

**Minutes of 1126th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 8.12.2016**

Present

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

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

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

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

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

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Professor K.C. Chau

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

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

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Anissa W.Y. Lai

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1126th Meeting held on 25.10.2016, 26.10.2016, 27.10.2016, 1.11.2016, 2.11.2016, 3.11.2016, 7.11.2016 and 10.11.2016

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1126th meeting held on 25.10.2016, 26.10.2016, 27.10.2016, 1.11.2016, 2.11.2016, 3.11.2016, 7.11.2016 and 10.11.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 2

[Closed Meeting (Deliberation)]

Consideration of Further Representations on Proposed Amendments to Draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TY/27 Arising from Consideration of Representations and Comments

(TPB Paper No. 10190)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

Deliberation Session

2. The Chairman said that other than the minutes of meeting, the video recordings of the hearing sessions of the meetings held on 25.10.2016, 26.10.2016, 27.10.2016, 1.11.2016, 2.11.2016, 3.11.2016, 7.11.2016 and 10.11.2016 were sent to Members by two batches on 16.11.2016 and 21.11.2016 respectively.

Declaration of Interests

3. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests as shown on the visualizer was reported in the minutes of meeting of 25.10.2016 (paragraphs 4 and 5 of the

minutes). No further declaration of interests had been received from Members since then. The declaration of interests in the item was as follows:

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee (as Director of Planning) | - | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan (as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department) | - | being an alternate representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA |
| Mr H.F. Leung | - | being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai |] | having current business dealings with |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau |] | HKHA and AECOM Asia Company |
| Dr C.H. Hau |] | Limited (AECOM) |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with HKHA and past business dealings with AECOM |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu | - | having current business dealings with HKHA |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - | had past business dealings with HKHA and having current business dealings with AECOM |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam |] | had past business dealings with HKHA, |
| Mr Franklin Yu |] | AECOM and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK) |

- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of Housing Department but not involved in planning work
- Professor S.C. Wong (Vice-chairman) - being the Chair Professor and Head of the Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Hong Kong where AECOM had business dealings with some colleagues and had sponsored some activities of the Department before

4. Members noted that Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr H.F. Leung, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members agreed that Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Mr Franklin Yu and Professor S.C. Wong, whose interests were indirect could stay in the meeting. Members also agreed that as Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had no involvement in the project, his interest was indirect and he could stay in the meeting.

Request for Verbatim Record of Minutes

5. The Secretary reported that many further representers/representers/commenters attending the hearing sessions had requested that the minutes should include a verbatim record reflecting each and every word said during their oral submissions. The Chairman had explained during the hearing that it was the practice of the Town Planning Board (the Board) that its minutes of meeting would only reflect the key points of discussion and the decision made to serve as official record of the meeting. If the verbatim record requested become the Board's new practice, the workload of the Secretariat would become unbearable. Furthermore, the audio-recordings of the open part of the meetings would be available at the Board's website for a specific period of time for public access. Members agreed that the Board's longstanding practice of only reflecting key points of discussion and the decision made in the minutes should similarly be adopted for the current hearing.

Further Information submitted by Further Representers/Reapersenters/Commenters

6. The Secretary reported that after the completion of the morning session of the hearing session on 25.10.2016, the Secretariat of the Board received a set of documents from Mr Andy Chan Wai Yip, the representative of a group of further representers/representers/commenters. The documents included a number of letters dated 9.5.2016, 14.6.2016, 10.8.2016, 11.8.2016 which were submitted by the Owners' Committee of Rambler Crest and/or Mr Poon Chi Shing, member of the Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) to the Board or Planning Department (PlanD) providing further information and their own records of the question and answer (Q&A) session of the hearing sessions held on 21.4.2016 and 26.4.2016 with their further responses to the questions raised by Members. On 10.11.2016, the Secretariat received another email/letter dated 10.11.2016 jointly submitted by the Owners' Committee of Rambler Crest and Mr Poon Chi Shing providing further information.

7. As the further information was submitted out-of-time, and according to the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), they should be treated as not having been made. A Member said that the Board only needed to note the fact that such further submission had been made, and should not consider the information therein as they were treated as not having been made. The Meeting agreed.

Deliberation

8. To facilitate deliberation, the Secretary briefly recapitulated the background of the further representations in respect of the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) as follows:

- (a) on 22.7.2016, the proposed amendment to rezone the northern portion of the "Residential (Group A)4" ("R(A)4") zone (original representation site) to "Open Space" ("O") (Amendment Item A) was exhibited for public inspection; and
- (b) a total of 2,238 valid further representations were received. In general, most of the further representations supported Amendment Item A but

expressed concerns/grievance on the remaining “R(A)4” zone.

Major Grounds and Responses

9. The Secretary recapitulated the major points made by the further representers/representers/commenters in their written and oral submissions which were grouped under the five main aspects.

Planning Intention and Buffer Area

10. The meeting noted that some further representers/representers/commenters had made the following major points on planning intention and buffer area:

- (a) the original representation site was planned for open space as recommended in the ‘South-East Tsing Yi Port Development Planning and Engineering Feasibility Study for Container Terminal 9’ (the CT9 Study) in 1990 to serve as a buffer area;
- (b) the government had committed to provide the open space at the original representation site to serve the locals;
- (c) the planning intention of original representation site which was then zoned “O” was indicated clearly on the previous Explanatory Statement (ES) of the previous Tsing Yi OZPs since 1992. Such planning intention had not been revised during subsequent OZP amendments until the current OZP No. S/TY/27;
- (d) the area was not suitable for residential development as it was a buffer for mitigating noise and glare impacts from CT9, the future public rental housing (PRH) residents would become ‘human buffer’; and
- (e) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), suitable buffer distance should be provided between residential use and CT9, container-related uses, logistic centre and Tsing Sha Highway.

11. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing sessions, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) according to the CT9 Study, industrial uses were recommended as a buffer to shield off the noise and glare impacts from CT9. The original representation site was a buffer between the existing residential uses and the proposed industrial buildings;
- (b) no documents could be identified to show that the Government had made a promise that the open space would be provided at the original representation site as a buffer between CT9 and Mayfair Gardens/Cheung Ching Estate;
- (c) upon rezoning of the Rambler Crest site from "Industrial" ("I") to "Commercial" ("C") in 1997, the requirement for a buffer to serve as a screen between Rambler Crest and Mayfair Gardens/Cheung Ching Estate was no longer required although the relevant section of the ES was not updated at that time; and
- (d) the proposed rezoning of the northern portion of original representation site to "O" was a balanced decision made taking into account provision of local open space as well as the demand for more public housing. With the proposed greening ratio of 30% for the PRH development, the planning intention of providing landscaping and recreation facilities could be maintained.

Traffic and Public Transportation

12. The Meeting noted that some further representers/representers/commenters had made the following major points on the traffic and public transportation:

- (a) the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) conducted by Housing Department (HD) was improper and had serious errors in the findings.

The traffic survey was conducted on a school holiday and underestimated the traffic impact;

- (b) the existing road capacity was insufficient and could not cater for the additional population;
- (c) there were frequent road works at Tsing Yi Road leading to serious traffic congestion. Any traffic accidents would paralyze the local traffic flow;
- (d) the existing public transport services could not meet the local demand and there were long waiting time for bus/green mini-bus (GMB);
- (e) effectiveness and feasibility of the traffic improvement measures in relation to the proposed PRH development was doubtful; and
- (f) given the constraints in road capacity, an increase in the bus services would only aggravate the traffic congestion problem.

13. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing sessions, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) the Transport Department (TD) considered that the TIA was acceptable from traffic engineering point of view. The TIA demonstrated that with the traffic generated by the proposed PRH development and the surrounding planned/committed developments including the Home Ownership Scheme development at Ching Chun Court, the private housing at Sai Shan Road and the proposed vehicle examination centre, the existing roads including junctions nearby would still perform at acceptable levels. Besides, TD advised that the bus and GMB services would be reviewed and enhanced two years before population intake of the proposed PRH development;

- (b) improvement to Tsing Yi Road was also proposed to enhance the operation of traffic movements and pedestrian flows. The existing circulatory carriageway of the roundabout at Tsing Yi Road/Ching Hong Road would be enlarged. The section of Tsing Yi Road to the south of Sai Shan Road would be converted to a dual one-lane carriageway for the provision of an on-street lay-by of 100m long for bus and GMB stops and footpath widening; and

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

- (c) the TIA had been conducted in accordance with TD's requirement, the survey results obtained in the TIA were consistent with the similar monitoring data available to TD and thus acceptable.

Environmental Concerns

14. The meeting noted that some further representers/representers/commenters had made the following major points on the environmental concerns:

- (a) the environmental assessments were conducted improperly and had serious errors;
- (b) the proposed PRH development would be subject to adverse noise impact from CT9, Tsing Sha Highway and Tsing Yi Road;
- (c) the proposed PRH development would be subject to adverse glare impact from CT9 and the nearby logistic centre;
- (d) the proposed PRH development would be subject to adverse air quality impact from CT9 and Tsing Sha Highway;
- (e) the proposed PRH development would impose adverse impacts on visual and air ventilation to nearby residents and would bring about accumulation of dioxin; and

- (f) the trees in the original representation site could provide greening, visual relief and keep air in the area fresh.

15. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing sessions, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) HD had conducted a Broad Environmental Assessment (BEA), which showed that the proposed PRH development with suitable mitigation measures would not have significant adverse environmental impacts;
- (b) the proposed PRH development was separated from CT9 by a site planned for container related uses which could shield the light and noise of CT9. The potential environmental impacts would be minimized in the detailed design of the proposed PRH development through building disposition and implementation of the noise mitigation measures such as acoustic windows/balconies to avoid disturbance of noise and glare to the future residents;
- (c) according to the BEA, 90% of the PRH units could comply with the standards set out in HKPSG. With the implementation of the recommended noise mitigation measures, a 100% noise compliance rate would be achieved in the detailed design;
- (d) the Visual Appraisal revealed that there would be no substantial visual impact imposed by the proposed PRH development;
- (e) the air ventilation assessment (AVA) consultant had advised that based on a qualitative analysis on the reduced development at the remaining "R(A)4" zone, the resultant air ventilation impact would be reduced;
- (f) the major potential source of dioxin was the Chemical Waste Treatment Centre (CWTC) in the southern part of Tsing Yi, which was more than one kilometre away; and

- (g) detailed tree compensation proposal would be formulated at the detailed design stage and transplanting would be considered.

Other Concerns

16. The Meeting noted that some further representers/representers/commenters had made the following major points on the other concerns:

- (a) there were insufficient open space and recreational facilities in Tsing Yi South;
- (b) community facilities should be provided to serve the residents of Tsing Yi South;
- (c) public consultation of the OZP amendment was conducted improperly;
- (d) construction cost would be higher for the proposed PRH development which was situated on a slope; and
- (e) locating in close proximity to a petrol filling station (PFS) would impose danger and risk on the proposed PRH development.

17. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing sessions, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) there was basically no shortfall in major community and recreational facilities in Tsing Yi according to HKPSG;
- (b) the existing/planned provisions of local open space for the Tsing Yi South was about 6 ha, which was more than the requirement of 3.3 ha under HKPSG for the planned population of 33,000;

- (c) although there would be a deficit of hospital beds, the provision was on a regional basis and the Tsing Yi residents could use the hospital facilities in the adjacent districts such as Kwai Chung;
- (d) the K&TDC and local residents were consulted on the OZP amendments. The Board had also conducted hearing sessions and all further representers/representers/commenters were invited to the meeting to present their views. The statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the proposed zoning amendment had been duly followed;
- (e) HD did not envisage any unusual difficulties that would render the PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone particularly costly; and
- (f) there was no liquefied petroleum gas supply in the concerned PFS and it would not impose fire safety impact on the proposed PRH development.

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

Proposals

18. The Meeting noted that some further representers/representers/commenters had made the following proposals:

- (a) to consider alternative sites in other parts of Tsing Yi and brownfield sites for housing development;
- (b) to rezone the remaining “R(A)4” zone to “O”;
- (c) to rezone the remaining “R(A)4” zone to “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) to ensure that the possible traffic and environmental problems could be properly addressed; and

- (d) to rezone the remaining “R(A)4” zone to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) for provision of community facilities or for the expansion of the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Tsing Yi) (the Tsing Yi IVE).

19. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing sessions, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) in order to meet housing needs, a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply was adopted by the Government. Other sites would also be considered for housing purpose, if found suitable and feasible;
- (b) after giving due consideration to the original representations and comments, the Board had decided to rezone the northern portion of the original representation site from “R(A)4” to “O” and considered that the remaining “R(A)4” zone was suitable for PRH development. There was no strong planning justifications provided by the further representations to demonstrate a change in planning circumstances to support the rezoning of the remaining “R(A)4” zone to “O”;
- (c) the planning intention of “R(E)” zone was primarily for phasing out of the existing industrial uses by allowing redevelopment to residential use through the planning application system to avoid perpetuation of industrial/residential interface problem. The remaining “R(A)4” zone and its adjoining sites were not existing industrial uses, and technical assessments had already been conducted for the proposed PRH development to demonstrate that there would be no insurmountable problems; and
- (d) the relevant government bureaux/departments had no request for rezoning the remaining “R(A)4” zone for “G/IC” purpose and the existing campus of Tsing Yi IVE had not fully utilized.

20. The Chairman then invited Members to express their views on various aspects of concerns raised by the further representers/representers/commenters. The Chairman further said that the issues grouped under five main aspects served only as a framework for reference. Members could raise other topics they considered appropriate during the discussion.

21. A Member said that he had paid visits to the site to get a better understanding of it and its surroundings.

Planning Intention and Buffer Area

22. Members noted that most of the further representers/representers/commenters had requested the Board to rezone the remaining “R(A)4” zone to “O” so as to maintain the function of the original representation site as a buffer area between CT9 and the residential developments of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate and to avoid any residential development within the buffer area.

23. A Member said that when the Rambler Crest site and the area to its southwest were zoned “I” on the OZP, there was a need to have a buffer area between the “I” zone and the nearby residential developments; but after the Rambler Crest site was rezoned to “C”, it was no longer necessary to provide a buffer area between the “C” zone and the residential developments. Since the other “I” sites to the southwest of Rambler Crest were zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Container-related Uses” (“OU(Container Related Uses)”), the Member enquired if there was any requirement for provision of buffer between the “OU(Container Related Uses)” zone and residential use. In response, the Secretary said that there was no specific requirement of buffer distance between container-related uses and residential development under the HKPSG. However, in order to comply with the relevant environmental standards, appropriate environmental mitigation measures might be required for individual container-related uses, depending on their nature and scale, for reducing their environmental impacts on the surrounding sensitive uses.

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

24. As regards whether the remaining “R(A)4” zone should be rezoned back to

“O” to serve as a buffer area for shielding the environmental impacts of CT9 and the container-related uses on the nearby residential developments, the Vice-chairman and six Members had the following views:

- (a) Rambler Crest and its adjoining hotel development had already been designed to function as a buffer for screening the noise and glare impacts of CT9 on the residential developments of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate;
- (b) the separation distance between Mayfair Gardens and the polluting uses in the vicinity would not be changed no matter the remaining “R(A)4” zone was used for the proposed PRH development or not. Compared with an open area under the original “O” zone, the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone would be even more effective in shielding off the environmental impacts of CT9 and the container-related uses on Mayfair Gardens. As such, the buffer function, if any, of the remaining “R(A)4” zone for Mayfair Gardens would not be weakened due to the proposed PRH development;
- (c) for the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone, the major sources of environmental impacts were from the operation of the adjacent container-related uses, including the Mapletree Logistics Hub, and traffic noise of the surrounding roads, rather than the operation of CT9. It was noted that there was no specific requirement for buffer distance between container-related and residential uses under the HKPSG. Meanwhile, HD had conducted a BEA to identify the environmental problems pertaining to the original representation site, which revealed that there should be no insurmountable environmental problems. The representatives of HD had also assured that the proposed PRH development could fully meet the noise standards requirement through proper building orientation/design and implementation of mitigation measures;
- (d) notwithstanding there was no set standard on buffer distance between

container-related and residential uses, with the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone as a committed development, the future planning of any new container-related developments at the adjacent “OU(Container Related Uses)” zone would need to propose appropriate mitigation measures to minimise the environmental impacts arising from their operations on the sensitive receivers, including the PRH development as a committed development;

- (e) while the local residents might worry that the future residents at the remaining “R(A)4” zone would become ‘human buffer’, the future residents could decide themselves whether they would like to move in when they were allocated the PRH flat. It was acknowledged that Hong Kong was in dire need of public rental flat. For the future residents, the living conditions of the proposed PRH development might be better than that of their current dwellings;
- (f) as the shipping industry in Hong Kong was shrinking, the usage of CT9 might decrease and hence its environmental impacts on the surrounding areas including the remaining “R(A)4” zone might diminish. In the long run, if the shipping industry continued to decline, part or whole of the site of CT9 might be turned to other more beneficial uses, and the current interface issue might disappear;
- (g) the reversion of the northern part of the original representation site to “O”, which was the decision of the Board after the hearing of the representations and comments held in April 2016, to allow its integration with the existing Tsing Hung Road Playground to form a larger open space development was considered appropriate. Although the “O” zone itself was not regarded as a buffer area, the proposed amendment (i.e. Amendment Item A) would allow sufficient separation distance among the neighbouring developments and a sizable breathing space for the local residents; and

- (h) it was not necessary to revert the remaining “R(A)4” zone back to “O” for the purpose of providing a buffer area between CT9 and the container-related uses with the nearby residential developments.

25. A Member noted that since the planning of CT9, the “O” zone of the original representation site had for a long time been described as serving as a buffer area between the residential developments and CT9 in the ES of the previous Tsing Yi OZPs until the description was deleted in the prevailing OZP No. S/TY/27. The ES also stated that the area for passive recreational purposes should be preserved in the interest of general amenity. There was thus a need to ensure that the new residential development would not be unduly affected by CT9 and associated activities.

26. A Member considered that instead of environmental considerations, the local residents opposed the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone mainly because they were worried that the future residents would compete with them for the existing transport and community facilities and other resources in the area which were currently insufficient. However, the current residents might indeed benefit from the provision of more facilities in the area by the Government in future due to the increase in population from the proposed PRH development.

27. Noting that there was currently no requirement on buffer distance for container-related uses under the HKPSG, a Member suggested that the Government might wish to consider the possibility of setting relevant buffer requirements as the environmental impacts of the container-related uses, which often operated 24 hours a day, could also be significant.

Traffic and Public Transportation

28. Some Members said that they had previously visited/passed through Tsing Yi South. While there was traffic congestion problem in the morning, the road infrastructure in the area was generally adequate. However, there were a lot of people queuing at the bus/GMB stops in the morning peak hours.

29. The Chairman noted that the traffic issues could be considered mainly from

two perspectives, namely, the capacity of road infrastructure and the provision of public transport services. Although the provision of public transport services was strictly speaking outside the purview of the Board as such provision would not be stipulated in the OZP, views of Members could still be conveyed to TD for consideration.

30. Mr Samson S.S. Lam, Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West) of TD, said that in terms of road infrastructure, the representative of TD had explained in the previous hearing sessions that the existing road network in Tsing Yi South was sufficient to cater for the existing traffic demand. The TIA commissioned by HD had already taken into account the committed/planned developments in the area including the proposed PRH development. It was demonstrated that the existing roads including nearby junctions would perform at an acceptable level with the additional traffic generated by the proposed PRH development. A number of traffic improvement measures had also been proposed, including expanding the roundabout at the junction of Tsing Yi Road and Ching Hong Road, and the provision of an on-street lay-by for bus and GMB stops. Regarding some further representers/representers/commenters' query if one-day survey data in the TIA was adequate, it should be noted that TD possessed comprehensive traffic data and had been monitoring the traffic conditions in various districts in Hong Kong. In considering the TIA report, TD had evaluated if the findings of the TIA were consistent with the relevant monitoring data available to TD. With respect to the complaints that one lane of Tsing Yi Road was always closed due to frequent road maintenance/public works, it was noted that the works was commissioned by the Water Supplies Department (WSD) for replacement and rehabilitation of water mains. He understood that the works were targeted to be completed by mid 2017. It was expected that the traffic capacity of the road could be resumed and the traffic conditions in the area could be improved.

31. In terms of public transport services, Mr Samson S.S. Lam said that the service provision was under regular review by TD. TD had conducted on-site surveys on the bus and GMB services in mid-2016 to review if the existing public transport services were sufficient. Given the large number of passengers in the peak hour, it was noted that there were left-behind passengers despite the high frequency of GMB services. The survey results had been presented by the representative of TD at the previous hearing sessions. TD would continue to monitor the public transport services in Tsing Yi South with a view to enhancing the services to meet the needs of the local residents. To cater for the new

traffic demand arising from the population intake of Ching Chun Court in early 2017, TD had already been liaising with the relevant public transport operators to review if enhancement of services was required. The Chairman added that despite concrete proposals on how the public transport services would be enhanced were not available at the moment, it was noted that the public transport services would be reviewed in the near future.

32. Three Members agreed that the road infrastructure in Tsing Yi South was generally adequate and the crux of the issues was how to enhance the public transport services in the area. A Member said that given the distances between Tsing Yi South and the railway stations were about 1.5 km to 2 km, which were outside the walking distance (about 500m) of the railway stations, convenient feeder services should be provided to encourage the local residents to use railway for daily commuting, which tallied with the Government's policy of using railway as the backbone public transport mode. The existing traffic problems encountered by the local residents were mainly related to the insufficient public transport services such as lack of choices and inadequate services at peak hours, and TD could liaise with the public transport operators to address the residents' concern. There was no need to plan for cycle tracks in Tsing Yi South as it was not suitable for cycling in consideration of the physical topography and road network. Another Member said that the external road connection in Tsing Yi was comprehensive and the road capacity should be fully utilized to solve the existing traffic problems in Tsing Yi South. For example, public transport should be allowed to use Stonecutters Bridge to/from the urban areas. Besides, covered walkway system should be provided to encourage the local residents to walk to the railway stations. Another Member said that in view of the illegal parking near the cul-de-sac of Tsing Yi Road, adequate parking spaces should be provided in the proposed PRH development according to HKPSG's requirement.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left this session of the meeting at this point.]

33. Noting that a number of further representers/representers/commenters complained about the poor traffic condition and the inadequate provision of public transport services in the peak hours, a Member said that those views should be passed to TD such that TD could take appropriate actions to resolve the problems as soon as possible. Given Tsing Hung Road, which provided access for both the container-related uses and the

Rambler Crest site, was one of the problematic roads with road safety concerns in the area, the Member suggested to restrict vehicles entering/leaving the hotel and residential portions of Rambler Crest via Tsing Hung Road, and to have a new ingress/egress for Rambler Crest from the north near the sewage treatment plant.

34. A Member said that although the TIA concluded that the public transport services were sufficient in general, the further representers/representers/commenters had pointed out some problems such as the bus stop near Rambler Crest was the last stop before entering Tsing Yi south bridge and shuttle bus service for Rambler Crest was not allowed by TD. As traffic was the main concern of the local residents, priority should be given to resolve the traffic problems seriously. For example, some of the bus routes could be rearranged with starting point at Tsing Yi South such that the bus stop near Rambler Crest would have more capacity before leaving Tsing Yi, shuttle bus service could be provided by the hotels to serve also the residents of Rambler Crest, and some routes could be allowed to pass through Stonecutters Bridge to/from the urban areas. The Government should think out of the box to address the local residents' concern.

35. The Vice-chairman said that it was necessary to distinguish between planning and implementation issues. As for planning considerations, a TIA had been conducted for the proposed PRH development. According to the findings of the TIA, the existing roads including junctions nearby would still perform at acceptable levels with the additional traffic generated by the proposed PRH development. The TIA had been conducted in accordance with Transport Planning and Design Manual and was accepted by TD. As for the implementation issues, both the further representers/representers/commenters and the representative of TD provided their observations and views on the provision of public transport services. The existing level of services was not satisfactory from the perspective of many residents. Indeed, the status quo might well continue if no new development was built. The proposed PRH development and rezoning proposal could provide a new opportunity to resolve the traffic problems. In the planning of public transport facilities, population density was one of the major considerations. Given the economy of scale in the provision of public transport services, the increase in population might result in better service provision, such as adding new routes and adjusting the frequency of the existing routes, resulting in shorter waiting time. As the formulation of an improvement plan was crucial, TD should be urged to handle the issue cautiously.

Before the development of the proposed PRH, TD should also be requested to closely monitor the existing situation and adopt remedial measures if necessary, such that the local residents could be benefited from the improved public transport services at an earlier stage.

36. A Member said that the provision of public transport services would depend on the demand. If there was an increase in demand arising from the increase in population, the operators would have more incentive to enhance the services. For example, the rearrangement of the GMB services due to the opening of the West Island Line and the South Island Line might free up resources and provide an opportunity for improving the GMB services in Tsing Yi South.

37. Members noted that TD had advised that the bus and GMB services would be reviewed and enhanced to tally with the population intake of the committed/planned residential developments. A Member said although the frustration of local residents caused by the long waiting time for public transport services in the peak hours was understandable, such traffic concerns during the peak hours were not uncommon in other districts in Hong Kong.

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

38. Noting that some further representers/representers/commenters had cast doubt on whether the TIA had underestimated the traffic demand as the survey was conducted one day before the Easter Holiday, a Member wondered if that could be ascertained and properly recorded. The Chairman noted that the government representatives had responded that the TIA had been conducted in accordance with TD's requirement and the established practice. The Secretary and Mr Samson S.S. Lam supplemented that according to the information provided by the government representatives, two surveys had been conducted, one was conducted on 31.3.2015 to estimate the passenger demand on the road based public transport services, and another was conducted on 29.1.2015 on traffic flow. The Member said that if that was the case, the fact was that the survey was conducted three days before the Easter Holiday.

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok left this session of the meeting at this point.]

39. A Member said that although the existing traffic condition was affected by the road maintenance/public works, those works were temporary in nature and the traffic conditions would be improved after completion of the works.

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

Environmental Concerns

40. A Member said that the hearing on the further representations on the proposed amendment to the draft OZP, which was made to partially meet the adverse representations, was a continuation of the hearing procedures. A focus of the current decision should therefore be on whether the proposed rezoning of the northern portion of the original representation site from “R(A)4” zone to “O” zone was appropriate. As most of the environmental considerations had been deliberated at the previous consideration and the Board had agreed to maintain the southern portion of the original representation site for PRH development, the previous discussion related to the remaining “R(A)4” zone should not be repeated unless there was new information provided by the further representers/representers/commenters. With respect to the environmental concerns recapitulated by the Secretary earlier in the meeting, they were mainly further elaborations of the issues previously discussed. Given the proposed rezoning of the northern portion of the original representation site to “O” zone would not induce adverse environmental impacts, the previous views on the environmental issues should be maintained. Four Members concurred with the above views.

41. A Member said that while the environmental concerns were similar to those previously discussed, it was noted that the issue of dioxin was newly raised by the further representers and that HD had given a more thorough explanation on the design and operation of acoustic window/balcony at the hearing of further representations. On glare issue, despite there was no stipulated standard to measure the glare impact, relevant government departments should adopt appropriate measures to address the concern of the local residents. With respect to air quality and noise issues, the government representatives had assured that the future design of the proposed PRH development would comply with relevant regulations and standards. A Member suggested that although there was still uncertainty on the implementation issues, the Board could consider if the

proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” site could provide a liveable environment for the future residents, which could be considered in two dimensions, including the compliance with relevant standards/regulations, as well as the fulfilment of the aspiration of the future residents. Given the future residents were non-existent at the moment, the current decision could only be made based on the best available information and to ensure that the best design had been adopted to address the concerns of the local residents.

42. Mr C.W. Tse, Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1), said that there were currently three monitoring stations for dioxin in Hong Kong, one of which was located in Cheung Ching Estate. As there was stringent control on the emission of dioxin at CWTC, the level of dioxin recorded at the Cheung Ching Estate station was similar to the other two stations. Although there was no stipulated ambient air standard for dioxin in Hong Kong, reference could be made to the relevant standard adopted in Japan. The measured level of dioxin in Hong Kong was very low and only about one-tenth of the limit stipulated by the Japanese standard.

43. A Member said that whether an area was liveable or not could be assessed by indicators such as sunlight penetration, air ventilation and view fan. For the existing sensitive receivers, the proposed PRH development could help screen off the adverse glare, air and noise impacts from CT9. However, the views of the residential developments in Cheung Ching Estate and Mayfair Gardens might be blocked by the proposed PRH development. For the future residents in the proposed PRH development, they might be more exposed to adverse glare and noise impacts but would have better sea views. It was noted that the proposed acoustic balcony was a good mitigation solution, which could screen off the noise while allowing natural ventilation at the same time. However, the acoustic window/balcony should be designed carefully so as to provide effective mitigation.

44. Noting that the proposed PRH development would be subject to potential road traffic noise impact, a Member asked how the noise level was measured. In response, Mr C.W. Tse said that the planning standards for traffic noise for domestic premises at outdoor and indoor environment were 70 dB(A) and 60 dB(A) respectively. The noise standard was presented in terms of $L_{10}(1 \text{ hour})$, which was very stringent. It

meant the average of the highest 10% sound level of the peak noise hour over a 24-hour period. Also, the acoustic balcony was not a theoretical design and had already been incorporated at Wing Cheong Estate in Sham Shui Po, which was right next to West Kowloon Corridor and subject to a noise level of over 80 dB(A), much higher than the noise level of 72-73 dB(A) in the proposed PRH site. The acoustic balcony had proved to be effective in reducing the noise impact to meeting the planning noise limits for the much noisier Wing Cheong Estate.

45. In response to a Member's question on the results of HD's background noise level measurement carried out in the BEA, which revealed that the noise level at the northern boundary of the original representation site (being closer to Cheung Ching Estate) was higher than the southern site boundary (being closer to CT9), Mr C.W. Tse commented that distance from the noise source was the major factor affecting the noise level. EPD had scrutinised the results of the background noise level measurement conducted by HD in the BEA. For the original representation site, road traffic noise was the more significant noise source because CT9 was in comparison located farther away from the site. The assessed noise level of the proposed PRH development at the original representation site exceeded EPD's noise standards by a few dB(A). From noise management angle, noise of this level could be abated with appropriate mitigation measures, such as suitable building orientation and construction of architectural fins, acoustic windows and balconies. Furthermore, HD would submit another detailed environmental assessment to EPD for vetting at a later stage to ensure that the relevant noise standards would be met.

46. As regards the air quality issue, Mr Tse commented that the air pollution level in Tsing Yi was not particularly high compared with other parts of Hong Kong. As regards air pollution that might arise from the operation of CT9 in the area, local vessels had been required to use lower sulphur diesel since 1994 to reduce 90% of the emission of sulphur dioxide into the air, and ocean going vessels berthing in the Hong Kong waters had also been required to use onshore power supply since 2015 to reduce the emission of sulphur dioxide from vessels. Over the past two years, the area in Kwai Tsing had recorded a reduction of 55% in sulphur dioxide emission.

47. A Member said that as the remaining "R(A)4" site was close to CT9 and

container related uses, the environmental concerns should be carefully tackled. The Member said that while the local residents had concerns on the adverse glare impact, it was noted in the responses of the government representatives that relevant measures would be adopted to minimize the adverse impacts. The Member concurred with the other Members' view that the environmental issues in relation to the proposed PRH development would not cause insurmountable problems.

48. A Member said that the proposed rezoning of the northern portion of the original representation site from "R(A)4" back to "O" was a right decision as all of the further representers/representers/commenters welcomed the proposal. As for the proposed PRH development at the remaining "R(A)4" zone, no matter whether it was labelled as a buffer area for CT9, there would be a need to put in place adequate mitigation measures to address the environmental concerns due to its proximity to CT9 and container related uses. In that regard, HD should input more effort in the design of the proposed PRH development instead of just meeting the minimum standards of the relevant regulations. The design of the whole development should be people-oriented with a view to providing a good living environment for the future residents and not to repeat the mistakes in the development of Rambler Crest.

49. The Chairman said that such views could be passed to the relevant departments for consideration. A Member agreed and said that, once the Board was satisfied with the proposed amendment to the OZP, the relevant government departments should have the flexibility to consider how best to take into account Member's views regarding the detailed design of the proposed PRH development.

Other Concerns

50. A Member said that some further representers/representers/commenters had raised concern on the poor condition of the existing local open space and the inadequate provision of retail space in particular wet market in the area. The existing retail provision in Rambler Crest was only of a small scale. As the two proposed residential developments nearby, i.e. Ching Chun Court and Sai Shan Road site, would be completed shortly, the demand for wet market would increase. Regarding the condition of the local open space, the Member considered that it was a management problem instead of a land

use issue. Notwithstanding that, the Member would like to suggest that HD should be requested to consider whether a market could be provided within the proposed PRH development to meet the local demand.

51. As the further representation site would probably remain as a passive green open area instead of being developed into an active open space, a Member suggested that decking over part of the proposed PRH development for landscaping and local open space underneath might be considered so as to form an integral part of green area and local open space with the “O” site under the proposed amendment. Three Members considered that more community facilities and children play area could be incorporated in the proposed PRH development.

52. A Member said that although the provision of supporting facilities in Tsing Yi as a whole was sufficient, such facilities might be concentrated in Tsing Yi North. To address the problem of inadequate supporting facilities in Tsing Yi South, relevant government departments should review if the supporting facilities should be improved in Tsing Yi South, in particular after the population intake of the committed/planned residential developments near Cheung Ching Estate and Mayfair Gardens, such that the local residents would be benefited from the proposed PRH development.

Proposals

53. The Chairman noted that the proposals raised by the further representers/representers/commenters included rezoning of the remaining “R(A)4” zone to “O”, “R(E)”, or “G/IC” zones and consideration of alternative suitable sites.

54. A Member said that should the Board consider its decision on retaining the “R(A)4” zoning for the remaining original representation site was still appropriate, other zoning proposals should logically be ruled out. The Vice-chairman said that the remaining “R(A)4” zone represented a decision already made by the Board after giving consideration to the representations and comments, and had been thoroughly discussed during the hearing.

55. The Meeting considered that after giving due consideration on the grounds of

the further representations and responses from relevant government departments, further amendment to the OZP would not be necessary. However, the various concerns of the further representers/representers/commenters were noted and opportunity should be taken to explore how various issues as raised could be addressed. It was noted that the local residents' concerns on the provision of public transport services and the potential environmental impacts on the future residents of the PRH development would be consolidated by the Secretariat in the form of a letter to the concerned government departments, including to request TD to conduct regular reviews on public transport services provision in Tsing Yi South and to request HD to incorporate appropriate mitigation measures in the detailed design of the proposed PRH development.

56. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of F1 to F72 and decided not to uphold the remaining views of F1 to F72, the views of F77 to F1616 and F1618 to F2219, and the opposing views of F2450 to F2473, and agreed that the draft Tsing Yi OZP should be amended by the proposed amendment for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed amendment of “Open Space” (“O”) zone under Amendment Item A is appropriate as it would enable the development of a consolidated open space among the surrounding residential developments;
- (b) the remaining “Residential (Group A)4” (“R(A)4”) zone is considered suitable for the PRH development with no insurmountable noise, air ventilation, light pollution and traffic issues. There is no strong planning justifications provided in the further representations to demonstrate a change in planning circumstances to support the rezoning of the remaining “R(A)4” zone to “O”, “Residential (Group E)”, “Government, Institution or Community” or other zones;
- (c) the planned provision of major Government, institution and community facilities and open space are generally sufficient to meet the demand of the existing and future population; and
- (d) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on

the proposed zoning amendments have been duly followed. The exhibition of OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance.”

57. The Board also noted that, in accordance with section 6H of the Ordinance, the OZP should thereafter be read as including the amendments. The amendments should be made available for public inspection until the Chief Executive in Council had made a decision in respect of the OZP in question under section 9 of the Ordinance.

58. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.