

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 10.11.2016.
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

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr K.F. Tang

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

**Agenda Item 1 (Continued)**

[Open Meeting]

3. 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)**

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

**Government Representatives**

*Planning Department (PlanD)*

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

Ms Fannie F.L. Hung - Senior Town Planner/Kwai Tsing

*Housing Department (HD)*

Ms Emily W.M. Ip - Planning Officer

Mr Stephen K.M. Leung - Chief Architect

Ms May S.S. Yeung - Architect

Mr Chow Kwok Sang - Civil Engineer

*Transport Department (TD)*

Mr Patrick K.H. Ho - Senior Engineer/Kwai Tsing

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

F835 – Wong Chun Hung, Albert

Mr Wong Chun Hung, Albert - Further Representer

F1912 - 趙慧琴

F1913 - 趙公博

R346 / C345 - Ma Yuk Chu, Judy

R471 - 阮國萍

R472 - 何慧中

R487 - 歐陽慧雯

R488 - Lee Wai Man

R497 - Leung Lai Kit

R502 - Chow Hui Ching

R510 - Cheng Chun Wah

R523 - Lai Chuk Mui

Ms Ma Yuk Chu, Judy - Representer and Commenter, and  
Further Representers' and Representatives'  
representative

Mr Lam Kai Hung - Further Representers' and Representatives'  
representative

F2161 - 李素貞

F2455 - Choi Chi Wah, Dave

R147 - Chee Wing Suet, Zoe

R149 - Lee Lai Sang

R154 - Lee Lin Ching

R157 - 何智賢

R168 - Ng Tan Fung, Tanny

R176 - 應義鎧

R177 - 聶雪梅

C159 - Wong Miu Kam

C160 - Tai Tat Ming

Mr Choi Chi Wah, Dave - Further Representer, and Further  
Representer's, Representers' and  
Commenters' representative

R580 - 馬玉英

C41 - Chu Hing Mui

Mr Wong Po Leung, Kaiser - Representer's and Commenter's  
representative

R764 - Cheung Hau Ka

C33 - Wan Wan Kam

C39 - 何穎妍

Mr Tang Wai Man - Representer's and Commenters'  
representative

R882 - 鄭劍亮

Ms Tam Yuk Ling - Representer's representative

C42 - 黃志揚

C49 - 陶以諾

Mr Sin Ho Fai - Commenters' representative

C51 - Chan Pui Wai

Mr Wong King Kwong - Commenter's representative

C52 - Chu Wing Tong

Ms Fung Wing Mei, Eugenia - Commenter's representative

C65 - Ngai Ying Chuen

C116 - 李秀琼

C131 - Sze Kwok Wing, Wingo

Mr Poon Chi Shing

- Commenters' representative

5. 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/commenter 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.

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

7. 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.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join this session of the meeting during DPO/TWK's presentation.]

8. The Chairman invited the further representers, representers/commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their further representations, representations/comments.

9. The representative of C42 and C49 requested to make his oral submission first as he had to leave early. As no objection to the proposed arrangement was raised by other attendees, Members agreed to accede to his request.

C42 - 黃志揚

C49 - 陶以諾

10. Mr Sin Ho Fai made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Vice-chairman of the New Territories West Branch of Civic Party and was representing Dr Hon Kwok Kai Ki as well as the residents of Tsing Yi;
- (b) the proposed Amendment Item A to rezone the northern portion of the “Residential (Group A)4” (“R(A)4”) zone to “Open Space” (“O”) zone on the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY/27 was welcomed. However, there were concerns over the suitability of the remaining “R(A)4” zone for the public rental housing (PRH) development in the light of the potential noise, air and light pollutions;
- (c) as raised by many residents of Rambler Crest and Mayfair Gardens, in the South-East Tsing Yi Port Development Planning & Engineering Feasibility Study for CT9 (the CT9 Study), the original representation site had been planned for a buffer area between CT9 and the existing residential developments to alleviate the noise and air impacts of the container terminal. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), only non-sensitive uses and structures could be built in buffer zone and residential development should be avoided;
- (d) in western countries, there was a concept of ‘Right to Housing’ advocated that every person should have the right to an adequate living standard, including sufficient provision of open space and a pollution free environment. Thus, in identifying suitable land for PRH

development, the adequacy of living of the future occupants should also be considered;

- (e) as the original representation site was a buffer area, its suitability for PRH development was doubtful because there would be no other buffer area separating the PRH and the container terminal. Thus, the PRH residents would be exposed to glare impact of the container terminal operation. According to medical reports, exposure to excessive light during night-time could affect the secretion of Melatonin (黑激素) which would upset sleep quality and trigger breast cancer disease;
- (f) Tsing Yi South had long been subject to noise disturbance from the operation of container terminal, container vehicles as well as container ships which had affected the living of residents especially during night-time. According to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report for the proposed PRH, about 10% of the units would be subject to a maximum noise level of 73dB(A) which exceeded the 70dB(A) noise standard. While PlanD claimed that the noise problem would not be insurmountable with the provision of noise mitigation measures, the effectiveness of such mitigation measures as acoustic windows were doubtful. Medical reports revealed that noise pollution would affect the health and growth of children as they required steady and sufficient sleep. In assessing the proposed PRH development, the intangible social costs such as health issues should be taken into account;
- (g) based on statistics compiled by Clean Air Network, from 1996 to 2015, the average level of sulphur dioxide in Kwai Tsing District was at 23.7 micrograms/cubic metre, which was amongst the highest in Hong Kong and was significantly higher than the average of the Territory at 15.9 micrograms/cubic metre. The emissions of sulphur dioxide were usually from container ships and container vehicles, and long-term exposure to sulphur dioxide could cause irritation to eyes and nose and lead to respiratory diseases;

- (h) prevailing winds in Kwai Tsing District were southerly and south-easterly. The original representation site was serving as a buffer to facilitate the dispersion of air pollutants. Upon development of the proposed PRH, the dispersion effect would diminish and the future PRH residents would be subject to severe air pollution;

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (i) the health issues caused by noise, air and light pollutions were affecting the residents of Rambler Crest and were also a concern for residents of the proposed PRH development. Such issues would not be eradicated unless the container terminal was relocated. Given that it might not be affordable or appropriate for PRH residents to employ such measures as air-conditioning and air-freshening to mitigate the adverse environmental impacts, the suitability of the remaining “R(A)4” site for PRH development should be reconsidered or the site should be reverted to open space use;
- (j) during the golden week periods, there had been an acute increase in the demand for public transport facilities from occupants of the hotels adjoining Rambler Crest. For green mini-bus (GMB) route No. 88G, it was often fully loaded during peak hours and the waiting time could be as long as 30 minutes. The concerned departments should put forward concrete proposals to resolve the existing traffic problem in the area, or otherwise no further residential development should be planned on the remaining “R(A)4” site; and
- (k) the Board was respectfully requested to consider the views and aspirations of the further representers and the residents of Tsing Yi. Due regard should be paid to their concerns on traffic, environment and community facilities as well as the needs and living quality of the future PRH residents in particular from the health perspective. It was hoped that the existing living quality of the Tsing Yi residents would not be

adversely affected.

F1912 - 趙慧琴

F1913 - 趙公博

R346 / C345 - Ma Yuk Chu, Judy

R471 - 阮國萍

R472 - 何慧中

R487 - 歐陽慧雯

R488 - Lee Wai Man

R497 - Leung Lai Kit

R502 - Chow Hui Ching

R510 - Cheng Chun Wah

R523 - Lai Chuk Mui

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and the visualiser, Ms Ma Yuk Chu, Judy, made the following main points:

- (a) it was her second time attending the meeting and she was representing a group of residents from Mayfair Gardens and Rambler Crest;
- (b) while the rezoning of the further representation site from “R(A)4” to “O” (i.e. Amendment Item A) was supported, it was proposed to revert the zoning of the remaining “R(A)4” site 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;

*Buffer Area for CT9*

- (c) the local residents were dissatisfied with DPO/TWK for misleading the Board that the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” site would itself become a buffer for the container terminal. According to the HKPSG, residential uses within buffer areas should be avoided;

- (d) during the planning of CT9, the southeastern part of Tsing Yi had been re-planned and the measures to alleviate the adverse air, noise and glare impacts of the container terminal on Mayfair Gardens, Cheung Ching Estate and the proposed Technical College (i.e. Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Tsing Yi) (Tsing Yi IVE)) had been examined. The CT9 Study proposed that upon relocation of the oil depot facilities, the use of the original representation site would be for buffering the adjacent residential uses from port development. After assessing three land use options, i.e. industrial park, general industrial and recreation, the CT9 Study recommended that the original representation site would be most suitable to be used for open space, and according to paragraph 10.4 of the Final Report of the CT9 Study (CT9 Report), the proposed uses of the buffer area should be environmentally acceptable with particular regard to the nearby sensitive receivers in Cheung Ching Estate, Mayfair Gardens and the proposed Technical College. In paragraph 10.5.6 of the CT9 Report, it was clearly stated that the original representation site was proposed for an open space with landscaped gardens, tennis courts and basketball courts to serve the Tsing Yi South residents, the Technical College students as well as the workers in the nearby industrial areas with a planned employment of about 35,000;
- (e) in persuading the Legislative Council (LegCo) to accept that the south-eastern part of Tsing Yi was the most suitable location for the proposed CT9, the then Secretary for Planning, Environment and Lands had promised to provide suitable buffer areas for separating the container terminal from residential areas;
- (f) after completion of Rambler Crest and the hotels in 2004, the residents had reflected to a District Council (DC) member that there were insufficient open space and recreational facilities in the locality. At a Kwai Tsing DC meeting held in 2006, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) explained that while the “O” site at Tsing Hung

Road was planned as a park, owing to its large site area of about 4 hectares, the high development cost due to slope issues and funding commitments for other park facilities in the district, there was no programme for implementation of the “O” site. Upon further discussion with the LCSD, it was agreed to build the Tsing Hung Road Playground (with an area of about 2,800m<sup>2</sup>) in part of the “O” site first to serve the needs of Rambler Crest residents, while the original representation site would be for tree planting and developed for a park later subject to sufficient funding;

- (g) it should be pointed out that Mei King Playground was regarded as an existing/committed development in the CT9 Study and did not form part of the proposed buffer area. As such, the buffer area mentioned in the Explanatory Statement (ES) for the “O” zone in Tsing Yi OZPs No. S/TY/6 to S/TY/26 was referring to the original representation site rather than Mei King Playground;
- (h) the land use proposals recommended in the CT9 Study were a result of comprehensive re-planning of Tsing Yi Area 22 upon relocation of the oil depot facilities and construction of the proposed CT9. Despite that the planned “Industrial” sites had later been rezoned to “Commercial” for development of Rambler Crest and hotels, the fact that the original representation site was a buffer area separating Mayfair Gardens, Cheung Ching Estate and Tsing Yi IVE from the container terminal remained unchanged. The buffer area should not be developed for residential use unless CT9 was relocated;

*Potential Risks*

- (i) there had been virtually no new residential developments in Tsing Yi South during the past 30 to 40 years and the population remained at about 23,000 throughout that period. It was because several potentially dangerous and hazardous uses and facilities had been relocated to the south-western part of Tsing Yi which posed risk to the

nearby residents in Tsing Yi South. Due to the limited route of escape from Tsing Yi, further population increase in Tsing Yi South should not be allowed;

*Open Space Provision*

- (j) according to the 2011 Census, the population of Tsing Yi was over 190,000 and most of them were living in public housing developments. While PlanD had said that based on the HKPSG, the existing and planned provision of open space was sufficient to meet the needs of the planned population of about 33,000 people in Tsing Yi South, local open space should also be provided for the enjoyment of workers in the nearby industrial, hotel and commercial developments at a standard of 0.5m<sup>2</sup> per worker in accordance with the HKPSG;
- (k) according to the HKPSG, local open space was intended for passive recreation providing sitting-out areas and children's playgrounds to serve the neighbourhood population. There were only three existing local open spaces in Tsing Yi South, i.e. Tsing Hung Road Playground (with an area of about 2,800m<sup>2</sup>), Mei King Playground (with an area of about 7,800m<sup>2</sup>) and open space within Cheung Ching Estate. However, the open space facilities in Cheung Ching Estate were outdated and could not meet the needs of the population. Moreover, while the further representation site was reverted to "O", it was located mainly on slopes and was fenced off from the local residents. According to paragraph 1.10.1 of Chapter 4 of the HKPSG, the "O" site could not be regarded as countable open space as it was not functional and usable for active recreation (e.g. games courts and pitches) and/or passive recreation (e.g. sitting-out areas, children's playgrounds and landscape planting areas). For such areas intended for planting or as an environmental buffer, they should be zoned "Amenity" and not counted as open space;
- (l) although PlanD had said that there were other open spaces at Ching

Hong Road and Cheung Tat Road for the enjoyment of the Tsing Yi South residents, it should be noted that the Ching Hong Road Playground was not friendly to small kids as it was located at a service reservoir which was remote and at distance of more than 800m from the residents of Rambler Crest. The playground facilities were poorly managed with only a soccer pitch. According to paragraph 1.12.4 of Chapter 4 of the HKPSG, local open space should be located within short walking distance from the residents it intended to serve, preferably within a distance of not more than 400m. As for the Cheung Tat Road Sitting-out Area, it was located within an unpleasant area surrounded by industrial buildings, container vehicle traffic, refuse collection point and food bazaars, and thus not suitable for recreation use;

*Buffer for Container-related Uses*

- (m) according to paragraph 6.8.2 of Chapter 12 of the HKPSG, port back-up and open storage uses should not be located adjacent to sensitive receivers such as residential dwellings. Given that noise, air and glare impacts would be generated from the port back-up uses, the remaining “R(A)4” zone was unsuitable for PRH development as it was located close to the “Other Specified Uses (Container-Related Uses) 1” site to its south. Although there were no fixed standards for provision of buffer area between port back-up and residential uses, there was a genuine need for such a buffer area considering that dangerous goods were often deposited on port back-up and open storage sites. In fact, in 2011, there was a traffic accident in Tsing Yi involving a container vehicle which led to the spilling of chemicals on the road and paralysed the traffic for about 4 hours. There were also reported incidents of fire hazard in several container and open storage yards from 2014 to 2016. It would be inappropriate and irresponsible to expose residents of the proposed PRH development to such potential hazards and risks;

*Noise Impact*

- (n) findings of academic studies indicated that exposure to noise pollution would affect quality of sleep and lead to various kinds of human health issues including dazzling, headache, mental illness, stomachache and even heart deceases, etc. Persistent or sudden noise disturbance at night-time would lead to rouses, hence affecting quality of sleep and resulting in adverse impacts on human health and mental state. According to the study findings, about 10% and 50% of people would be adversely affected by persistent noise levels at 40dB(A) and 70dB(A) respectively, and about 10% and 70% of people would be roused by sudden noise levels at 40dB(A) and 60dB(A) respectively;
- (o) she herself was one of the victims of sudden noise. As the weather turned cooler recently, she left the windows opened before going to sleep on 5.11.2016 but only found herself woken up by frequent aircraft noise at about 4 o'clock in the morning. After two consecutive days with such bad experience, she closed the windows before going to sleep on the third day but her sleep pattern had already been disturbed and she spontaneously woke up at about 4 o'clock in the morning. She then showed a video clip recorded in Rambler Crest at night to demonstrate the aircraft noise;
- (p) HD claimed that by adopting appropriate noise mitigation measures, the 10% PRH units with noise exceedance would become in compliance with the noise standards. However, HD had not provided any concrete data on the mitigation effect of such measures as acoustic windows and acoustic balconies. As acoustic windows and acoustic balconies had already been used for noise mitigation purpose at other public housing estates including Wing Cheong Estate occupied in 2013, HD should have information on the effectiveness of those noise mitigation measures. She then showed several photos showing the design of acoustic windows, architectural fins and acoustic balconies in Wing Cheong Estate;

- (q) the effectiveness of the noise mitigation measures was doubtful. According to the information provided by a Sham Shui Po DC member, even after installing acoustic windows, architectural fins and acoustic balconies, the respective noise levels measured at the balcony and the indoor area of a unit in Wing Cheong Estate still reached 82.6 dB(A) and 72.6dB(A) which did not comply with the stipulated noise standards;
- (r) she showed a video clip recorded in a unit of Wing Cheong Estate to demonstrate the design of acoustic windows, architectural fins and acoustic balconies and said that since the windows for the indoor area were not fully openable, the air ventilation inside the units would be poor. As it might not be affordable for PRH residents to deploy air-conditioning, they would suffer from heat during the hot weather. During the autumn and winter seasons, the poor ventilation inside the units would also lead to humid conditions;
- (s) according to the experience of some Wing Cheong Estate residents, since the windows at the acoustic balconies had only grilles but not fully enclosed with glass windows, their effectiveness for noise mitigation was insignificant. Moreover, during stormy weather, the rainwater could fall readily inside the balconies making the place wet and unsafe for children. At a construction cost of about HK\$50,000 for each acoustic balcony, the cost-effectiveness of installing acoustic balconies for some 300 units at the proposed PRH development was questionable;
- (t) the architectural fins and acoustic windows were also of poor design. During rainy season, rainwater falling on the architectural fins would in turn spill inside the unit, making the place wet. As for the acoustic windows, it was prone to rust and might trap water inside causing hygiene problem. Thus, both architectural fins and acoustic windows would lead to maintenance and management issues of the buildings as well as the surrounding environment;

- (u) HD should have assessed the effectiveness of those noise mitigation measures at Wing Cheong Estate before adopting such measures in the new PRH developments;
- (v) according to the Noise Impact Assessment conducted for the proposed PRH development, the Area Sensitivity Rating of the original representation site was classified as “B” and hence the adopted noise standards for day-time and night-time should be 65dB(A) and 55dB(A) respectively;

*Air Quality Impact*

- (w) the air quality impact of the container-related uses should be assessed in the Environmental Air Quality Assessment of the proposed PRH development. Moreover, detailed and quantitative data rather than qualitative descriptions should be provided in the assessment to justify its findings;

*Traffic Impact and Carparking Provision*

- (x) according to the HKPSG, one carparking space should be provided for 6 to 9 subsidised housing units and one light goods vehicle space should be provided for 200 to 600 units. There should also be provision of a minimum of one loading/unloading bay around each residential block for service vehicles. However, no information on carparking and loading/unloading provision was provided in the papers and documents prepared by government departments. Given the relatively small site area and the development constraints such as noise and light issues pertaining the remaining “R(A)4” site, it was questionable whether the required carparking provision of about 300 spaces could be accommodated in the future PRH development. A detailed layout of the proposed PRH development should be provided for the consideration of the Board;

[Mr Sunny L.K. Ho arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (y) feasibility of the proposed expansion of the Tsing Yi Road/Ching Hong Road roundabout was doubtful given its adjoining space had been significantly limited by the existing petrol filling station, footpaths and mature trees. While one possibility was to convert the existing footpath into an underpass, the construction cost would be high;
- (z) there was an acute demand for public transport services particularly connection with MTR stations from the residents of Rambler Crest, Cheung Ching Estate and Mayfair Gardens. However, there were only five franchised bus routes serving Tsing Yi South and the buses were often fully loaded when arriving at the Tsing Yi Road bus stop. Though the residents had lodged numerous complaints on the matter to the DC members and the relevant departments, the franchised bus and GMB operators often responded that they had no additional resources to further improve their operations;
- (aa) while the hotels adjoining Rambler Crest were providing shuttle bus services for their occupants, the routes did not cover the popular tourist spots and the fares were expensive. Given that GMB services were economical and convenient, the passenger demand from hotel occupants was very high. In fact, apart from the golden week periods, there would be an upsurge in passenger demand from hotel occupants when major trade and convention events were held at AsiaWorld-Expo and such demand would also concentrate in the morning peak. Furthermore, since the hotel occupants often brought along their luggage on board, the GMBs would be very congested and could be overloaded which might increase the risk of traffic accidents;
- (bb) as the hotels had been in operation for over 10 years, the scope of further improving their shuttle bus services would be slim;

*PRH Design*

- (cc) it was a planning mistake to permit residential developments close to the container terminal and Rambler Crest had been cited as an example of ‘walled buildings’ (屏風樓) in the academic books of secondary schools. It was envisaged that the proposed PRH development, if proceeded, would follow the footsteps of Rambler Crest;

*Daily Life Affected*

- (dd) since 2013, a section of Tsing Yi Road had been closed to facilitate the works by the Water Supplies Department. Moreover, there were closure schemes along Tsing Yi Road for works by various utility and telecom companies. As a matter of fact, since she moved into Rambler Crest about 10 years ago, different closure schemes along Tsing Yi Road had been continuing and road closure had in effect become a long-lived and endless event. The same situation also applied to other parts in Tsing Yi. Any further increase in population in Tsing Yi South would trigger further works and road closures, thus affecting the daily life of the local residents;
- (ee) the eating place and supermarket facilities in Rambler Crest were often fully occupied with visitors during and after dinner time. Local residents had to make their way to those facilities much earlier to avoid long queues and overcrowding;

*Conclusion*

- (ff) the original representation site was reserved under the CT9 Study as a buffer area. Its “O” zoning should not be amended for residential development, or otherwise the future PRH residents would suffer from noise, air and light pollution while the daily life of Tsing Yi South

residents would also be adversely affected;

- (gg) the effectiveness of the proposed noise mitigation measures were highly doubtful. Concrete information on the effectiveness of the proposed noise mitigation measures should be provided by HD. Quantitative data should also be given in the EIA report to support the conclusion that there were no insurmountable technical problems for the proposed PRH development in particular on noise issues; and
- (hh) it was respectfully hoped that the Board would seriously monitor the planning work of the Government and consider reverting the zoning of the remaining “R(A)4” site to “O” for retaining the only ‘green lung’ for the Tsing Yi South residents.

C65 – Ngai Ying Chuen

C116 - 李秀琼

C131 - Sze Kwok Wing, Wingo

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

- (a) he was representing the Owners’ Committee of Rambler Crest;
- (b) the local residents were dissatisfied with PlanD, HD and TD as they only aimed at meeting housing target but disregarded professionalism, moved goal-posts, adopted inaccurate data, and misled the public and the Board. They proposed to revert the whole original representation site from “R(A)4” to “O”;
- (c) through the previous presentation and Q&A sessions, the local residents had tendered many arguments, data and personal experiences to the Board for consideration. They also learnt about the concerns of Members and responses from government departments. However, as they could not raise questions during the Q&A session, there were still

outstanding issues for which satisfactory explanations were yet to be given by government departments;

*Buffer Area for CT9*

- (d) according to the CT9 Study, the container terminal would generate noise and air pollutions affecting the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate. Thus, it recommended to designate the area between the container terminal and Mayfair Gardens (including the original representation site and the Rambler Crest site) as a buffer zone for construction of industrial buildings and open space to serve as a noise barrier for the container terminal;
- (e) in a TPB meeting held in April 2016, DPO/TWK confirmed that the original representation site would remain as a buffer area even after construction of the proposed PRH. However, PlanD had recently amended the ES of the Tsing Yi OZP and claimed that the original representation site was no longer a buffer area. PlanD's explanations were contradictory as they had also previously said that the site was a landscaped buffer and not a buffer zone for alleviating noise and air pollution. In the ES of the Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/26, it was clearly stated that the open space in front of Mayfair Gardens including the original representation site was intended for a buffer area separating the container terminal and the residential areas. However, when rezoning the original representation site from "O" to "R(A)4", the reference to buffer area was deleted from the ES of OZP No. S/TY/27. While Rambler Crest had been completed for over ten years, the relevant paragraph in the ES was only amended recently when public housing developments were in high demand. It was suspected that PlanD was hiding some facts and misleading the Board and the general public;
- (f) the original representation site was proposed for a buffer area in the CT9 Study. In paragraphs 3.3.4, 3.5.1 and 10.4 of the CT9 Report, it was clearly stated that the Technical College (i.e. Tsing Yi IVE) and the

residential developments of Cheung Ching Estate and Mayfair Gardens were environmentally sensitive receivers and hence a buffer distance of 100m based on HKPSG should be reserved in front of them to alleviate the environmental impacts arising from CT9. In accordance with the HKPSG, only non-sensitive uses could be developed within buffer areas and residential uses should be avoided;

- (g) according to the paragraph 10.5.6 of the CT9 Report, the proposed open space at the original representation site was intended to provide such facilities as tennis courts and basketball courts to serve the local residents as well as the workers of nearby industrial buildings and the students of the Technical College. Paragraph 10.7.3 of the CT9 Report further stated that the open space would include tree plantings, gardens and seating areas but not residential buildings. Thus, based on the information given in the CT9 Report, the original representation site should only be used as a buffer area and not for residential development unless the CT9 Report findings were overturned by the findings of another study after public consultation or CT9 was ultimately relocated;

*Public Transport Facilities*

- (h) it was doubtful if the existing traffic condition could be improved by the measures recommended in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) Report such as increasing the service frequency and introducing new routes of public transport services;
- (i) the original representation site was located at Tsing Yi Road which was the last stop on Tsing Yi Island for those bus services departing for Kowloon. However, when arriving at the Tsing Yi Road bus stop, the buses were often full and were unable to pick up any more passengers. The Kwai Tsing DC and local residents had repeatedly reported that problem to TD and the franchised bus/mini-bus operators. However, the situation had not been improved as the operators did not have sufficient resources in terms of providing additional vehicles,

manpower and routing to improve their services. At the TPB meeting held on 7.11.2016, the representative of TD also admitted that for any additional services, cost-effectiveness was a major consideration of the franchised bus/mini-bus operators. In fact, since Tsing Yi Road was the last stop before the buses left Tsing Yi, the franchised bus operator might consider that the passenger demand from the nearby area was insufficient to justify the provision of a new bus service specifically serving the area;

- (j) according to the TIA report, traffic surveys by HD's consultant were conducted on 31.3.2015 which was within the Easter school holiday. Thus, the survey figures were grossly under-estimated and misleading, and could not reflect the actual traffic situation. Additional traffic surveys on multiple days over the whole year should be conducted in order to ensure the accuracy of survey findings and minimise doubts from the general public;

#### *Road Traffic*

- (k) government departments' descriptions in respect of the traffic situation of Tsing Yi, including that container vehicles to and from container terminals would mainly pass through the strategic roads such as Nam Wan Tunnel and Ting Kau Bridge, and that without the proposed PRH development, road improvement measures would not be required to improve the existing traffic condition, were inaccurate;
- (l) the local residents had said in many occasions that Tsing Yi Road was already busy. Tsing Yi Road was frequently used by container vehicles and traffic accidents along Tsing Yi Road involving container vehicles were not uncommon. Following the completion of Mapletree Logistics Hub, the container vehicle traffic had further increased and traffic accidents and congestions often occurred in Tsing Yi South including Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Yi south bridge;

- (m) according to the data obtained from the New Territories South Traffic Headquarters, from April 2015 to April 2016, there were a total of 52 traffic accidents in Tsing Yi South involving medium goods vehicles: Tsing Yi Road (24 cases), Tsing Hung Road (1 case), Tsing Yi Hong Wan Road (22 cases), Ching Hong Road (4 cases) and Kwai Tsing Road (1 case). While those figures had not included accidents involving private cars and container trucks, they already demonstrated the traffic problem in the road network around the original representation site. As the section of Tsing Yi Road serving the proposed PRH development was a cul-de-sac, in case of any accident at the entrance of the development, the traffic of the area would be paralysed;

*PRH Design*

- (n) PlanD and HD claimed that by adopting appropriate noise mitigation measures and re-orienting building dispositions, the 10% PRH units with noise exceedance would become in compliance with the noise standards, and the air and glare impacts would be mitigated. However, PlanD and HD had not provided any concrete data on the mitigation effect of such measures as acoustic windows and acoustic balconies. Thus, it would be difficult to prove that full noise compliance could be achieved for the proposed PRH development. If noise exceedance was subsequently detected upon completion of the PRH development, the initial approval process would be criticized for being hasty;
- (o) in reducing the number of PRH blocks from five to four, and then from four to three, the entire planning and findings of the technical assessments for the proposed PRH development, including building disposition, building height, open space facilities, TIA, air ventilation assessment, noise impact assessment and glare impact assessment, should have been varied. Thus, there might be significant disparities between the assessment findings based on the initial and current PRH schemes. In the absence of complete information provided by PlanD

and HD, it would be difficult for the Board to make any objective analysis on the proposed PRH development. PlanD and HD should re-conduct the technical assessments based on the current scheme and resubmit them to the Board for consideration; and

- (p) it was hoped that the Board would carefully study the representations and re-examine the suitability of the remaining “R(A)4” site for PRH development in view of its original planning intention as buffer area, and the inadequacies in terms of traffic, community and environmental protection measures. The proposed residential use for the remaining “R(A)4” site should be rejected and the site should be reverted to open space.

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

R580 - 馬玉英

C41 - Chu Hing Mui

13. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Wong Po Leung, Kaiser, made the following main points:

- (a) it was his third time attending the meeting. During the previous sessions, the residents of Tsing Yi South had made presentations and already adduced a lot of facts and evidence on those problems faced by them in terms of traffic, noise, air, glare as well as the lack of open space and community facilities;
- (b) similar to Rambler Crest, the remaining “R(A)4” site was subject to strong wind and gales during typhoon seasons. However, given the windows of the acoustic balconies proposed for the PRH development had only grilles but not fully enclosed with glass windows, the rain could fall readily inside the balconies making the flats wet. The stability of the architectural fins proposed for the PRH development,

which were to be installed at a tilted angle, was also doubtful;

- (c) given that the capital costs for each acoustic window and acoustic balcony were about HK\$20,000 and \$50,000 respectively, the cost-effectiveness of such noise mitigation measures was in doubt and should be further examined by HD;
- (d) according to the CT9 Study and the relevant Legislative Council (LegCo) documents, the original representations site was indented to serve as a buffer area to alleviate the noise and glare impacts of container terminals on the residential developments including Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate. As proven by the facts and evidence adduced by other attendees during the previous meeting sessions, such intention had remained unchanged over the years. According to the HKPSG, no residential development should be built on buffer areas;
- (e) during the examination of feasibility for CT9, the whole Tsing Yi Island had been re-planned by the Government. As a result, the southern and south-western parts of Tsing Yi were designated for container terminals, port back-up and industrial uses with ample buffer areas provided for the nearby residential developments subsequent to the relocation of the oil depots; while the central, northern and northeastern parts were planned for residential and related uses. Taking Cheung Wan Street as the dividing line, the areas to its east and south-east were mainly occupied by industrial buildings and container related sites; while the areas to its west and northwest were mainly residential developments. The proposed PRH development was against the planning intention of the site and in contradiction with the original planning concept for Tsing Yi;
- (f) according to the minutes and audio records of previous meetings, several versions of explanation had been provided by DPO/TWK regarding the function and location of buffer areas which was

misleading. Had DPO/TWK studied carefully the planning history and background of Tsing Yi, the buffer areas at Tsing Hung Road would not be identified for residential development and there would be no need to hold a meeting to discuss the issue which was a waste of time and resources;

- (g) the HKSAR Government's land-making policy was an analogy of the 'Great Leap Forward' (大躍進) which was one of the most tragic events suffered by the Chinese people from 1958 to 1960. While the 'Great Leap Forward' was initiated by Mao Zedong to rapidly transform the country through rapid industrialisation and collectivisation, the campaign turned out to be a total failure due to the grandiose mentality of leaders, idealistic goals and negligence on realities;
- (h) in particular, the HKSAR Government's public housing policy was closely resembled to the 'nationwide iron and steel production campaign' (全民大煉鋼運動) advocated under the 'Great Leap Forward' which had caused a nationwide famine with an estimated death toll of about 45 million. Since 2014, the Government had devoted extensive manpower and resources to identification of housing land with an aim to meeting the housing target of 480,000 units in the ten years. However, due to poor planning and unrealistic goals, public housing developments had been built sporadically;
- (i) the underlying reasons for the acute demand for public housing should not be ignored. First, the high land prices had led to inflation in prices of private housing which surpassed the affordability of the citizens. Thus many young people had chosen to apply for public housing units. Second, it was estimated that the amount of immigrants from mainland China to Hong Kong had reached about 50,000 and majority of them had applied for public housing. As a result, the demand for public housing was acute and the waiting list for public housing was long.

No matter how hard the Government had worked to identify land for public housing development, the supply was barely sufficient to meet the demand. If the Government were to overcome the housing shortage and to meet the genuine needs of the community, the problems of high land and flat prices and lenient immigration policy should first be resolved;

- (j) in pursuing the unrealistic objective of ‘overtaking the United Kingdom, and catching up with the United States’ (超英趕美) during the ‘nationwide iron and steel production campaign’, the whole Chinese nation had put in huge efforts to produce iron and steel out of improper ingredients including scrap metals, pots, pans, and other metal artefacts, and using inappropriate tools and methods such as backyard steel furnaces and fuel woods taken from doors and furniture. The consequences were a massive production of iron and steel of poor quality and substantial damage to the environment. The mistaken acts were later recognised by a Chinese official who admitted that while those metal products were not usable, they were being left in a dumping ground and subject to high management cost;
- (k) similarly, in identifying land for housing developments, the HKSAR Government was repeating the same mistakes. While government departments had devoted extensive resources to follow the advocates of the Chief Executive to increase housing supply, they had neglected the public opinion, disregarded the planning standards and ignored the adverse traffic, noise and glare impacts of the developments. As a result, the rezoning of unsuitable areas such as “GB” and buffer areas for housing developments had caused public grievances as well as damages to the ecology and environment;
- (l) most of the public and private housing developments produced from those unsuitable areas were of low quality due to the small sizes of sites, high development intensity, small flat size and lack of ancillary

facilities. The increasing emergence of infill developments had resulted in the sacrifice of people's living quality for housing targets and could be regarded as a kind of 'small wisdom, big mistake' (「小智慧大錯誤」);

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

- (m) as those low quality public housing developments were not suitable for living, people would be reluctant to move in or request to change for better housing units, thus leading to high vacancies in public housing which in turn would cause problems of security, health and environmental hygiene. Moreover, such public housing developments would be subject to a massive number of complaints from their residents. There would also be high costs involved in the management of the developments which would be a waste of public money; and
- (n) in conclusion, the Board should take note of history and shelve the proposed PRH development. The remaining "R(A)4" site should be reverted to "O" for provision of large-scale recreational and community facilities to serve the needs of the Tsing Yi South residents.

F2161 - 李素貞

F2455 - Choi Chi Wah, Dave

R147 - Chee Wing Suet, Zoe

R149 - Lee Lai Sang

R154 - Lee Lin Ching

R157 - 何智賢

R168 - Ng Tan Fung, Tanny

R176 - 應義鏗

R177 - 聶雪梅

C159 - Wong Miu Kam

C160 - Tai Tat Ming

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and the visualiser, Mr Choi Chi Wah, Dave, made the following main points:

- (a) he requested to have a verbatim record of his oral submission;
- (b) he had been living in Tsing Yi South for eight years and had witnessed the changes of the area before and after the completion of Tsing Sha Highway. He came to express his views and concerns on the rezoning proposal to the Board and was also representing 10 other further representers, representers and commenters who were unable to attend the meeting;

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (c) while the rezoning of the northern part of the original representation site from “R(A)4” to “O” (i.e. Amendment Item A) was welcomed, the boundary of the amendment item was opposed and should be extended to cover the whole original representation site by “O” zone. It was because the original representation site was considered unsuitable for residential development as it was adjoined by a petrol filling station to the north-east and the Tsing Yi Preliminary Treatment Works to the north. Moreover, the site was located on sloping grounds and subject to a number of development constraints including the existence of over one thousand trees, a drainage reserve, a waterworks reserve and an underground high voltage electricity transmission line. As the site was located in close proximity to Tsing Sha Highway as well as the container terminals and container-related uses such as vehicle parks and logistics centre, it was also subject to severe noise impact especially from container vehicles;
- (d) upon thorough research on information and documents obtained from libraries, government websites, professional people and university professors as well as historical documents and planning guidelines, it was revealed that the proposed rezoning of the original representation

site from “O” to “R(A)4” would bring about many problems;

*Noise Pollution*

- (e) the major sources of noise pollution in Tsing Yi South were container operations, mid-stream operation and cargo working areas, container trucks and heavy goods vehicles as well as aircrafts;
- (f) according to the community noise guidelines issued by the World Health Organisation (WHO) in 1999, an average noise level of 50 to 55dB(A) in day-time was considered moderately to seriously disturbing and noise level over 45dB(A) in night-time could affect sleep quality. While the standards in Hong Kong were lower, some units in the proposed PRH development would still exceed the noise standard of 60 to 70 dB(A);
- (g) most of the noise emitters mentioned in the HKPSG including aircraft, road traffic, container terminals, public cargo working areas (PCWAs) and open car/lorry parks could be found within a distance of 200m from the original representation site. Residential use was regarded as one of the major noise sensitive receivers;
- (h) container terminals were a major noise source with high noise levels and lasted for long periods. Such noise could be generated by various penetrating sources such as warning sirens, straddle carriers and horns of departing ships (at over 100 dB(A)), gantry container cranes (at about 110 to 150 dB(A)), ship generators (at about 110 to 115 dB(A)) as well as container trucks and heavy goods vehicles. In addition to the above, there were also noises produced from the port back-up areas including PCWAs, mid-stream operations and open car/lorry parks;
- (i) according to the CT9 Study, the operation of CT9 and its back-up areas would cause significant noise impacts to the proposed Technical College (i.e. Tsing Yi IVE) as well as the residential developments of

Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate, and the estimated noise levels would barely meet or slightly exceed the stipulated standards. Since the proposed PRH development was located even closer to the container terminals and container related uses, it would definitely be affected by the noise pollution. The noise problem would be persistent and long term unless the container terminals were relocated to other places. In fact, during the consideration of CT9 development, there had been suggestion from Legislative Councillors to re-site CT9 with a view to avoiding noise and other disturbances to Tsing Yi South residents and freeing up the land for residential development. There had been proposals previously for new container terminals at the northern and southern coasts of Lantau Island;

- (j) Tsing Yi South was located beneath the departure flight path of Runway 07L/R of the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA) and was hence subject to severe disturbance from aircraft noise. When flying above Tsing Yi South, the aircrafts were ascending at a height of about 5,000 to 6,0000 feet often resulting in a noise level exceeding 100dB(A) for the residential developments below. Due to the prevailing wind directions, Runway 07L/R was the main runway in use during the winter season. The loud and sudden aircraft noise was unacceptable to residents especially after midnight;
- (k) according to the statistics obtained from the Civil Aviation Department, the number of departing flights using Runway 07L/R during midnight (i.e. from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) had been gradually increasing from only over 5,000 flights in 1999 to about 30,000 flights in 2016, i.e. an average of over 80 flights per night. As the number of departing flights using Runway 07L/R would be even higher during the winter season, it was estimated that the number could increase to over 100 flights per night. Given the past increasing trend of about 10% per year, it was anticipated that the number of departing flights during midnight would continue to rise, in particular upon completion of the Third Runway System of the HKIA;

- (l) information from another source ‘www.flightradar24.com’ also indicated that within an hour, 21 out of 30 departing flights using Runway 07L/R during midnight flew above Tsing Yi;
- (m) residents in Tsing Yi South were often woken up by the sudden aircraft noise during midnight, particularly in the colder seasons when windows were usually kept open;

[The Vice-chairman left this session of the meeting at this point.]

*Light Pollution*

- (n) the major sources of light pollution in Tsing Yi South were container terminals, mid-stream operations, PCWAs and multi-storey logistics centres. The adverse effect of light pollution on human health would not be lower than that of noise;
- (o) according to the CT9 Study, the glare impact of CT9 on Cheung Ching Estate and Mayfair Gardens with a glare rating of 34 was considered unacceptable by the Highways Department at the time. As the remaining “R(A)4” site was located closer to the container terminal, the glare impact on the proposed PRH development would be even more significant. The situation was further aggravated after the recent completion of Mapletree Logistics Hub which was located next to the proposed PRH development;
- (p) concerns on the glare impact of the then proposed CT9 was raised in the LegCo in 1991 and a member suggested government officials to stay in the area overnight to experience the magnitude of problem. PlanD officers should also be urged to personally experience the glare impact during midnight. He then showed a video clip recorded around midnight to demonstrate the light pollution generated by CT9;

*Air Pollution*

- (q) the major sources of air pollution in Tsing Yi South were container terminal operations, container trucks, heavy goods vehicles and container ships. Poor air quality could affect human health in particular triggering respiratory diseases;
- (r) the remaining “R(A)4” site was located right on two major air paths, including one along West Kowloon, Tsing Yi and Tsuen Wan as identified in the HKPSG, and another along Tsing Yi North and Kwai Chung South. Given one of the prevailing wind directions was in north-south direction, the proposed PRH development with a maximum building height of 140mPD would obstruct the wind flows and deter the dispersion of air pollutants in the area, thus affecting the health of the PRH residents and also the residents nearby;
- (s) as stated in Chapter 9 of the HKPSG, in designing the land use pattern, space between buildings should be maximised and the disposition of open spaces and building areas should be such that ventilation corridors passing through urban centres might be maintained to facilitate dispersion of air pollutant. Thus, a ventilation corridor should always be maintained for dispersion of the otherwise locally trapped air pollutants;
- (t) a diagram extracted from the EIA Report for the Tsing Sha Highway project showed that there was a high concentration of nitrogen dioxide at the remaining “R(A)4” site given its proximity to the Tsing Sha Highway. Thus, the proposed PRH development would be subject to a high level of air pollutants;

*Health*

- (u) in an open speech given by the Director of Housing, it was concluded

that ‘*HD has to adhere to its core responsibilities in the construction and maintenance of housing, that is, to provide no-frills and safe accommodation, which is conducive to tenants’ healthy living*’. In the light of that, the remaining “R(A)4” site should not be developed for any residential use;

*Public Transport*

- (v) he took cross-harbour bus route No. 948/948X (from Cheung Wang Estate to Tin Hau) to Admiralty for work every morning. Although the bus service was frequent during the morning peak at a time interval of about 2 to 5 minutes, very often the buses were already fully loaded when arrived at the Cheung Ching Estate bus stop, particularly after the occupation of Greenview Villa;
  
- (w) on 1.11.2016, he made an observation on the service of route No. 948/948X as follows:
  - (i) as usual, he arrived at the bus stop at 7:55 a.m. and there were already 25 passengers in the queue for bus No. 948/948x
  
  - (ii) at 8:02 a.m., the first bus No. 948 arrived but did not stop, and the queue was extended to some 35 passengers;
  
  - (iii) at 8:07 a.m., the second bus No. 948X arrived but again did not stop, and the queue was extended to over 50 passengers;
  
  - (iv) at 8:10 a.m., the third bus No. 948 arrived and some passengers got on board. 22 passengers including he himself were left in the queue;
  
  - (v) at 8:15 a.m., the fourth bus No. 948 arrived but did not stop. There were 27 passengers in the queue and some passengers had already left possibly for other modes of transport;

- (vi) at 8:20 a.m., the fifth bus No. 948X arrived which he could finally get on board, but there were still 25 passengers left in the queue; and
- (vii) since the last service of bus No. 948x usually arrived at 8:30 a.m., some passengers might not be able to get on board;
- (x) upon further increase in population from Ching Chun Court as well as the new developments at Sai Shan Road and the remaining “R(A)4” site, the situation would only get worse;

*Buffer Area*

- (y) according to the HKPSG, buffer area was defined as area of land separating incompatible land uses which should be of sufficient distance to minimise the potential conflict between them. There should not be any sensitive structures or uses such as residential, school and hospitals in buffer areas. The original representation site was serving as a buffer area between CT9 and the residential developments;
- (z) a chronology of public statements made by government officials regarding the buffer area between CT9 and the residential developments in Tsing Yi South was as follows:
  - (i) in December 1988, the then District Officer/Kwai Tsing (DO/KT) told the media that any new container terminals should be located far away from residential areas to minimise nuisance;
  - (ii) in December 1989, the Port and Airport Development Study (PADS) was announced which proposed to construct a new container terminal in Tsing Yi South. In the light of the potential glare impact of the container terminal, the need to

provide a buffer area at the ex-oil depot sites (i.e. the original representation site) between the container terminal and the residential developments of Cheung Ching Estate and Mayfair Gardens was raised in the PADS report;

- (iii) in 1990, the proposal of CT9 development at Tsing Yi South was officially announced. The then Kwai Tsing District Officer (DO/KT) said that there would be a buffer area between the cargo-related use areas and the residential estates including Cheung Ching Estate and Mayfair Gardens;
- (iv) the CT9 Report published in August 1991 stated that the proposed development would provide sites for the required port-related uses and a good mix of other compatible uses (i.e. industrial, recreational and government sites) which included an effective buffer for CT9 and the sensitive uses. In paragraph 3.3.4 of the CT9 Report, it was suggested that as the Technical College (i.e. Tsing Yi IVE) and the adjacent residential developments were environmentally sensitive uses, the sites immediately in front (including the remaining “R(A)4” site) should be used for appropriate buffer uses;
- (v) in September 1991, a meeting was held between the Tsing Yi South resident organisations and the Project Manager of the then Tsuen Wan Development Office, who promised that a buffer area for anti-pollution would be provided as part of the compensation for the development of CT9;
- (vi) in December 1991, the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board confirmed that the original representation site would be planned for a park to serve as a buffer between the container terminal and the residential developments of Cheung Ching Estate and Mayfair Gardens; and

- (vii) from 1995 to 2016, the Tsing Yi OZPs No. S/TY/10 to S/TY/26 continued to state that the original representation site was a buffer area. Since such planning intention had all along remained unchanged, sufficient justifications should be provided for rezoning the buffer area for residential use.

15. At this juncture, noting that there was a sub-heading ‘Integrity Issue of Government Officials in PlanD’ in Mr Choi’s PowerPoint presentation, the Chairman reminded Mr Choi that views expressed by attendees at the hearing session were not subject to any immunity provision and attendees should be mindful of not making any defamatory remarks. Mr Choi responded that he understood. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and the visualiser, Mr Choi continued to make the following main points:

*Integrity Issue of Government Officials in PlanD*

- (a) while the local residents suggested to enlarge the “O” zone to cover the remaining “R(A)4” site, they were angered by PlanD’s responses saying that the Board had already considered the remaining “R(A)4” site suitable for the proposed PRH development with no insurmountable noise, air ventilation, light pollution and traffic issues and agreed to retain the remaining “R(A)4” site for PRH development. It was suspected that certain officials of PlanD had misled the Board to make inappropriate consideration in both the original representation meeting (1110th TPB meeting) and the further representation meeting (1126th TPB meeting);
- (b) regarding buffer area, there were different versions of responses by PlanD:
  - (i) in the TPB meeting held on 21.4.2016, DPO/TWK said that the MPC had confirmed in 1991 that the “O” zone of the original representation site was to provide a park to serve as a buffer area between Mayfair Gardens/Cheung Ching Estate and CT9.

DPO/TWK also said that after the original representation site was developed for PRH, it could still serve as a buffer area for the nearby residential developments;

- (ii) in the TPB meeting held on 26.4.2016, DPO/TWK said that according to the CT9 Study, there was a tree planting requirement in the land lease and the original representation site was vegetated as a landscape buffer;
  - (iii) in PlanD's letter issued to the Owners' Committee of Rambler Crest on 6.10.2016, it was stated that according to the CT9 Study, the original representation site was proposed as a landscaping area but not serving as a buffer area for noise and glare; and
  - (iv) in the TPB meeting held on 3.11.2016, DPO/TWK said that the original representation site was recommended to serve as a buffer area under the CT9 Study. However, since the completion of Rambler Crest, the original representation site was no longer required as a buffer;
- (c) as a matter of fact, the original representation site was all along a buffer area between CT9 cum container-related uses and the residential developments of Cheung Ching Estate and Mayfair Gardens, and not as a buffer for industrial uses, as stated in a number of documents including the PADS Report, the CT9 Report, record of LegCo meetings held in 1991 and 1993, record of MPC meeting held in 1991 and the Tsing Yi OZPs No. S/TY/10 to S/TY/26 from 1995 to 2016. DPO/TWK also recognised on 21.4.2016 that whether or not the original representation site was developed for residential use, it could still serve as a buffer area for the nearby residential developments;

*Other Misleading Issues*

- (d) apart from the issue of buffer area, PlanD had also misled the Board on

other aspects and incorrect information had been provided for the proposed rezoning:

- (i) in the TPB meeting held on 25.10.2016, DPO/TWK said that the section of Tsing Sha Highway along the remaining “R(A)4” site was covered by noise barriers and that according to the HKPSG, a buffer distance of 50m between the highway and residential use was sufficient as compared to a buffer distance requirement of 300m without screening. In actual fact, however, the section of Tsing Sha Highway covered by noise barriers along the remaining “R(A)4” site only had a length of 75m. According to the EIA Report for the Tsing Sha Highway Project, those noise barriers were purposely installed to screen off noise for the Tsing Yi IVE student quarters (i.e. Fok Ying Tung Hall of Residence) but not the proposed PRH development. Since part of the remaining “R(A)4” site was not protected by noise barriers, if a buffer distance of 300m from Tsing Sha Highway was required, the site would not be suitable for residential development;

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (ii) in various occasions, government officials had said that container vehicles were not supposed to use upper section of Tsing Yi Road as the new Tsing Yi south bridge and the connection road for the container terminal were designed to provide more direct access to the container terminals without routing through the residential area; and that there might be cases of illegal parking of container vehicles on upper section of Tsing Yi Road but they were only occasional. However, the EIA Report for the Tsing Sha Highway Project had already assumed that there would be an average traffic flow of 550 vehicles per hour (20% of which, i.e. 110, were heavy vehicles) along upper section of Tsing Yi Road, and the figures were in line with the actual experience of the local residents. In fact, container vehicles departing from container terminals No. 1 to

7 and 9 for Tsing Ma Bridge/Ting Kau Bridge would all prefer to route through Tsing Yi Road/Ching Hong Road given that it was the shortest and most convenient route;

- (iii) in April 2016, DPO/TWK said that if the HKPSG standards were met, measures for mitigating the impacts of CT9 would not be required at the original representation site and quoted Lai King Estate as a reference. It should however be noted that Lai King Estate was located at about 200m from the container terminals as compared to 50m between the remaining ‘R(A)4’ site and the container-related uses. In addition, the facts that there was a green buffer between Lai King Estate and the container terminal, and that noise barriers had been installed along Route 3 in between, had helped alleviating the adverse impacts of the container terminals;

### *Conclusion*

- (e) the proposed Amendment Item A to rezone the northern portion of the ‘R(A)4’ zone to ‘O’ on the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27 was welcomed. However, the remaining ‘R(A)4’ zone for the proposed PRH development should also be rezoned to ‘O’. Such views were supported by a number of LegCo members and district council members from various political parties. The Kwai Tsing DC also passed a motion opposing the proposed PRH development;
- (f) during the planning of CT9, the residents of Tsing Yi South had raised vigorous objections against the proposed development of container terminal. As part of the compensation to the residents for the development of CT9, government officials had promised that a buffer area would be provided as an anti-pollution belt; and
- (g) there was no doubt that the original representation site was still an effective buffer zone between CT9 and the residential developments of

Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate and the Tsing Yi IVE. Sensitive receivers such as residential use should be avoided within the buffer zone.

16. The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 1:15 p.m.

17. The meeting was resumed at 2:30 p.m. on 10.11.2016
18. 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

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

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

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

Presentation and Question Sessions (Cont'd)

[Open Meeting]

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

## **Government Representatives**

### *Planning Department (PlanD)*

- Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan & 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 (SPO) (Atg.)
- Mr Stephen K.M. Leung - Chief Architect (CA)
- Ms May S.S. Yeung - Architect (A)
- Mr Chow Kwok Sang - Civil Engineer (CE)

### *Transport Department (TD)*

- Mr Patrick K.H. Ho - Senior Engineer/Kwai Tsing (SE/KT)
- Mr Tam Lai Ming - Senior Transport Officer/Kwai Tsing (STO/KT)

## **Further Representers, Representatives, Commenters and their representatives**

F48 - 關婉微

F1640 - 施少林

F1645 - 莊淑雯

F1754 - Leung Tse Kin

R525 - Chiu Ying Yuen

- Ms Yuen Foon Yung - Further Representers' and Representer's representative

F835 - Wong Chun Hung, Albert

- Mr Wong Chun Hung, Albert - Further Representer

F1912 - 趙慧琴

F1913 - 趙公博

R346 / C345 - Ma Yuk Chu, Judy

R471 - 阮國萍

R472 - Ho Wai Chong

R487 - Au Yeung Vivien

R488 - Lee Wai Man

R497 - Leung Lai Kit

R502 - Chow Hui Ching

R510 - Cheng Chun Wah

R523 - Lai Chuk Mui

Ms Ma Yuk Chu, Judy

- Representer, Commenter, Further Representers' and Representers' representative

Mr Lam Kai Hung

- Further Representers', Representers' and Commenter's representative

F2161 - 李素貞

F2455 - Choi Chi Wah, Dave

R147 - Chee Wing Suet, Zoe

R149 - Lee Lai Sang

R154 - Lee Lin Ching

R157 - 何智賢

R168 - Ng Tan Fung, Tanny

R176 - 應義鏗

R177 - 聶雪梅

C159 - Wong Miu Kam

C160 - Tai Tat Ming

Mr Choi Chi Wah, Dave

- Further Representer, Further Representer's, Representers' and Commenters' representative

R580 - Ma Yuk Ying

C41 - Chu Hing Mui

Mr Wong Po Leung, Kaiser

- Representer's and Commenter's

representative

R764 - Cheung Hau Ka

C33 - Wan Wan Kam

C39 - 何穎妍

Mr Tang Wai Man - Representer's and Commenters' representative

R882 - 鄺劍亮

Ms Tam Yuk Ling - Representer's representative

C51 - Chan Pui Wai

Mr Wong King Kwong - Commenter's representative

C52 - Chu Wing Tong

Ms Fung Wing Mei, Eugenia - Commenter's representative

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

R764 - Cheung Hau Ka

C33 - Wan Wan Kam

C39 - 何穎妍

21. Mr Tang Wai Man made the following main points:

- (a) many attendees had already commented that the remaining "Residential (Group A)4" ("R(A)4") zone was not suitable for residential development by providing a comprehensive historical account of the development of Container Terminal 9 (CT9) and the planning intention of the original representation site as a buffer zone to screen off environmental nuisances from container-related uses. DPO/TWK had also mentioned in the

previous hearing sessions that the original representation site was a buffer area for CT9. Although it had already been stated in the government documents from 1988 to 2016 that the site was not suitable for residential development, the Government still pushed forward the Public Rental Housing (PRH) development proposal, which was unreasonable and wasting Members' time;

- (b) if there was no insurmountable problem for the proposed PRH development at the buffer area, the Board would not propose amendment to the previous rezoning proposal by reducing the number of residential blocks from five to three. Being a local resident in the vicinity, he was of the view that the area, which was subject to severe environmental nuisances in particular air pollution, was not suitable for residential development. Proposing PRH development at the remaining "R(A)4" zone without addressing the environmental problems properly was irresponsible and equivalent to chronic murder of the future residents;
- (c) the Board should not accept PlanD's rezoning proposal just because of the need to meet the housing supply target. It should bear in mind that once PRH was constructed at the remaining "R(A)4" zone, the future residents would live there in the long-term. It was the Government's duty to provide a safe living environment with reasonable supporting facilities for the future residents;
- (d) the adverse impacts generated by additional population in the area had not been adequately assessed and the technical assessments for the proposed PRH development were unreliable. For example, some viewpoints selected for the visual impact assessment were far away from the proposed development. The conclusion that the proposed PRH blocks would not affect the air ventilation of the surrounding areas was not convincing. The local residents would not object to the proposed PRH development if there were strong justifications for the proposal. However, no convincing proposal had been provided by relevant government departments so far;

- (e) neither the residents nor the owners' committees in the three adjacent residential developments had been consulted on the proposed PRH development, not to mention the supporting facilities;
- (f) should the Board insist on approving the rezoning proposal for PRH development, a bold approach should be adopted to increase the development intensity dramatically such that there was incentive for the extension of the railway to the area. He foresaw that the local residents would welcome that proposal as they would be benefited from the improved public transport services and the higher property value;
- (g) he also welcomed the proposal for columbarium development as the associated traffic flow would only be generated at certain peak seasons; and
- (h) he doubted if there was spare carrying capacity in the area to accommodate the proposed PRH development and social welfare facilities, and urged the Board to reject the rezoning proposal for the welfare of the future residents.

R882 - 鄺劍亮

22. Ms Tam Yuk Ling 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 "Open Space" ("O") zone on the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (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) she recalled that Tsing Yi South was occupied by incinerator and oil depot about 30 years ago. When she purchased a flat at Rambler Crest, she did not realize that the area was subject to severe air pollution, noise nuisance, glare impact and traffic problem and was not suitable for long-term residence until she moved in. Although she lived on 41/F, it seemed that her flat was located in a valley and the noise from the hotels and CT9 could be heard clearly in early morning and at night. Long-term residence in areas with high noise nuisances would affect the health of the residents, in particular children whose ability to concentrate would be affected. To avoid the noise nuisances, she always needed to close the windows and rely on air-conditioning, resulting in high cost for electricity;
- (d) the hotel guests were not satisfied with the living environment neither, as was demonstrated by the very low rating for the hotels given by them on the internet. There were also hotel guests committing suicide every year, which might be triggered by the poor environment;
- (e) the parks in the vicinity were very small and full of mosquitoes. The local residents were frequently disturbed by the hotel guests when using the parks;
- (f) she queried if the environmental assessment had been interpreted out of context such that residential development was allowed in the buffer zone for CT9. Quoting the eighth commandment of the Ten Commandments that one should not bear false witness against his/her neighbour, she doubted the integrity of those who allowed residential development in the buffer zone. As the needs of human beings were more than a shelter, she worried that even though the housing problem could be temporarily solved, more problems would be created in future and the grievances of the local residents would turn Tsing Yi South into another Tin Shui Wai; and
- (g) she played a song called “燕尾蝶” to express her feelings on the rezoning proposal. Although the lyrics of the song were written more than ten

years ago, the situation that followers were constantly replaced by buildings had not been changed over the years. She questioned what the world would be if the situation continued.

C51 - Chan Pui Wai

23. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Wong King Kwong 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) although he supported PRH development, it should not be planned at the Tsing Hung Road site which could not be considered as a suitable site;
- (d) the conclusion of the traffic impact assessment (TIA) 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. Taken his family as an example, all four persons in his family needed to commute by public transport daily. He queried how the figure had been derived and if the traffic generated by the nearby hotels and the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Tsing Yi) (Tsing Yi IVE) had been taken into account in the assessment;
- (e) the traffic generated by a number of residential developments, including Mayfair Gardens, Cheung Ching Estate, Rambler Crest and two committed/planned housing developments (i.e. Ching Chun Court Home

Ownership Scheme (HOS) and a proposed private housing development at Sai Shan Road), would pass through Ching Hong Road, the roundabout near Ching Hong Road, Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Yi Interchange to Kowloon. However, only one lane was designated at Tsing Yi Interchange for vehicles going to Kowloon via Tsing Yi south bridge;

- (f) although the section of Tsing Yi Road to the north of Ching Hong Road was the major exit to Kowloon, there was frequent road maintenance/public works and only one lane was available for use most of the time. The road would become even narrower when buses approached the bus stop. The roundabout near Ching Hong Road, even after expansion as proposed by the Government, could not cater for the demand as large vehicles usually needed more time to round through;
- (g) given there was only one exit from Tsing Yi South to Kowloon, no matter how the local road network was enhanced, such as expanding the roundabout and removing the central divider, the existing traffic problems could not be resolved and the additional traffic generated by the proposed PRH development with more than 10,000 persons could not be accommodated;
- (h) although the representative of TD had indicated that new bus or Green mini-bus (GMB) feeder routes between the proposed PRH development and Tsing Yi Railway Station could be considered, it was noted that the costs for the new services to be borne by the service providers would also need to be considered. He did not agree with the argument that inadequate public transport services could be compromised by a longer waiting time; and
- (i) he urged Members to keep a watchful eye on the consultancy reports, request the government representatives to clarify the ambiguities and revert the remaining “R(A)4” zone to “O”.

C52 - Chu Wing Tong

24. Ms Fung Wing Mei, Eugenia 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;
  - (c) in response to a Member’s question raised in a previous hearing session on whether the proposed PRH development could help revitalize the shopping mall and market in Tsing Yi South, she said that reference could be made to the revitalization of market in Tin Yiu Estate of Tin Shui Wai. There was a surge of rental level for the stalls after the revitalization scheme, resulting in a monopolized operation and price increases in food and daily necessities;
  - (d) there was insufficient supporting facilities, such as shopping mall, market, hospital, public transport, and leisure and recreational facilities, to cater for the needs of additional population in Tsing Yi South;
  - (e) she got woken up by noises at night recently and found that they were the death squawks from trees outside the window, lamenting why the trees would be felled despite they were healthy and had been acting as air purifier and noise barrier for more than ten years;
  - (f) although acoustic window would be adopted in the proposed PRH development, its construction cost was very high, amounting to several tens of thousands dollars per unit, or about a hundred million dollars for the whole development. Besides, its effectiveness for noise reduction was uncertain and the future maintenance cost could be very high;

- (g) the air quality and noise level in the area were already very poor due to CT9, road traffic and logistics centre. Those problems would be further aggravated by the proposed tree felling and population in-take. The welfare of the existing residents had been ignored by the Government;
- (h) she questioned on the number of trees that could be planted to compensate for some 900 trees to be felled, and if the health of the residents could be compensated; and
- (i) given the remaining “R(A)4” zone was not suitable for residential development due to the lack of supporting facilities and the adverse environmental and traffic impacts, she urged the Board to reject the rezoning proposal and revert the remaining “R(A)4” zone back to “O”.

F835 - Wong Chun Hung, Albert

25. Mr Wong Chun Hung, Albert made the following main points:

- (a) he grew up in Hong Kong and had studied abroad. In his thirties, he was living in Ramble Crest and noticed that Hong Kong was deteriorating in aspects such as environmental quality, urban planning as well as housing provision. In his discussion with friends from different countries, he found that housing was the most imminent problem to be tackled;
- (b) a number of attendees had already pointed out that residential development was not piling up of block puzzle which could be pushed over and started all over again. Lots of resources would be involved in the development process and many people might live in the proposed PRH development for their whole life. If the planning, traffic and environmental problems associated with the proposed PRH development were not addressed properly, the rezoning proposal should not be approved hastily; and
- (c) the government officials from different departments, who were professionals with the required knowledge, had the responsibilities to plan

for a better living environment. They should put more efforts not only in the planning and development of Tsing Yi South, but also in the urban and other new development areas. He urged the Board to listen to the views of the local residents and consider the rezoning proposal carefully.

F48 - 關婉微

F1640 - 施少林

F1645 - 莊淑雯

F1754 - Leung Tse Kin

R525 - Chiu Ying Yuen

26. Ms Yuen Foon Yung made the following main points:
- (a) having lived in Mayfair Gardens for 27 years, she witnessed the changes in Tsing Yi South;
  - (b) the original representation site, which was a buffer area for CT9, was a compensatory measure for the local community including Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate in relation to the construction of CT9. Changing the buffer area for residential development was contrary to the original principle and unfair to the local residents. She was disappointed about PlanD's deletion of "buffer area" in relevant documents as reported by Apple Daily in a news article on 4.11.2016;
  - (c) Mayfair Gardens would be surrounded by the committed Ching Chun Court HOS, the proposed private housing development at Sai Shan Road, as well as the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road. The addition of some 20,000 population in the vicinity would have great impact on Mayfair Gardens;
  - (d) apart from traffic problems, there was a lack of basic supporting facilities in Tsing Yi South, including recreational facilities (e.g. swimming pool, park and ball court) library and market. The existing markets in Cheung Tsing and Cheung Hong Estates could not meet the needs of local residents

on daily necessities. She doubted if there were sufficient supporting facilities for the additional population, and if there was space in the area for the construction of a large shopping mall as proposed by the Government;

- (e) quoting the experience of an old couple taking bus near Tsing Yi IVE, she said that it was very difficult for Mayfair Gardens residents to squeeze onto GMB route No. 88C between 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. given the large number of Tsing Yi IVE students; and
- (f) she did not oppose housing development if it was at a suitable location. As the attendees had already explained to Members that the remaining “R(A)4” zone was not suitable for residential development, she urged the Board to make a right decision on the rezoning proposal.

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

#### Acoustic windows/balconies

28. A Member asked the representative of HD to brief Members on the acoustic treatment for the proposed PRH development. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Chow Kwok Sang, CE of HD, said that the site was mainly subject to road traffic noise and fixed plant noise. According to HKPSG, the standard for road traffic noise for all domestic premises was 70 dB(A) measured at 1m away from the façade of the noise sensitive receiver. A preliminary prediction for noise levels at the original representation site had been conducted. Under the unmitigated scenario, a maximum traffic noise level of 73 dB(A) was recorded at the previously proposed Block 4 facing Mayfair Gardens. For Blocks 1 to 3, the maximum traffic noise level was 72 dB(A) which was recorded at the southern part facing CT9. For fixed plant noise, the acceptable noise levels stipulated in the Noise Control Ordinance (Cap. 400) were 70 dB(A) at day time (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.) and evening time (7:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.) and 60 dB(A) at night time (11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.). The measured levels at the original representation site at day time and night time were 61 dB(A) and 56 dB(A) respectively.

29. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Stephen K.M. Leung, CA of HD said that possible noise mitigation measures included building configuration, architectural fins and acoustic windows/balconies. For acoustic windows, there were two layers of windows parallel to each other - the outside layer side-hinged windows and the inside layer sliding windows. With the two layers of windows opening at alternative sides, and sound absorptive lining around the gap in between the two window layers, noise could be reduced while allowing natural ventilation at the same time. The noise level could be reduced by about 4 to 8 dB(A). For acoustic balconies, there had been two generations of acoustic balcony design, and HD was constantly improving on it. The main features included configuration of balcony (with a sliding screen in front of the balcony door in the second generation design) to enhance air flow, additional options like sound absorptive lining at walls and ceiling, and projected panel outside the parapet. The noise reduction level for the second generation acoustic balcony could be up to 12 dB(A) depending on the physical local environment like orientation, height and design of the residential unit. The design of acoustic windows/balconies was effective in reducing road traffic noise for compliance with HKPSG and the Buildings Ordinance on natural lighting and ventilation. A video was played at this juncture to illustrate the design of an acoustic window.

30. In response to questions from the Chairman and a Member, Mr Stephen K.M. Leung said that the two layers of acoustic windows should only be opened at alternative sides such that noise from the outside would pass through the air gap for mitigation. The windows could also be closed entirely for turning on air conditioning.

31. In response to a Member's question, Mr Stephen K.M. Leung said that the first generation of acoustic balconies had already been incorporated in Wing Cheong Estate at Sham Shui Po. The second generation of acoustic balconies, with the addition of sliding screen, should be more effective in noise reduction and would be adopted in new housing projects. As for whether the proposed PRH development would adopt acoustic windows or balconies, it would depend on the orientation and design of the building blocks, and the required extent of noise mitigation at different locations in the detailed design stage.

32. In response to some Members' questions on the design of acoustic balcony, Mr Stephen K.M. Leung further said that the sliding screen would comply with the requirements of the Buildings Ordinance on natural lighting and ventilation, construction and structural

stability. The sound absorptive lining, such as glass fibre or rock wool covered in aluminium panel, would be suitable for external use with low maintenance requirement. As for the projected panel, its design could be further enhanced for draining of rainwater and preventing stacking up of materials. In order to prevent unexpected loading on the projected panel, the tenant handbook would require tenants to avoid putting anything on it. With the provision of acoustic balcony, the air conditioner originally installed in the external façade (now a balcony) would be moved to another location of the residential unit.

#### Container related uses

33. Noting that there was fire incident in the container yard as shown by an attendee, a Member asked if the container yard adjacent to the remaining “R(A)4” zone was monitored by the Government. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, said that the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Container Related Uses” sites to the south-east of the remaining “R(A)4” zone, which were now used for parking of container vehicles and storage of containers, were subject to control of Government under short-term tenancy.

#### Traffic

34. As most of the attendees complained about the poor traffic condition in Tsing Yi South, a Member asked if there was any measure to improve the traffic condition in the area. With the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Patrick K.H. Ho, SE/KT of TD said that in terms of traffic capacity, the on-site survey and junction assessments in the TIA commissioned by HD demonstrated that the existing roads including nearby junctions (including Tsing Yi Interchange and junction of Tsing Yi Road and Ching Hong Road) would perform at an acceptable level with the additional traffic generated by the proposed PRH development. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Tam Lai Ming, STO/KT of TD, said that in terms of public transport facilities, there were currently more than 20 franchised buses and GMB routes travelling via Tsing Yi South in the vicinity of the proposed PRH site, to the nearest railway stations, nearby districts (e.g. Tsuen Wan and Kwai Chung), Kowloon, New Territories and Hong Kong Island. According to recent on-site surveys conducted by TD, the existing GMB routes, including No. 88C (Mayfair Gardens – Kwai Fong Railway Station), No. 88F (Rambler Crest – Tsing Yi Railway Station) and No. 88G (Rambler Crest – Kwai Fong Railway Station) had occupancy rates of above 90% at peak

hours and had left-behind passengers. However, most of the left-behind passengers were able to board next trips within 10 minutes. As for franchised bus routes passing through Tsing Yi South, the occupancy rates were between 10% to 95% at peak hours. For example, the average occupancy rates for No. 249M (Mayfair Gardens – Tsing Yi Railway Station) at the AM and PM peak hours were about 10% and less than 50% respectively. Although some trips of No. 42A (Cheung Hang Estate to Jordan) heading to Jordan, and No. 948X (Cheung Wang Estate to Causeway Bay) heading to Hong Kong Island had left-behind passengers, the left-behind passengers were able to board the immediate next trip within three and eight minutes respectively. The survey results revealed that the existing public transport services could meet the existing passenger demand in Tsing Yi South. However, TD would continue monitor the public transport services in Tsing Yi South, and if needed, follow-up with the relevant public transport operators for enhancing services and providing adequate public transport services to residents in Tsing Yi South.

35. Noting that a number of attendees had cast doubt on the effectiveness of the proposed road improvement works, a Member asked how the roads could be widened to address the traffic problems. Referring to a plan on road improvement works in the PowerPoint and a photo in the visualiser, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the roadside amenity area in front of the petrol filling station (PFS) near the junction of Ching Hong Road and Tsing Yi Road would be removed such that the roundabout could be expanded to accommodate two large vehicles at the same time. For the section of Tsing Yi Road to the south of Sai Shan Road, the central divider would be removed and the dual two-lane carriageway would be converted to dual one-lane carriageway for the provision of an on-street lay-by for bus and GMB stops and the widening of the eastern footpath to about 6m. Given that section of Tsing Yi Road was a cul-de-sac, there should be adequate traffic capacity upon implementing the proposed works. The road improvement works recommended by the TIA had been accepted by TD. With the aid of a plan in the visualiser, Mr Patrick K.H. Ho supplemented that the roundabout at the junction of Ching Hong Road and Tsing Yi Road could accommodate two buses at the same time after the improvement works.

36. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Wong King Kwong (representative of C51), referring to the same plan on road improvement works in the PowerPoint, said that the section of Tsing Yi Road to the north of Ching Hong Road was very busy as it was

the major exit to Kowloon. Despite it was a dual two-lane carriageway, one lane was always closed due to frequent road maintenance and public works. The traffic condition was unsatisfactory as the road was too narrow for bus boarding, the footpath was very narrow and the island at the pedestrian crossing was too small for pedestrians to wait safely. Besides, only one lane at Tsing Yi Interchange had been designated for traffic to Kowloon. Given there was only one exit to Kowloon, any road improvement measures in Tsing Yi South without improvement at the bottleneck could not solve the traffic problems.

37. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Wong Po Leung, Kaiser (representative of R580 and C41) referring to the same plan on road improvement works in the PowerPoint, said that the roundabout at the junction of Tsing Yi Road and Ching Hong Road could hardly be expanded as it was surrounded by footpaths near PFS, Mei King Playground and Cheung Ching Estate. He queried if it was possible for two buses to go through at the same time. With respect to the section of Tsing Yi Road to the south of PFS, the existing footpath was very narrow for which only one person could pass through. He doubted if there was sufficient space for the proposed on-street lay-by for bus and GMB stops. As the bottleneck for the local road network was at the roundabout near Ching Hong Road, the proposed road improvement works to the south of the roundabout could not solve the problem. Along the route from Ching Hong Road and Tsing Yi Road to Kowloon, two accidents had been recorded within the past month. With the aid of a photo in the visualiser, Mr Choi Chi Wah, Dave (F2455) supplemented that the sections of roads near Ching Hong Road roundabout were very problematic. An accident involving a dumper truck just happened near the junction of Ching Hong Road and Tsing Yi Road on the day of the meeting session. He doubted if the road network design was able to cater for the additional traffic demand.

38. Noting that some attendees had raised concerns on the tourist buses parked near the cul-de-sac of Tsing Hung Road, a Member asked if it was possible to prohibit tourist buses from entering Tsing Hung Road. With the aid of Plan FH-3 of the Paper shown in the visualiser, Mr Patrick K.H. Ho said that as Tsing Hung Road provided access for tourist buses and private cars entering the hotel and residential portions of Rambler Crest, restricting vehicles from using that road was not appropriate. However, Tsing Hung Road was subject to a 24-hour restriction on car stopping and parking (i.e. double yellow lines were marked at the Road).

39. Noting that a number of attendees had complained that the PFS had attracted heavy vehicles to the local road network and imposed constraints to the expansion of the roundabout near Ching Hong Road, a Member asked the views of the local residents on the relocation of the PFS. In response, Mr Choi Chi Wah, Dave said that the PFS was one of the facilities for local residents in relation to the relocation of the oil depot. Although some heavy vehicles would make use of the PFS, it was not the only reason attracting heavy vehicles in using the local road network. Given that Tsing Yi South was not only the port back-up area for CT9, but also for CT1 to CT8, a number of container related uses such as logistic centre and container yards were located in Tsing Yi South, resulting in heavy container related traffic flow. Assuming half of the container related traffic would make use of the local road network near Ching Hong Road, the traffic impact could be quite substantial. As such, relocation of PFS could not help resolve the traffic problems. As for whether the local residents would support the relocation of the PFS, Mr Choi said that he needed the PFS service and could not represent the others in answering the question. However, it was noted that a new lease with a term of 15 years had just been granted for the PFS and renovation works for the PFS was completed just recently.

#### Traffic accidents

40. Noting that a number of attendees had raised concerns on the large number of heavy vehicles and the frequent traffic accidents in Tsing Yi South, a Member asked if the traffic accident rate in Tsing Yi South was higher than that in other districts. Mr Patrick K.H. Ho said that all traffic accident black spots (TABS) in Hong Kong were monitored by TD and there was no TABS in Tsing Yi South. TD would carry out focused studies on locations where the frequency or severity of traffic accidents was relatively high, such that proposals could be introduced to improve the road environment that might attribute to accidents. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Patrick K.H. Ho said that the criteria adopted for classification of a TABS included (i) a location with nine or more traffic accidents involving personal injuries over the past one year; or (ii) a location with six or more traffic accidents involving pedestrian injuries over the past one year; or (iii) a location with two or more fatal traffic accidents over the past five years. As for whether the traffic accident rate in Tsing Yi South was higher than that in other districts, Mr Patrick K.H. Ho said that there was no such data since traffic accidents would involve different kinds of

vehicles with different reasons.

41. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Choi Chi Wah, Dave criticized that TD's figures on TABS only focused on those accidents with personal injuries. The fact that Tsing Yi South had a higher percentage of heavy vehicles had been ignored. As the heavy vehicles usually carried dangerous goods, the accidents caused by those vehicles would have greater implication than that caused by private cars in other districts.

#### Air quality

42. In response to a Member's question on air quality, Ms Fannie F.L. Hung, STP/KT of PlanD, referring to a PowerPoint slide, said that Air Pollution Control (Marine Light Diesel) Regulation was introduced in 2014 to control the sulphur content of locally supplied marine light diesel. Relevant regulation for ocean going vessels was put in force in 2015 requiring the vessels to switch to fuel with low sulphur content while berthing in Hong Kong. After the introduction of the regulation for 2 years, the sulphur dioxide level at Kwai Tsing District in 2015-2016 had reduced by 55% comparing with that in 2012-2013. It demonstrated that the regulation had positive effect on the air quality in Kwai Tsing District.

43. In response to a Member's question, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, with the aid of the visualiser, said that according to the air quality monitoring stations' readings stated in Environmental Protection Department's annual report, the sulphur dioxide levels in Kwai Tsing District had complied with the relevant standards.

#### Vacancy rate of PRH

44. In response to a Member's question, Mr Stephen K.M. Leung said that there were currently about 750,000 public housing units with a vacancy rate of 0.5% (i.e. about 3,800 units). About 7,000 units were recovered and re-allocated each year.

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

Proposed PRH development

45. In response to a Member's question, Mr Chow Kwok Sang said that according to HKPSG, about 70 residential parking spaces, 10 retail parking spaces, 20 motorcycle parking spaces and 10 light goods vehicle parking spaces would be provided in the proposed PRH development.

46. In response to a Member's question, Mr Stephen K.M. Leung said that the proposed PRH development was still in the planning stage. HD would continue to optimize the layout with a view to further alleviate the environmental concerns.

47. In response to a Member's question, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the estimated population for the proposed PRH development had included all age groups including children, which was consistent with the established practice.

48. As Members had no more question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing on the day was completed. He thanked the government's representatives as well as the further representers, representers, commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would deliberate the representations in their absence on another day and would inform the further representers, representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. They left the meeting at this point.

49. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.