

APPENDIX 8A

TRAFFIC STATEMENT



**Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction
for Permitted Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) and
Proposed House Use with Conservation Proposal at Lot nos. 1695 S.E ss.1 RP,
1695 S.F ss.1 and 1695 S.H RP (Part) in D.D. 120 and Adjoining Government Land,
Tai Kei Leng, Yuen Long**

Traffic Statement

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Traffic Statement is to support the Section 16 (S16) planning application for Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) and Proposed House Use with Conservation Proposal at Lot nos. 1695 S.E ss.1 RP, 1695 S.F ss.1 and 1695 S.H RP (Part) in D.D. 120 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Kei Leng, Yuen Long.
- 1.2 The applicant has put forward a conservation-cum-development proposal on the Site. A S16 planning application (Planning Application No. A/YL/289) was approved in July 2022. A new S16 planning application with new development parameters is now applying.
- 1.3 The tentative development parameters for the Proposals are shown below:

**Table 1.1 Development Parameters for the Approved Scheme
(Planning Application No. A/YL/289)**

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Site Area | About 1,953 m ² |
| GFA | About 5,930 m ² |
| No. of Beds | 281 (or within a range of 260 – 300) |

Table 1.2 Development Parameters for the This Application

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Site Area | About 1,877.1 m ² |
| GFA | About 6,956 m ² |
| No. of Beds | 241 beds (or within a range of 220 – 260) |



- 1.4 This Traffic Statement is therefore prepared to identify the magnitude of the change in traffic volume generated from the proposed development, and its impact due to this minor change.

2. THE FINDINGS

- 2.1 **Table 2.1** gives a detail calculation on the estimated traffic trips induced by the proposed development.

Table 2.1 Derivation of the Traffic Trips on the Scenarios

| | Approved Scheme (Planning Application No. A/YL/289) | | | | This Application | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | AM Peak | | PM Peak | | AM Peak | | PM Peak | |
| | Gen. | Attn. | Gen. | Attn. | Gen. | Attn. | Gen. | Attn. |
| Site Area | About 1,953 m ² | | | | About 1,877.1 m ² | | | |
| GFA | About 5,930 m ² | | | | About 6,956 m ² | | | |
| No. of Beds | 281 beds (or within a range of 260 – 300) | | | | 241 beds (or within a range of 220 – 260) | | | |
| Trip Rates (pcu/hr/flat) | 0.08633 | 0.08633 | 0.08633 | 0.08633 | 0.08633 | 0.08633 | 0.08633 | 0.08633 |
| Trips (pcu/hr) | 26 | 21 | 13 | 17 | 22 | 18 | 11 | 15 |

Note:

1) Upper range of no. of beds is adopted as conservative approach.

- 2.2 **Table 2.2** gives a comparison of the traffic generated by the development with 300 beds and 260 beds.

Table 2.2 Comparison of the Traffic Trips

| | Peak Hour Trips (pcu/hr) | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | AM Peak | | PM Peak | |
| | Gen. | Attn. | Gen. | Attn. |
| This Application (260 beds) | 22 | 18 | 11 | 15 |
| Approved Scheme (300 beds) | 26 | 21 | 13 | 17 |
| Difference | -4 | -3 | -2 | -2 |



2.3 From **Table 2.2**, it is revealed that the decrease of no. of beds from 300 to 260 will generate lesser traffic trips in the peak hours.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 With the decrease of no. of beds from 300 to 260, the proposed development will generate lesser traffic trips in the peak hours. The traffic impact by the proposed development to road network under the new application will be even smaller than the approved scheme.

3.2 Therefore, the assessment in the TIA (Planning Application No. A/YL/289) approved in July 2022 is already in conservative approach and could be adopted for this new application. The proposed change is therefore considered acceptable from traffic engineering point of view.