities were proposed at the PRH site. While the elderly and disabled persons might rely on wheelchairs, there were insufficient public transport facilities to cater for their needs. Currently, he encountered great difficulties in taking his mother, who was a wheelchair user, to hospital by bus;
- (f) referring to some photographs, he said that the tourist buses for the hotels in Rambler Crest usually parked near the cul-de-sac of Tsing Hung Road, thus affecting the local traffic;
- (g) as Rambler Crest was subject to severe traffic noise from Tsing Sha Highway, noise mitigation measures such as acoustic windows were required. He doubted if the adverse noise impact on the proposed PRH development could be mitigated by the proposed setback of building blocks, and if such design would affect the air ventilation of Rambler Crest;
- (h) as the commercial centre with 4,000m² gross floor area in the proposed PRH development would not be sufficient to cater for the needs of the future residents, the retail facilities in Rambler Crest would be subject to the additional demand and the local residents might be adversely

affected; and

- (i) the proposed PRH development was opposed by the Kwai Tsing District Council.

12. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Patrick Chu Ka Leung made the following main points:

- (a) he requested to have a verbatim record of his oral submission;
- (b) proposed Amendment Item A to rezone the northern portion of the “R(A)4” zone to “O” zone on the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27 was welcome. However, the remaining “R(A)4” zone for the proposed PRH development should also be rezoned to “O” so as to maintain its original function of being a buffer zone for Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate arising from the construction of CT9. Residential development within the buffer zone should be avoided;

Buffer zone for CT9

- (c) the original representation site and its surrounding areas fell within a planned buffer zone for CT9 under the environmental impact assessment (EIA) of the South-East Tsing Yi Port Development Planning & Engineering Feasibility Study for CT9 (the CT9 Study) in 1991. According to Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), no sensitive receivers such as residential development should be located within a buffer zone. The environmental issues related to the construction of CT9 had been explained to the Legislative Council (LegCo) by the then Secretary for Planning, Environment and Lands with a view to addressing the grave local concerns. As the EIA had been endorsed by the Government and no amendments had been made to the report since then, it should have legal status. If the EIA was not superseded by another assessment and the Government did not follow the recommendations of the report, it could be considered as maladministration;

- (d) in the previous hearing session, DPO/TWK had said that area to the south of Tsing Hung Road, which was originally planned for container related uses, was leased under short-term tenancies for parking of container vehicles. Given there was no industrial use in the area, the need for the original representation site acting as a buffer was no longer required. He doubted if DPO/TWK understood the original planning intention of the buffer zone as recommended by the EIA for CT9, and questioned if the buffer zone was originally designated to screen off the environmental nuisances from CT9, or the adjacent industrial uses. Besides, a number of government documents stating that the original representation site formed part of the buffer zone could be found in the public domain. If there was any change to the status of the buffer zone, the relevant EIA should be updated in accordance with proper procedures. He queried if DPO/TWK had misled the Board as his current argument was different from what was said in the previous hearing in April 2016;

- (e) if the Board ignored the facts and opposing views from the local residents and accepted PlanD's rezoning proposal due to the need to meet the housing supply target, the remaining "R(A)4" zone should be rezoned to "Residential (Group E)" such that the project proponent would need to submit development proposal for the Board's approval. Through the planning application mechanism, the Board could scrutinize the development proposal to make sure that the possible traffic and environmental problems associated with the proposed development could be properly addressed. Although the TIA had demonstrated that no insurmountable problem would be caused by the proposed development, it did not mean there was no problem at all;

History of Rambler Crest

- (f) in response to a Member's request raised on 25.10.2016 for the development history of Rambler Crest in particular on its buffering function for CT9, he provided a historical account of the development of

Rambler Crest as follows:

- (i) the status of Rambler Crest was ambiguous. Although it was akin to a commercial development, residential use was allowed therein. However, it could not be considered as a residential development as it was developed as commercial use within “Commercial” (“C”) zone;

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

- (ii) making reference to a letter from PlanD shown on the visualiser, he said that the planning history of Rambler Crest could be found in two documents, including the planning application for hotel and service apartment uses approved on 5.11.1999, and an amendment to the scheme approved on 3.3.2000;
- (iii) in 1998, Hutchinson Whampoa Properties Limited (Hutchinson) purchased the land for the development of Rambler Crest. A planning application for the development of hotel and service apartment at the site was approved with conditions by the Board in 1999 and an amendment to the approved scheme was approved in 2000. The planning intention for the Rambler Crest site to act as a buffer between Mayfair Gardens/Cheung Ching Estate and CT9 could be found in the relevant Town Planning Board (TPB) papers. The land premium for Rambler Crest development was only about HK\$0.3 billion, which was much lower than a normal residential development;
- (iv) Rambler Crest had been packaged by the developer as a residential development for sale in 2003. By quoting a news article on 30.6.2003, he drew Members’ attention to the following facts:

- a TPB Member, Professor Patrick Lau Sau Shing, was astonished at the sale of Rambler Crest as the original planning intention for the site was only for short residential stay given its close proximity to CT9;
 - according to PlanD, the planning application was approved mainly on the ground that the future occupiers would generally be transients who might tolerate a higher noise level on a temporary basis;
 - as there was a lack of regulations/restrictions for the selling of service apartment, the residents were misled by the developer who had packaged Rambler Crest as a residential development for sale;
 - to address the differences between service apartments and residential flats, the developer claimed that the units could be partitioned flexibly and each unit was equipped with a split-type air conditioner in addition to a central fresh air intake system;
 - as the site was zoned "C" on the OZP with the planning intention to act as a buffer between the existing sensitive receivers and CT9, the residents would be subject to severe adverse impacts;
- (g) Rambler Crest was completed in 2004. Since then, the residents had been adversely affected by the poor air quality, noise and glare impacts from CT9. As the residents could not get access to all of the information, they could only rely on the Government to act as a gate keeper and believed that the flats approved for sale could be used for residential purposes. He doubted if the rights of the residents had been duly protected by the Government in the incident;

- (h) they had sought help from 11 government bureaux/departments but none of them could offer any help, in particular, on the status of Rambler Crest. The Lands Department (LandsD) considered that the site was for commercial use but had not explained why long-term residential use was allowed. The Environmental Protection Department, considering that Rambler Crest as a commercial development, stated that only the indoor noise level would be measured according to the prevailing practice. PlanD's reply only mentioned that Rambler Crest was a service apartment without any explanation on why long-term residential use was allowed. The Rating and Valuation Department pointed out that the rates for Rambler Crest were charged based on the estimated annual rental value of a residential property;
- (i) referring to an email reply from LandsD shown in the visualiser, he criticised that the residents' concerns had not been addressed properly by the relevant bureaux/departments. Each bureau/department was trying to pass the buck;
- (j) a number of documents had revealed that service apartments were prohibited from sale to individuals before 1997. He questioned why the policy was changed between 1998 and 1999 where Hutchinson was allowed to sell the flats at Rambler Crest, and asked which government departments should be held accountable for the matter;
- (k) the adverse impacts currently suffered by the residents of Rambler Crest had clearly demonstrated the importance of the buffer zone and explained why the buffer zone was not suitable for residential development. He did not agree with DPO/TWK's view that the buffer zone was no longer required due to no industrial use in the nearby areas; and
- (l) he added that when the oil depot was moved elsewhere, the original representation site was not rezoned to residential use, which proved that it was not suitable for residential development. He urged the Board to

respect the original planning intention for the original representation site and the surrounding areas as a buffer for CT9.

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

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

F1099 – 李春生

F1111 – Leung Cheuk Wah

F1113 – Chung Wai Fong

R295 – Chow Lai Shan

13. With the aid of plans, photos, video clip and extract of government documents shown in the PowerPoint and visualiser, Ms Chow Lai Shan made the following main points:

- (a) she requested to have a verbatim record of her oral submission;
- (b) proposed Amendment Item A to rezone the northern portion of the “R(A)4” zone to “O” zone on the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27 was welcome. However, the remaining “R(A)4” zone for the proposed PRH development should also be rezoned to “O” so as to maintain its original function of being a buffer zone for Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate arising from the construction of CT9. Residential development within the buffer zone should be avoided;
- (c) to facilitate the construction of CT9, the previous oil depot site (including the original representation site) was recommended to act as screens between the existing sensitive receivers and CT9. It was stated in the minutes of a LegCo meeting held on 20.11.1999 that the land where the oil terminals were sited would be developed with industrial buildings of varying heights so as to provide a buffer between the two residential estates and the container terminals and their traffic;

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (d) the buffer area, which was originally zoned “Industrial” on the Tsing Yi OZP, was then rezoned to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Container Related Uses” (“OU(CRU)”), “C” (i.e. Rambler Crest) and “O” zones. Although DPO/TWK said that there was no insurmountable problems for the construction of three residential blocks at the remaining “R(A)4” zone, his statement was based on unreliable technical assessments. For example, the TIA findings that only some 1,000 passenger trips for public transport services at the AM peak hours would be generated by the proposed PRH development with a population of more than 10,000 was unrealistic. The Board should consider the rezoning proposal based on facts rather than the figures provided in the technical assessments;

- (e) quoting relevant paragraphs (extracts from sessions 10.3, 10.4, 10.5.6, 10.7.3) in the CT9 Study report, she said that the government document had clearly pointed out that a buffer zone between the sensitive receivers (including Cheung Ching Estate, Mayfair Gardens and Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Tsing Yi) (Tsing Yi IVE)) and CT9 was required. While medium-rise industrial buildings were proposed as environmental shield, sites immediately in front of the sensitive receivers should be low-rise and environmentally acceptable in order to satisfy the requirement of HKPSG for a 100m buffer zone. Besides, the provision of open space and recreational facilities would serve not only residents of Tsing Yi South, but also the workers in the nearby areas and students in the adjacent technical college. Given the planning intention for the buffer zone and open space, she said that environmentally sensitive uses should not be provided in the buffer zone and doubted the basis for PlanD to rezone the open space for other use;

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

- (f) referring to a news video clip showing the future residents of the proposed PRH development might be subject to adverse impacts and quoting DPO/TWK’s answer to a Member’s question in a previous hearing

(paragraph 42 of minutes of 1110th meeting of the Board held on 21.4.2016), she said that the “O” zone, which acted as the screens between the existing sensitive receivers and CT9, was not suitable for environmentally sensitive use. If the Board insisted on approving the rezoning proposal, it would be contrary to the original planning intention and the future residents of the PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone would become screens to CT9;

- (g) quoting paragraph 6.8.2 of Chapter 12 of HKPSG, she said that port back-up and open storage uses should not be located adjacent to sensitive receivers such as residential dwellings, and the use of buffering on both large and small sites should be encouraged;
- (h) the government documents had clearly pointed out that a buffer, which included the original representation site and the nearby areas, was required for CT9, and open space should be provided to meet the needs of the local community. PlanD, in putting forward the proposal to rezone the original “O” zone for other uses, should provide evidence to demonstrate that the above-mentioned documents were no longer valid or had been superseded by other documents;
- (i) although Tsing Yi Road was a dual two-lane carriageway, only one lane in each direction could be used due to frequent maintenance and public works. As the road closure for such works usually lasted for a long time, she doubted if the existing roads could cater for the additional traffic demand generated by the proposed PRH development;
- (j) in answering a Member’s question on 25.10.2016, DPO/TWK had said that container vehicles using Tsing Yi south bridge would not affect the local traffic. However, referring to a photo taken on 27.10.2016 showing an overturned container truck at the roundabout near Ching Hong Road, she pointed out that there were actually many container vehicles, heavy vehicles and tourist buses using local roads in Tsing Yi South, thus endangering the safety of other road users;

- (k) referring to a video clip showing the operation glare of CT9 at night, she pointed out that the residents in the nearby areas were currently suffering from adverse glare and noise impacts from CT9. She doubted if the mitigation measures for the proposed PRH development could address the problems and urged the Board to consider if the existing infrastructural and supporting facilities in the area could cater for the new residential development before making a decision on the rezoning proposal for PRH development.

F1169 – 梁志強

F1179 – Ho Tat Yin

F1522 – 陳桂屏

F1641 – Leung Kwong Ming

F1727 – 林鴻傑

F1736 – 魏財就

F1741 – 曾維珠

F1743 – 周儉成

F1750 – Cheng Ka Wa

F1826 – 馮家耀

14. With the aid of some video clips, Mr Leung Kwong Ming, who was a resident and member of Owners' Committee of Mayfair Gardens, made the following main points:

- (a) he requested to have a verbatim record of his oral submission;
- (b) proposed Amendment Item A to rezone the northern portion of the "R(A)4" zone to "O" zone on the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27 was welcome. However, the remaining "R(A)4" zone for the proposed PRH development should also be rezoned to "O" so as to maintain its original function of being a buffer zone for Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate arising from the construction of CT9. Residential development within the buffer zone should be avoided;

- (c) he was a full-time driver responsible for delivering liquefied petroleum gas for oil company. He would like to make oral representation on the traffic impact of the rezoning proposal from the viewpoint of a driver;
- (d) despite a number of attendees had raised concerns that the proposed PRH development would aggravate the existing traffic problem in Tsing Yi South, DPO/TWK still stated that most of the container vehicles would not pass through local roads and the traffic condition in the area was acceptable, and that it was technically feasible to accommodate an additional population of about 10,000 from the proposed PRH development. In view of the above, some video clips were played to let Members have a better understanding on the actual traffic condition in the area;

Existing traffic condition

- (e) a video clip, which was recorded at 8:09 a.m. on 27.10.2016, was played to show the traffic condition near the bus stop at Ching Tao House of Cheung Ching Estate. As the concerned bus stop was the last bus stop before entering Tsing Yi south bridge, many residents from Mayfair Gardens, Cheung Ching Estate and Rambler Crest chose to take bus at that stop. That section of Tsing Yi Road was particularly busy and it was observed that three container trucks, two tourist buses, one container tractor and one concrete mixer had passed through the bus stop within the two-minute record time;
- (f) a video clip, which was recorded at 8:10 a.m. on 28.10.2016, was played to show the traffic condition along the route from Ching Hong Road to the bus stop at Ching Tao House. Six container trucks, one container trailer, one container tractor and a number of tourist buses were observed within the five-minute record time;

- (g) a video clip, which was a high-angle shot from Cheung Ching Estate recorded at 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. on 28.10.2016, was played to show the traffic condition at a roundabout near Rambler Crest. The traffic condition in the morning peak hour was very busy and most of the vehicles were using the same route (i.e. via Ching Hong Road, Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Yi Interchange) to Kowloon. Apart from buses, there were many heavy vehicles and tourist buses passing through the roundabout;

- (h) a video clip, which was recorded at the same place from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. on 31.10.2016, was played to show the traffic condition at the roundabout near Rambler Crest on another day. It demonstrated that the daily traffic condition at the roundabout was similar. Due to the poor traffic condition, the local residents needed to spend a long time for their daily commuting trips at peak hours;

- (i) the existing population in Tsing Yi South was about 20,000. With the anticipated additional 3,800 people from the two committed/planned housing developments (i.e. Ching Chun Court HOS and a proposed private housing development at Sai Shan Road), it would increase the burden on public transport facilities in the area. He did not understand why it was stated in the Paper (referring to the Covering Note on Technical Assessments of the Proposed PRH Development at Tsing Hung Road at Enclosure VIII) that as the scale of the current proposed PRH development in the remaining “R(A)4” zone was reduced, the traffic generated/attracted and public transport demand would then be reduced proportionally, and that the traffic impact on the concerned road junctions in the vicinity of the site would be further reduced, and the traffic impact induced by the proposed PRH development was acceptable from traffic engineering point of view. He queried if the above conclusion derived from the consultancy study had adequately reflected the actual situations. The video clips recorded by the local residents had already demonstrated that the traffic condition in the area was unsatisfactory. Given road capacity was the major constraint, an increase in the bus services, such as

adding new bus routes or bus stops, could not resolve the problem but would only aggravate the traffic congestion problem at peak hours;

- (j) he queried DPO/TWK's claim that container vehicles going to CT9 would mainly use Tsing Yi south bridge without passing through local roads. Making reference to Plan FH-3 of the Paper, he said that the container vehicles going to Kowloon East/West from CT9 usually passed through Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Yi Interchange before entering Tsing Yi south bridge. The traffic condition in the area had worsened in recent years due to the Government's promotion of logistics industry in Tsing Yi;
- (k) a video clip, which was recorded at noon on 31.10.2016, was played to show the traffic condition near the roundabout in front of the PFS. A number of heavy vehicles heading for different destinations passing through the roundabout were observed. He said it demonstrated that the vehicles usually chose the shortest or most convenient path rather than the route planned by the Government;
- (l) three video clips, which were recorded from 7:19 p.m. to 7:24 p.m. on 27.10.2016, 7:24 p.m. to 7:29 p.m. on 27.10.2016, and 11:38 p.m. on 28.10.2016 respectively, were played to show the traffic condition near the access road to Rambler Crest, Mei King Playground and the roundabout in front of the PFS. He pointed out that contrary to DPO/TWK's claim that most of the heavy vehicles would not make use of local roads in Tsing Yi South, heavy vehicles could be observed and the traffic near the roundabout was still busy at night;

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

- (m) a video clip, which was recorded while walking towards the cul-de-sac of Tsing Yi Road at noon on 31.10.2016, was played to show the roadside parking of heavy vehicles near the cul-de-sac of Tsing Yi Road. He said that given there were insufficient parking spaces for large and long vehicles in the area, the section of Tsing Yi Road near the

cul-de-sac had become an open parking area for such vehicles. The drivers usually parked their vehicles temporarily at that section of Tsing Yi Road for convenience;

Effectiveness of traffic improvement measures

- (n) referring to the traffic enhancement measures in relation to the proposed PRH development (Attachment C of Appendix II of TPB Paper No. 10085 at Enclosure I of the Paper), he doubted if the proposed on-street lay-by for bus and GMB stops would be adequate and suspected that the queuing of buses and mini-buses would tail back along Tsing Yi Road which would affect traffic flow and road safety. He questioned if the measure to restrict the right turn movement at the junction of Tsing Yi Road and Sai Shan Road was effective as the movement of vehicles might not follow the planning intention of the Government. With regard to the proposed connection of Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Sha Highway, he commented that vehicles entering Tsing Sha Highway could only move northwards and the traffic would be diverted to the common route, which already had a high traffic flow, to Kowloon (i.e. via the roundabout near CT9, Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Yi Interchange). Besides, the routes chosen by the driver of container trucks to/from CT9 would depend on the origin/destination of the trip; and

Reprovisioning of vehicle examination centres at Tsing Yi

- (o) according to a paper for LegCo Panel on Development (3185GK - Re-provisioning of Transport Department's Vehicle Examination Centres at Tsing Yi) on 23.6.2015, three existing vehicle examination centres (VEC) in Kowloon Bay and To Kwa Wan would be relocated to Tsing Yi. Given the estimated trips (125 vehicles per hour) to the new VEC would spread over the four connecting bridges (i.e. Stonecutters Bridge, Tsing Yi Bridge, Tsing Tsuen Bridge and Ting Kau Bridge) and the normal opening hours of the centre was 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, more vehicles would be attracted to Tsing Yi from different directions at

peak hours, thus aggravating the existing traffic congestion problem.

15. As the presentations of the further representers, representers, commenters and their representatives were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

16. Given the planning intention of the original representation site and the provision of open space could be found in difference sources, including the CT9 Study and the information provided by PlanD, a Member asked (i) if the open space provision in Tsing Yi South was adequate and (ii) if the open space at the original representation site was previously planned for the workforce and students in the nearby areas. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, making reference to a plan showing the local open space (LO) in Tsing Yi South in the PowerPoint, said that there were a number of existing LOs in the vicinity of the remaining "R(A)4" zone, such as Tsing Hung Road Playground, Mei King Playground and Ching Hong Road Playground, which amounted to about 3.21 ha. As the total population in Tsing Yi South would be increased from 23,000 to around 33,000, about 3.32ha of LO would be required according to HKPSG's requirement of 1m² per person. Given the planned LO was about 6ha (including the proposed LO in Ching Chun Court HOS and the remaining "R(A)4" zone), there would be a surplus of more than 2 ha of LO in Tsing Yi South. The Member further queried why CT9 Study had stated that the LO was inadequate to serve the needs. Mr. Lawrence Y.C. Chau responded that the open space provision recommended by the CT9 Study in 1991 had adopted the higher end of HKPSG's requirement of 0.5 m² to 1m² per worker taken into account the deficit of recreational facilities along the south coast. The planned provision would serve not only workers within the study area but also those working in the proposed industrial premises along the southern coast of Tsing Yi (around 35,000 workers). Besides, the recreational facilities planned in the original representation site would serve not only the workers in the adjacent industrial areas but also the students in the adjacent technical college.

17. A Member said that the video clips played by the attendees demonstrated that the original road network designed to separate container vehicles and local traffic might not work as a number of container and heavy vehicles could be found using the local roads. The Member asked if there was any measure to restrict heavy vehicles from using local roads. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that he did not have the relevant information at hand but the representative of Transport Department could provide the requested information in later

hearing sessions. Referring to a plan showing the major road network in the PowerPoint, Mr Chau further said that container vehicles could go to Tsing Yi south bridge directly through an underground passageway from CT9 without making use of the Tsing Yi Interchange. Besides, most of the heavy vehicles would make use of trunk roads such as Nam Wan Tunnel rather than local road network.

18. The same Member asked Mr Leung Kwong Ming (F1641) if the local residents had any suggestion for the improvement of local traffic condition. Mr Leung said that the local traffic condition could hardly be improved due to the existence of CT9. In order to save time and money, the drivers would choose the shortest and most convenient route for their destinations rather than the planned trunk roads.

19. In response to a Member's question on the location of the proposed VEC, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau pointed out its location at Tsing Yi West on a plan in the PowerPoint.

20. Noting an attendee's statement that according to HKPSG, port back-up and open storage uses should not be located adjacent to sensitive receivers, a Member asked if the proposed use for the "OU(CRU)" site to the immediate south of the remaining "R(A)4" zone was for port back-up use and if that complied with the requirement of HKPSG. Referring to a plan and Table 1.3 of Chapter 9 of HKPSG in the PowerPoint, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the remaining "R(A)4" zone and the "OU(CRU)" zone was separated by a road and there was no recommended buffer distance between the "OU(CRU)" zone and sensitive uses under HKPSG. The "OU(CRU)" site was proposed for multi-storey car park which was subject to further study, including environmental assessment to ascertain if its noise impact on the surrounding areas was acceptable.

21. As there were no more questions from Members, the meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.