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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

## Background

1.1 The subject site is located in D.D.130, Lam Tei, Tuen Mun (the "Subject Site"). At present, the Subject Site is unoccupied, and access to the Subject Site via an existing unnamed road which is connected to Ng Lau Road. The location of the Subject Site is shown in Figure 1.1.
1.2 A Section 12A planning application for the minor relaxation of the maximum plot ratio restriction to 2.5 for residential use at the Subject Site was approved by the Town Planning Board (TPB ref: Y/TM-LTYY/9) on $24^{\text {th }}$ September 2021 (the "Approved Scheme"). This Section 12A planning application is for minor relaxation of the maximum plot ratio restriction for residential use at the Subject Site from the approved 2.5 to 5.0 (the "Proposed Development").
1.3 Against this background, CKM Asia Limited, a traffic and transportation planning consultancy firm, was commissioned by the Owner to conduct a traffic impact assessment in support of the Proposed Development. This report presents the findings and recommendations of the traffic impact assessment for the Proposed Development.

## Structure of Report

1.4 The report is structured as follows:

Chapter One - Gives the background of the project;
Chapter Two - Describes the existing situation;
Chapter Three - Presents the Proposed Development;
Chapter Four - Describes the traffic impact analysis; and
Chapter Five - Gives the overall conclusion.

### 2.0 EXISTING SITUATION

## The Subject Site

2.1 The Subject Site is bounded by the Light Rail Transit ("LRT") and the Tuen Ma Line to the East, and a nullah to the West. Access to the Subject Site is from the south and is via a bridge over the nullah. The Access Road is connected to Ng Lau Road.

## The Road Network

2.2 Ng Lau Road is a single carriageway 2-lane 2-way local distributor which connects with the Lam Tei Interchange to the south and Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei underneath the Kong Sham Western Highway. It provides access to villages, e.g., San Hing Tsuen, Tuen Tsz Wai, and Tsing Chuen Wai.
2.3 Lam Tei Interchange connects Tsing Lun Road, Hong Po Road, Ng Lau Road, Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei, Yuen Long Highway and Tuen Mun Road. It is the main access for traffic accessing the Subject Site and strategic routes.

## Existing Traffic Flows

2.4 To quantify the traffic flows in the vicinity of the Subject Site, manual classified counts were conducted on Tuesday, $18^{\text {th }}$ April 2023, Wednesday, $19^{\text {th }}$ April 2023 and Wednesday, $26^{\text {th }}$ April 2023 during the AM and PM peak at the following junctions:

- J1: Unnamed Road/ Access Road;
- J2: Ng Lau Road/ Unnamed Road;
- J3: Ng Lau Road / Lam Tei Interchange;
- J4: Tsing Lun Road/ Hong Po Road/ Lam Tei Interchange;
- J5: Lam Tei Interchange;
- J6: Lam Tei Interchange/ Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei;
- J7: Tsing Lun Road/ Tsz Tin Road;
- J8: San Hing Road / Ng Lau Road (Southern);
- J9: San Hing Road / Ng Lau Road (Northern);
- J10: T-junction at San Hing Road;
- J11: Ng Lau Road / Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei; and
- J12: Hong Po Road / Yan Tin Estate Access Road.
2.5 The locations of these junctions and the area of influence (the "AOI") are shown in Figure 2.1 and the layouts are shown in Figures 2.2-2.13 respectively.
2.6 The traffic counts are classified by vehicle type to enable traffic flows in passenger car units ("pcu") to be calculated. The AM and PM peak hours identified from the surveys are found to be between $0800-0900$ hours and 1700 - 1800 hours respectively. The existing AM and PM peak hour traffic flows in pcu/hour are presented in Figure 2.14.


## Existing Junction Performance

2.7 The existing junction performance of the surveyed junctions are calculated based on the existing traffic flows, and the analysis was undertaken using the methods outlined in Volume 2 of the Transport Planning and Design Manual ("TPDM").

The results are summarised in Table 2.1 and the detailed calculations are found in Appendix A.

TABLE 2.1 EXISTING JUNCTION PERFORMANCE

| Ref. | Junction | Type of Junction <br> (Parameter) | AM <br> Peak | PM <br> Peak |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J1 | Unnamed Road/ Access Road | Priority (DFC) | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| J2 | Ng Lau Road/ Unnamed Road | Priority (DFC) | 0.033 | 0.030 |
| J3 | Ng Lau Road/ Lam Tei Interchange | Signal (RC) | $104 \%$ | $95 \%$ |
| J4 | Tsing Lun Road/ Hong Po Road/ Lam Tei Interchange | RA (DFC) | 0.501 | 0.548 |
| J5 | Lam Tei Interchange | RA (DFC) | 0.480 | 0.453 |
| J6 | Lam Tei Interchange/ Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei | Signal (RC) | $129 \%$ | $223 \%$ |
| J7 | Tsing Lun Road/ Tsz Tin Road | Signal (RC) | $67 \%$ | $111 \%$ |
| J8 | San Hing Road/ Ng Lau Road (Southern) | Priority (DFC) | 0.057 | 0.037 |
| J9 | San Hing Road/ Ng Lau Road (Northern) | Priority (DFC) | 0.223 | 0.496 |
| J10 | T-junction at San Hing Road | Priority (DFC) | 0.006 | 0.002 |
| J11 | Ng Lau Road / Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei | Signal (RC) | $140 \%$ | $133 \%$ |
| J12 | Hong Po Road / Yan Tin Estate Access Road | Priority (DFC) | 0.060 | 0.011 |

Note: RC - reserve capacity; DFC - design flow/capacity ratio, RA - Roundabout
2.8 The above results indicate that the surveyed junctions currently operate with capacities during the AM and PM peak hours.

## Link Operational Performance

2.9 The link operational performance of the surveyed road links are calculated based on the existing traffic flows, and the analysis was undertaken using the methods outlined in Volume 2 of the Transport Planning and Design Manual ("TPDM"). The results are summarised in Table 2.2.

## TABLE 2.2 EXISTING LINK CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

| Ref | Link |  | Adjusted Design Flow (veh/hr) |  | Traffic Demand (veh/hr) |  | V/C Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | PM Peak | AM Peak | PM Peak | AM Peak | PM Peak |
| L1 | Castle Peak Road - LamTei | NB | 2,604 | 2,520 | 763 | 1,314 | 0.29 | 0.52 |
|  |  | SB | 2,604 | 2,604 | 1,444 | 763 | 0.55 | 0.29 |
| L2 | Castle Peak Road Lingnan | NB | 2,800 | 2,800 | 385 | 419 | 0.14 | 0.15 |
|  |  | SB | 2,604 | 2,800 | 625 | 450 | 0.24 | 0.16 |
| L3 | Yuen Long Highway | NB | 4,700 | 4,700 | 4,462 | 4,810 | 0.95 | 1.02 |
|  |  | SB | 4,700 | 4,371 | 3,615 | 3,962 | 0.77 | 0.91 |
| L4 | Tuen Mun Road | NB | 4,700 | 4,700 | 4,821 | 5,833 | 1.03 | 1.24 |
|  |  | SB | 4,371 | 4,371 | 4,360 | 3,933 | 1.00 | 0.90 |
| L5 | San Hing Road | 2-way | 744 | 800 | 43 | 29 | 0.06 | 0.04 |
| L6 | Ng Lau Road (north of J9) | 2-way | 744 | 800 | 215 | 344 | 0.29 | 0.43 |
| L7 | Ng Lau Road (south of J2) | 2-way | 744 | 800 | 249 | 371 | 0.33 | 0.46 |
| L8 | Lam Tei Interchange (between J3 and J5) | EB | 2,604 | 2,800 | 917 | 638 | 0.35 | 0.23 |
|  |  | WB | 2,800 | 2,800 | 1,011 | 1,100 | 0.36 | 0.39 |
| L9 | Tsing Lun Road | NB | 1,767 | 1,767 | 448 | 371 | 0.25 | 0.21 |
|  |  | SB | 1,900 | 1,900 | 775 | 685 | 0.41 | 0.36 |

$N B$ - northbound $\quad S B$ - southbound $\quad E B$ - eastbound $\quad W B$ - westbound
2.10 The above results show that the assessed road links operate with sufficient capacity, except for Tuen Mun Road northbound, which is operating with V/C ratios at 1.24 during PM peak hours.
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## Public Transport Facilities

2.11 The Subject Site is located close to public transport services, including franchised buses and public light buses and these operate within 400 metres or some 8minutes' walk away. Details of these public transport services are presented in Table 2.3. The location and major pedestrian routes of these public transport services are shown in Figure 2.15.

TABLE 2.3 ROAD-BASED PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES OPERATING CLOSE TO THE SUBJECT SITE

| Route | Routing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Frequency } \\ & (\mathrm{min}) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CTB 50 ${ }^{(1)}$ | Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) $\rightarrow$ Tsim Sha Tsui (Kowloon Station) ${ }^{(A)}$ | 4 per day |
|  | Tsim Sha Tsui (Kowloon Station) $\rightarrow$ Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) ${ }^{(8)}$ | 4 per day |
| CTB 55 ${ }^{(1)}$ | Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) $\rightarrow$ Kwun Tong Ferry Pier ${ }^{\left({ }^{(1)}\right.}$ | 4 per day |
|  | Kwun Tong Ferry Pier $\rightarrow$ Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) ${ }^{(8)}$ | 4 per day |
| CTB 56 ${ }^{(1)}$ | Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) $\rightarrow$ Sheung Shui (Tin Ping Estate) ${ }^{(A)}$ | 4 per day |
|  | Sheung Shui (Tin Ping Estate) $\rightarrow$ Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) ${ }^{(B)}$ | 4 per day |
| CTB 56A ${ }^{(1)}$ | Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) $\rightarrow$ Queen's Hill Fanling (via: Sheung Shui Station) | 3 per day |
|  | Queen's Hill Fanling (via: Sheung Shui Station) $\rightarrow$ Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) ${ }^{(C)}$ | 2 per day |
| CTB 950 ${ }^{(1)}$ | Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) $\rightarrow$ Exhibition Centre Station ${ }^{\left({ }^{\text {( }}\right.}$ | 1 per day |
|  | Exhibition Centre Station $\rightarrow$ Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) ${ }^{(B)}$ | 1 per day |
| CTB 955 ${ }^{(1)}$ | Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) $\rightarrow$ Sai Wan Ho ${ }^{(A)}$ | 1 per day |
|  | Sai Wan Ho $\rightarrow$ Tuen Mun (Ching Tin and Wo Tin) ${ }^{(B)}$ | 1 per day |
| CTB B3A | Shan King Estate - Shenzhen Bay Port | 30-60 |
| CTB N969 ${ }^{\text {(D) }}$ | Tin Shui Wai Town Centre - Causeway Bay (Moreton Terrace) | 20-45 |
| KMB 53 | Yoho Mall (Yuen Long) - Tsuen Wan (Nina Tower) | 25-35 |
| KMB 63X | Hung Shui Kiu (Hung Fuk Estate) - Jordan (West Kowloon Station) | 12-30 |
| KMB 67M | Tuen Mun (Siu Hong Court) - Kwai Fong Station | 5-20 |
| KMB 67X | Tuen Mun (Siu Hong Court) - Mong Kok East Station | 6-25 |
| KMB 68A | Long Ping Estate - Tsing Yi Station | 8-25 |
| KMB 258A ${ }^{(1)}$ | Hung Shui Kiu (Hung Fuk Estate) $\rightarrow$ Lam Tin Station | 2 per day |
| KMB 258P ${ }^{(2)}$ | Hung Shui Kiu (Hung Fuk Estate) - Lam Tin Station | 12-30 |
| KMB 261P | Tuen Mun (Siu Hong Court) $\rightarrow$ Sheung Shui (Tin Ping) ${ }^{(2)(A)}$ | 2-3 per day |
|  | Sheung Shui (Tin Ping) $\rightarrow$ Tuen Mun (Siu Hong Court) ${ }^{(1)(\text { (3) }}$ | 1 per day |
| KMB 267X ${ }^{(1)}$ | Tuen Mun (Siu Hong Court) $\rightarrow$ Lam Tin Station ${ }^{\text {(A) }}$ | 2 per day |
|  | Lam Tin Station $\rightarrow$ Tuen Mun (Siu Hong Court) ${ }^{(B)}$ | 2 per day |
| KMB 960A ${ }^{(1)}$ | Central $\rightarrow$ Hung Shui Kiu (Hung Fuk Estate) ${ }^{(1)}$ | 1 per day |
| KMB 960C ${ }^{(1)}$ | Tuen Mun (Fu Tai Estate) $\rightarrow$ Causeway Bay (Victoria Park) ${ }^{(A)}$ | 2 per day |
|  | Causeway Bay (Victoria Park) $\rightarrow$ Tuen Mun (Fu Tai Estate) ${ }^{(8)}$ | 1 per day |
| KMB 960P | Hung Shui Kiu (Hung Yuen Road) $\rightarrow$ Causeway Bay (Victoria Park) | 10-35 |
|  | Causeway Bay (Victoria Park) $\rightarrow$ Hung Shui Kiu (Hung Yuen Road) ${ }^{(1)(B)}$ | 1 per day |
| KMB 960X ${ }^{(1)}$ | Hung Shui Kiu (Hung Yuen Road) $\rightarrow$ Quarry Bay (King's Road) ${ }^{(A)}$ | 8 per day |
|  | Quarry Bay (King's Road) $\rightarrow$ Hung Shui Kiu (Hung Yuen Road) ${ }^{(8)}$ | 8 per day |
| KMB N260 ${ }^{\text {(D) }}$ | Tuen Mun Pier Head - Mei Foo | 20-25 |
| LWB A34 | Hung Shui Kiu (Hung Yuen Road) - Airport (Ground Transportation Centre) | 20-60 |
| LWB E33P | Siu Hong Station (South) - Airport (Ground Transportation Centre) | 12-45 |
| LWB NA33 ${ }^{(\mathrm{D})}$ | Tuen Mun (Fu Tai Estate) $\rightarrow$ Cathay Pacific City | 3 per day |
|  | Cathay Pacific City $\rightarrow$ Tuen Mun (Fu Tai Estate) | 5 per day |
| LWB NA37 ${ }^{(\mathrm{D})}$ | Tin Shui Wai Town Centre $\rightarrow$ Cathay Pacific City | 5 per day |
|  | Cathay Pacific City $\rightarrow$ Tin Shui Wai Town Centre | 6 per day |
| NLB B2 | Yuen Long MTR Station - Shenzhen Bay Port | 25-40 |
| GMB 42 | Tsing Chuen Wai - Tuen Mun Town Centre | 13-15 |
| GMB 606S ${ }^{(\text {D })}$ | Yuen Long (Fung Cheung Rd) - Tsim Sha Tsui East | 6-13 |

KMB - Kowloon Motor Bus $\quad$ LWB - Long Win Bus $\quad$ CTB - CityBus $\quad$ GMB - Green Minibus NLB - New Lantao Bus
Note: ${ }^{(1)}$ Monday to Friday. (Except public holidays)
${ }^{(2)}$ Monday to Saturday (Except public holidays)
${ }^{(A)}$ AM peak only ${ }^{\text {(B) }}$ PM peak only
${ }^{(C)}$ AM and PM peak only ${ }^{\text {(D) }}$ Overnight service

## Survey on Road-based Public Transport Services Located in the Vicinity

## Road-based Public Transport

2.12 Survey on road-based public transport services listed in Table 2.3 was conducted during the AM and PM peak periods on Thursday, $18^{\text {th }}$ January 2024 at the bus stops near the subject site. The survey locations are shown in Figure 2.15. The survey results are summarized in Table 2.4 and the detailed information are shown in Appendix B.

TABLE 2.4 OCCUPANCY OF EXISTING ROAD-BASED PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES OPERATING NEAR THE SUBJECT SITE

| Direction | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Passenger |  | Occupancy$[c]=[b] /[a]$ | No. of Passenger |  | Occupancy$[f]=[e] /[d]$ |
|  | Capacity [a] | Occupied [b] |  | Capacity [d] | Occupied [e] |  |
| Outbound - To other districts | 5,057 | 3,588 | 71\% | 2,398 | 813 | 34\% |
| Inbound - From other districts | 2,297 | 823 | 36\% | 2,915 | 1,823 | 63\% |

2.13 The above results indicate that the surveyed road-based public transport services currently operate with spare capacities during the AM and PM peak hours.

## Rail-based Public Transport

2.14 Based on the information obtained from the Legislative Council, the operational performance for MTR Tuen Ma Line in 2022 is summarized in Table 2.5.

TABLE 2.5 OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF MTR TUEN MA LINE

| Item | Parameters |
| :--- | :--- |
| Maximum carrying capacity when train frequency <br> maximized [a] | 70,000 passengers / hour |
| Existing carrying capacity [b] | 58,800 passengers / hour ${ }^{(1)}$ |
| Current Patronage [c] | 34,500 passengers / hour ${ }^{(2)}$ |
| Current Loading [c]/[b] \{Critical Link\} | $59 \%$ \{Tsuen Wan West to Mei Foo \} |
| Loading compared with maximum carrying capacity [c]/[a] | $50 \%$ |

Source: Reply Serial No. TLB168 for Question Serial No. 1237, Controlling Officer's Reply, Examination of Estimates of Expenditure 2023-24. Finance Committee. Legislative Council. 14 April 2023. [https://www.legco.gov.hk/yr2023/english/fc/fc/w_q/tlb-e.pdf](https://www.legco.gov.hk/yr2023/english/fc/fc/w_q/tlb-e.pdf)
${ }^{(1)}$ According to the reply, existing train frequency has not yet increased to the maximum level as permitted by the signaling system.
${ }^{(2)}$ According to the reply, in view of the impact of COVID-2019, patronage shown is based on those months in 2022 when the pandemic situation was relatively eased.
2.15 Table 2.5 shows that the MTR Tuen Ma Line operates at $59 \%$ of its current capacity, or $50 \%$ of its maximum carrying capacity during the peak hour.

## Existing Footpath Level-Of-Service

2.16 To quantify the existing pedestrian flows, pedestrian counts were conducted during the AM and PM peak periods on Thursday, $18^{\text {th }}$ January 2024 at footpaths located in the vicinity of Proposed Development, and the observed peak 15minute pedestrian flows are shown in Figure 2.16.
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2.17 The Level-Of-Service ("LOS") of a pedestrian footpath depends on its width and number of pedestrians using the facility. Description of the LOS at walkway is obtained from Volume 6 of the TPDM and is presented in Table 2.6.

TABLE 2.6 DESCRIPTION OF PEDESTRIAN FOOTPATH LOS

| LOS | Flow Rate <br> (ped/min/m) | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | $\leq 16$ | Pedestrians basically move in desired paths without altering their movements in response to <br> other pedestrians. Walking speeds are freely selected, and conflicts between pedestrians are <br> unlikely. |
| B | $16-23$ | Sufficient space is provided for pedestrians to freely select their walking speeds, to bypass <br> other pedestrians and to avoid crossing conflicts with others. At this level, pedestrians begin <br> to be aware of other pedestrians and to respond to their presence in the selection of walking <br> paths. |
| C | $23-33$ | Sufficient space is available to select normal walking speeds and to bypass other pedestrians <br> primarily in unidirectional stream. Where reverse direction or crossing movement exist, <br> minor conflicts will occur, and speed and volume will be somewhat lower. |
| D | $33-49$ | Freedom to select individual walking speeds and bypass other pedestrians is restricted. <br> Where crossing or reverse-flow movements exist, the probability of conflicts is high and its <br> avoidance requires changes of speeds and position. The LOS provides reasonable fluid flow; <br> however considerable friction and interactions between pedestrians are likely to occur. |
| E | $49-75$ | Virtually, all pedestrians would have their normal walking speeds restricted. At the lower <br> range of this LOS, forward movement is possible only by shuffling. Space is insufficient to <br> pass over slower pedestrians. Cross- and reverse-movement are possible only with extreme <br> difficulties. Design volumes approach the limit of walking capacity with resulting stoppages <br> and interruptions to flow. |
| F | $>75$ | Walking speeds are severely restricted. Forward progress is made only by shuffling. There <br> are frequent and unavoidable conflicts with other pedestrians. Cross- and reverse- <br> movements are virtually impossible. Flow is sporadic and unstable. Space is more man <br> characteristics of queued pedestrians than of moving pedestrian streams. |

Source: Volume 6 Chapter 10 of TPDM
2.18 The observed peak 15-minute pedestrian flows LOS assessment is presented in Table 2.7.

## TABLE 2.7 EXISTING LOS ASSESSMENT

| Location | Clear Width ${ }^{(1)}$ <br> [Effective Width] (m) | Peak <br> Period | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Flow (ped/ } \\ 15 \mathrm{~min}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Flow rate (ped/min/m) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P1. Footpath on the footbridge connected to Ng Lau Road | 2.0[1.5] | AM | 50 | 2.2 | A |
|  |  | PM | 33 | 1.5 | A |
| P2. Footpath between Lam Tei LRT stop and bus stop at Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei | 2.5[1.5] | AM | 105 | 4.7 | A |
|  |  | PM | 70 | 3.1 | A |
| P3. Footbridge over Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei | 2.5[1.5] | AM | 72 | 3.2 | A |
|  |  | PM | 35 | 1.6 | A |

${ }^{(1)}$ The width excludes railing and obstructions.
2.19 The above results indicate that the surveyed footpaths currently operate with LOS A during the AM and PM peak. As stated in the TPDM, LOS A to C is considered as an acceptable level of service: "In general, LOS C is desirable for most design at streets with dominant 'living' pedestrian activities".

### 3.0 THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

## Key Parameters

3.1 The Proposed Development key parameters are presented in Table 3.1.

## TABLE 3.1 KEY PARAMETERS

| Item | Proposed Development |
| :--- | :--- |
| Development Site Area | About 8,896 $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Domestic Plot Ratio | 5.0 |
| Domestic GFA | $44,480 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Flat Mix <br> (GFA) | Flat Size $\leq 40 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
|  | $40 \mathrm{~m}^{2}<$ Flat Size $\leq 70 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Total number of Flats |  |

## Provision of Internal Transport Facilities

3.2 The internal transport facilities for the Proposed Development are provided in accordance with the recommendations of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines ("HKPSG") and are presented in Table 3.2.

## TABLE 3.2 PROVISION OF INTERNAL TRANSPORT FACILITIES FOR

 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT| Facility | HKPSG Recommendation | Provision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Car Parking Space | For Residents: <br> Parking Requirement $=$ GPS $\times$ R1 $\times$ R2 $\times$ R3 <br> Global Parking Standard (GPS): 1 car parking space per 4-7 <br> flats <br> Demand Adjustment Ratio (R1): $\quad 0.5$ for flat size $\leq 40 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA 1.2 for flat size $40-70 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ <br> GFA <br> Accessibility Adjustment Ratio(R2): 1.0 outside 500m-radius of rail station <br> Development Intensity Adjustment Ratio (R3): 1.0 for Plot Ratio 2.0-5.0 <br> For 1,100 flats with flat size less than $40 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA <br> Minimum: $(1,110 / 7 \times 0.5 \times 1.0 \times 1.0)=79.3$, say 80 nos. <br> Maximum: $(1,110 / 4 \times 0.5 \times 1.0 \times 1.0)=138.8$, say 139 nos. <br> For 275 flats with flat size $40-70 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA <br> Minimum: $(275 / 7 \times 1.2 \times 1.0 \times 1.0)=47.2$, say 48 nos. <br> Maximum: $(275 / 4 \times 1.2 \times 1.0 \times 1.0)=82.5$, say 83 nos. <br> Total $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minimum }=80+48=128 \text { nos. } \\ & \text { Maximum }=139+83=222 \text { nos. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 222 \text { nos. @ } 5.0 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~L}) \times \\ & 2.5 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~W}) \times 2.4 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{H}) \\ & =\text { HKPSG maximum } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | For Visitors: <br> Visitor car parking for private residential developments with more than 75 units per block should be provided at 5 visitor spaces per block in addition to the recommendations, or as determined by the Authority. <br> For 5 blocks: $5 \times 5$ nos. $=25$ nos. | 25 nos. (22 nos. @ <br> $5.0 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~L}) \times 2.5 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~W}) \mathrm{x}$ <br> $2.4 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{H})+3$ nos. @ <br> $5.0 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~L}) \times 3.5 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~W}) \times$ <br> $2.4 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{H})$ for person with disabilities) <br> = HKPSG maximum |
|  | Total Car Parking Space: <br> Minimum $=128+25=153$ nos. <br> Maximum $=222+25=\mathbf{2 4 7}$ nos. <br> Note: For total no. of car parking space in lot $=151-250$ nos., the Building (planning) regulation 72 require provision of 3 accessible car parking spaces | 247 nos. (including 3 accessible car parking spaces) |

## TABLE 3.2 PROVISION OF INTERNAL TRANSPORT FACILITIES FOR

 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT (CONT'D)| Facility | HKPSG Recommendation | Provision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Motorcycle <br> Parking <br> Space | For Residential Uses: <br> TD Comment: $\quad$1 motorcycle parking space shall be <br> provided for every 81 flats <br> $\frac{\text { For } 1,385 \text { flats: }}{1,385 / 81} \quad=17.1$, say 18 nos. | ```18 nos.@ 2.4m (L) x 1.0m (W) x Min. 2.4m (H) = fulfil TD comment, OK``` |
| Goods <br> Vehicle <br> Loading/ <br> Unloading <br> Bay | For Residential Uses: <br> Minimum of 1 loading / unloading bay for goods vehicles within the site for every 800 flats or part thereof, subject to a minimum of 1 bay for each housing block or as determined by the Authority. <br> For 5 blocks, each block less than 800 flats: $\mathbf{5}$ no. | ```5 nos.@ 11.0m (L) x 3.5m (W) x Min. 4.7m (H) = HKPSG minimum, OK``` |
| Bicycle <br> Parking <br> Spaces | For Residential Uses: <br> Within $0.5-2 \mathrm{~km}$ to rail station, 1 space per 15 flats with flat size $<70 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ $=1,385 \div 15$ $=93 \text { nos. }$ | ```93 no.@ 1.8m (L) x 0.8m (W) x Min. 2.4m (H) = comply HKPSG, OK``` |

3.3 Table 3.2 shows that the internal transport facilities provided comply with the recommendations of the HKPSG. The master layout plan of the Proposed Development is shown in Figure 3.1.

## Planned Road Works near the Proposed Development

3.4 The existing access road and unnamed road connecting the Proposed Development with Ng Lau Road is planned to be improved, to provide a $7.3 \mathrm{~m}-$ wide road carriageway, a 2 m -wide footpath and a 2 m -wide cycle track (the "Planned Road Works"). The Planned Road Works to be implemented by the Owner as part of the Approved Scheme and is found in Appendix C.

## Swept Path Analysis

3.5 The CAD-based swept path analysis programme, Autodesk Vehicle Tracking, was used to check the ease of manoeuvring of vehicles within the Proposed Development, and the swept path analysis drawings are found in Appendix D. Vehicles are found to have no manoeuvring problems.

### 4.0 TRAFFIC IMPACT

## Design Year

4.1 The Proposed Development is expected to be completed in 2030, and the design year adopted for the traffic assessment is, whichever later of the 2: (i) at least 3 years after the planned completion of the development, i.e., 2033, or (ii) 5 years from the date of this application, i.e., 2028. Therefore, Year 2033 is adopted for junction capacity analysis.

## Traffic Forecasting

4.2 Year 2033 peak hour traffic flows for the junction capacity analysis is produced (i) with reference to the 2019-based BDTM NTW1 (the "BDTM"); (ii) estimated growth from 2031 to 2033; (iii) expected traffic generation by the planned / committed developments in the vicinity; and (iv) expected traffic generation by the 2 cases, i.e., Approved Scheme and Proposed Development.

## Modelling and Validation

4.3 The BDTM provides traffic forecasts for the years 2026 and 2031 and these have taken into account the planned developments, changes to the strategic road network, population growth, etc. Therefore, The BDTM is used as the basis to produce the traffic flow for this TIA.
4.4 The BDTM is validated, and the validation meets criteria found in the "BDTM Study". Nevertheless, the traffic network and zone in the vicinity of the Proposed Development were further reviewed to ensure the traffic model is up-to-date and the modelled flow can be adopted. The modelling and validation methodology include, but not limited to, the following:

- The road links and junctions were checked and updated to ensure that any recent change in the existing road network is considered and missing road links or junction does not exist.
- The schedules of public transport services such as franchised bus and green/ red minibus were also checked to ensure that the updated routings and headway information are adopted.
- The zone and centroid connectors were reviewed to ensure that the traffic zones generate/ attract traffic at appropriate locations.
- The traffic flows produced by BDTM at the surveyed junctions were reviewed with reference to the observed traffic flows.
- The validation methodology is same as that adopted in the BDTM. All count locations were reviewed and checked using the GEH statistic (a modified chi squared test to provide a statistic for both the magnitude of the difference and the percentage difference between modelled and observed flows). The GEH statistic is defined by:

$$
\sqrt{\frac{\left(V_{2}-V_{1}\right)^{2}}{\frac{1}{2}\left(V_{2}+V_{1}\right)}}
$$

where $V_{1}$ and $V_{2}$ are the observed and modelled flows.

### 4.5 The validation criteria adopted are found in Table 4.1.

TABLE 4.1 VALIDATION CRITERIA

| Locations | Target |
| :--- | :--- |
| Traffic flows at all count locations | $85 \%$ return a GEH statistic of 5 or less <br> $100 \%$ <br>  |

## Estimated Traffic Growth Rate from 2031 to 2033

4.6 Reference is made to the "Hong Kong Population Projections 2022 - 2046" published by Census and Statistics Department, and the information is presented in Table 4.2.

TABLE 4.2 HONG KONG POPULATION PROJECTIONS FROM CENSUS AND STATISTICS DEPARTMENT

| Year | Population in Hong Kong (thousands) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2031 | $7,820.2$ |
| 2033 | $7,903.6$ |
| Average Annual Growth $(\mathbf{2 0 3 1} \mathbf{~ 2 0 3 3 )}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 3 \%}$ |

4.7 Table 4.2 shows that the annual population growth between 2031 and 2033 is $0.53 \%$, and is adopted for estimated traffic growth rate from 2031 to 2033.

## Additional Planned/ Committed Developments near the Subject Site

4.8 The planned/ committed developments near the Subject Site not included in the BDTM but have been incorporated to produce the future year traffic flows are listed in Table 4.3 and the locations are presented in Figure 4.1.

## TABLE 4.3 THE ADDITIONAL PLANNED / COMMITTED DEVELOPMENTS NEAR THE SUBJECT SITE

| Ref. <br> No. | Development | Intake <br> Year | Land Use | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GFA } \\ & \left(\mathbf{m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | No. of Flat (no.) | Average Flat Size ( $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) | No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuen Mun Area $54{ }^{(1)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | Site $1 \& 1 \mathrm{~A}$ Wo Tin Estate | 2022 | PRH | -- | 4,232 | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Retail | 2,420 | -- | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | SWF | 1,060 | -- | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Kindergarten | - | -- | -- | 1 no. |
| B | Site 2 <br> Yan Tin Estate | 2017 | PRH | -- | 4,688 | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Retail | 4,250 | -- | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | SWF | 3,600 | -- | -- | -- |
| C | Site $3 \& 4$ (East) Ching Tin Estate | 2022 | PRH | -- | 5,183 | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Retail | 3,130 | -- | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | SWF | 1,810 | -- | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Kindergarten | -- | -- | -- | 1 no. |
| D | Site $3 \& 4$ (West) Novo Land | 2025 | Private Housing | -- | 4,600 | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Retail | 5,000 | -- | -- | -- |
| E | Site 4A (East and West) ${ }^{(2)}$ | 2026 | Light Public Housing | -- | 5,620 | -- | -- |
| G | Site 4A (South) | 2028 | PRH | -- | 1,475 | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Kindergarten | -- | -- | -- | 1 no. |
| H | Site 5 | $2028$ | SSF | -- | 1,020 | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | SWF | 1,300 | -- | -- | -- |

## TABLE 4.3 THE ADDITIONAL PLANNED / COMMITTED DEVELOPMENTS NEAR THE SUBJECT SITE (CONT’D)

| Ref. No. | Development | Intake Year | Land Use | GFA ( $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) | No. of Flat (no.) | Average Flat Size ( $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) | No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development at San Hing Road and Hong Po Road, Tuen Mun ${ }^{(3)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | San Hing Road Site | $\begin{gathered} 2030 \\ - \\ 2033 \end{gathered}$ | PRH / SSF | -- | 9,400 | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Primary School | -- | -- | -- | 1 nos. |
|  |  |  | Kindergarten | -- | -- | -- | 2 nos. |
|  |  |  | SWF | N/A | -- | -- | -- |
| J | San Hing Road Site Extension | $\begin{gathered} 2030 \\ - \\ 2033 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | PRH / SSF | -- | 1,500 | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Retail | 5,000 ${ }^{(4)}$ | --- | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Sport Centre | -- | -- | -- | 1 no. |
| K | Ho Pong Road Site | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2030 \\ - \\ 2033 \end{gathered}$ | PRH / SSF | -- | 9,500 | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Retail | 5,000 ${ }^{(4)}$ | -- | -- | -- |
|  |  |  | Kindergarten | -- | -- | -- | 2 no. |
|  |  |  | SWF | N/A | -- | -- | -- |
| Other Planning Applications Nearby ${ }^{(5)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L | A/TM-LTYY/ 426 | 2026 | Private Housing | -- | 184 | 31 | -- |
| M | Y/TM-LTYY/ 10 | -- | Private Housing | -- | 288 | 40 | -- |
| N | A/TM-LTYY/ 301 | -- | NTEH ${ }^{(3)}$ | -- | 1 | 195 | -- |
| O | A/TM-LTYY/ 335 | -- | NTEH ${ }^{(3)}$ | -- | 1 | 195 | -- |
| P | A/TM-LTYY/ 336 | -- | NTEH ${ }^{(3)}$ | -- | 1 | 195 | -- |
| Q | A/TM-LTYY/ 370 | -- | NTEH ${ }^{(3)}$ | -- | 1 | 195 | -- |
| R | A/TM-LTYY/ 371 | -- | NTEH ${ }^{(3)}$ | -- | 1 | 195 | -- |
| S | A/TM-LTYY/ 372 | -- | NTEH ${ }^{(3)}$ | -- | 1 | 195 | -- |

PRH - Public Rental Housing SSF - Subsidised Sale Flats NTEH - New Territories Exempted House SWF - Social Welfare Facilities
(1) extracted from TIA of Approved Planning Applications A/TM/500 and A/TM/583
(2) extracted from Legislative Council Panel on Housing discussion paper $C B(1) 1123 / 2023(02)$ on December 2023
(3) extracted from Tuen Mun District Council discussion paper TMDC 19/2023 on September 2023
(4) No information on area for retail uses is found in public domain, assumed 5,000 $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ GFA of retail
(5) extracted from Planning Statement of Approved Planning Applications

## Planned Road Improvement Works Nearby

4.9 The planned road improvement works at assessed junctions are presented below.

## Development at San Hing Road and Hong Po Road

4.10 Some road improvement works are planned under the "Site Formation and Infrastructure Works for Public Housing Developments at San Hing Road and Hong Po Road, Tuen Mun and Choi Shun Street, Sheung Shui - Investigation, Design and Construction" (Agreement No. CE 39/2021 (CE)) by Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD"), and these are summarized in Table 4.4. The road improvement works are found in Appendix E.

TABLE 4.4 PLANNED ROAD IMPROVEMENT WORKS UNDER AGREEMENT NO. CE 39/2021 (CE) BY CEDD

| Ref | Brief Description of the Improvement |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | Provide 2 left-turn lanes at Ng Lau Road southbound |
| J4 | Provide 1 left-turn lane at Lam Tei Interchange eastbound |
|  | Provide exclusive left-turn lane from Hong Po Road southbound |
| $\mathrm{J6}$ | Modify the entry lanes from Lam Tei Interchange westbound <br>  <br> Jrovide 2 right-turn lanes and 1 shared lane for right turn and straight ahead at Castle Peak <br> $\mathrm{J7}$ |
| Jrovide a channelized island at Tsz Tin Road eastbound* |  |
| J 12 | Widened to provide 2lane 2-way single carriageway at minor road |

4.11 The improvement work described in Table 4.4 will be completed gradually before 2030 - 2033, i.e., the intake of public housing of San Hing Road site, and San Hing Road site extension and Hong Po Road site (Note: These are items I, J and K in Table 4.3). These improvement works are adopted for the Year 2033 junction capacity analysis.

## Hung Shiu Kiu New Development Area

4.12 Road improvement work is planned at Ng Lau Road / Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei (J11) under the "Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area Package A Works for Second Phase Development - Design and Construction" (Agreement No. CE 01/2020 (CE)) by Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD"). The layout of road improvement at J11 is presented in Appendix E.

## Net Increase in Traffic Generation between the Approved Scheme and the Proposed Development

4.13 To estimate the traffic generation of the Proposed Development, reference is made to the TPDM. However, the smallest flat size in the TPDM is $60 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA, which is substantially larger than the Proposed Development average flat size of only $32 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA. Hence, the estimated traffic generation is conservative, i.e., on the high-side. The adopted trip generation rates and the estimated AM and PM peak hour traffic generation are presented in Table 4.5.

TABLE 4.5 ADOPTED TRIP RATES AND TRAFFIC GENERATION FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

| Proposed Development | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Generation | Attraction | Generation | Attraction |
| Trip Rates(pcu/ flat/ hr) | 0.0718 | 0.0425 | 0.0286 | 0.0370 |
| Residential Use with average $60 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Generations (pcu/ hr) | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 2}$ |
| $\mathbf{1 , 3 8 5}$ flats with average flat about $\mathbf{3 2 m}^{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{~ G F A}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 2}$ |  |  |

4.14 The traffic generation of Approved Scheme found in the approved traffic impact assessment is presented in Table 4.6.

TABLE 4.6 ADOPTED TRAFFIC GENERATION FOR APPROVED SCHEME

| Scheme |  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Generation | Attraction | Generation Attraction |  |  |  |
| Approved Scheme | $\underline{37}$ | $\underline{22}$ | 18 |  |  |  |
|  | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |

4.15 The net increase in traffic generation between the Approved Scheme and the Proposed Development is presented in Table 4.7.

TABLE 4.7 NET INCREASE IN TRAFFIC GENERATION

| Scheme | Traffic Generation (pcu/ hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  | Generation | Attraction | Generation | Attraction |
| Proposed Development (from Table 4.4) [a] | 100 | 59 | 40 | 52 |
| Approved Scheme (from Table 4.5) [b] | 37 | 22 | 18 | 23 |
| Net Increase [a] - [b]: | +63 | +37 | +22 | +29 |
|  | +100 |  | +51 |  |

4.16 Table 4.7 shows that the Proposed Development is expected to generate 100 and 51 additional pcu (2-way) in AM and PM peak respectively.

## Year 2033 Traffic Flows

4.17 Year 2033 traffic flows for the following cases are derived:

Year 2033 Without = Traffic flows derived with reference to 2031 NTW1 BDTM

Proposed Development
[A]

+ estimated traffic growth between 2031 and 2033 + estimated traffic generation of the planned / committed developments after 2019

Year 2033 With Approved = [A]+ estimated traffic generation for Approved Scheme Scheme [B]

Year 2033 With Proposed $=[B]+$ net increase in traffic generation by Proposed Development [C] Development
4.18 Year 2033 peak hour traffic flows for the above three cases are shown in Figures 4.2 - 4.4 respectively.

## Year 2033 Junction Capacity Analysis

4.19 Year 2033 junction capacity analysis for the three cases are summarised in Table 4.7 and detailed calculations are found in the Appendix A.

TABLE 4.8 YEAR 2033 JUNCTION PERFORMANCE

| Ref | Junction | Type of Junction (Parameter) | 2033 Without Proposed Development |  | 2033 With <br> Approved Scheme |  | 2033 With <br> Proposed Development |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM <br> Peak | PM Peak | AM Peak | PM Peak | AM Peak | PM Peak |
| J1 | Unnamed Road/ Access Road | Priority (DFC) | 0.055 | 0.049 | 0.056 | 0.050 | 0.059 | 0.051 |
| J2 | Ng Lau Road/ Unnamed Road | Priority (DFC) | 0.052 | 0.046 | 0.128 | 0.079 | 0.266 | 0.125 |
| J3 | Ng Lau Road/ Lam Tei Interchange | Signal (RC) | 42\% | 48\% | 39\% | 46\% | 35\% | 44\% |
| J4 | Tsing Lun Road/ Hong Po Road/Lam Tei Interchange | RA (DFC) | 0.694 | 0.659 | 0.703 | 0.666 | 0.719 | 0.675 |
| J5 | Lam Tei Interchange | RA (DFC) | 0.797 | 0.668 | 0.806 | 0.677 | 0.822 | 0.691 |
| J6 | Lam Tei Interchange/ Castle Peak Road Lam Tei | Signal (RC) | 26\% | 49\% | 26\% | 49\% | 26\% | 49\% |
| J7 | Tsing Lun Road/ Tsz Tin Road | Signal (RC) | 23\% | 61\% | 22\% | 60\% | 21\% | 59\% |
| J8 | San Hing Road/ Ng Lau Road (Southern) | Priority (DFC) | 0.091 | 0.055 | 0.094 | 0.060 | 0.100 | 0.065 |
| J9 | San Hing Road/ Ng Lau Road (Northern) | Priority (DFC) | 0.198 | 0.448 | 0.198 | 0.448 | 0.198 | 0.448 |
| J10 | T-junction at San Hing Road | Priority (DFC) | 0.058 | 0.071 | 0.059 | 0.074 | 0.063 | 0.078 |
| J11 | Ng Lau Road / Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei | Signal (RC) | 16\% | 15\% | 16\% | 15\% | 16\% | 15\% |
| J12 | San Hing Road / Hong Po Road | Signal (RC) | 55\% | 96\% | 121\% | 197\% | 116\% | 195\% |

Note: RC - reserve capacity; RA - Roundabout, DFC - design flow/capacity ratio
4.20 Table 4.8 shows that the Proposed Development has negligible traffic impact to the road junctions analysed.

## Year 2033 Link Performance

4.21 The 2033 link performances are assessed and the results are shown in Table 4.9.

TABLE 4.9 YEAR 2033 LINK CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

| Ref | Link |  | Adjusted Design Flow (veh /hr) |  | Year 2033 Traffic Demand (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  |  | Year 2033 V/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Without <br> Proposed Development | With Approved Scheme |  | With <br> Proposed Development |  | Without <br> Proposed <br> Development |  | With Approved Scheme |  | With <br> Proposed <br> Development |  |
|  |  |  | AM Peak | PM <br> Peak | AM <br> Peak | PM <br> Peak | AM <br> Peak | PM Peak | AM <br> Peak | PM <br> Peak | AM <br> Peak | PM <br> Peak | AM Peak | PM <br> Peak | AM <br> Peak | PM <br> Peak |
| L1 | Castle Pea | NB |  |  | 2,604 | 2,604 | 864 | 1,434 | 864 | 1,434 | 865 | 1,434 | 0.33 | 0.55 | 0.33 | 0.55 | 0.33 | 0.55 |
|  | Road - Lam Tei | SB | 2,604 | 2,604 | 1,810 | 1,238 | 1,810 | 1,238 | 1,812 | 1,240 | 0.70 | 0.48 | 0.70 | 0.48 | 0.70 | 0.48 |
| L2 | Castle Peak | NB | 2,800 | 2,800 | 501 | 581 | 501 | 581 | 502 | 582 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.18 | 0.21 |
|  | Road - Lingnan | SB | 2,604 | 2,800 | 808 | 562 | 810 | 562 | 812 | 563 | 0.31 | 0.20 | 0.31 | 0.20 | 0.31 | 0.20 |
| L3 | Yuen Long | NB | 4,700 | 4,700 | 5,677 | 6,373 | 5,683 | 6,377 | 5,694 | 6,384 | 1.21 | 1.36 | 1.21 | 1.36 | 1.21 | 1.36 |
|  | Highway | SB | 4,700 | 4,700 | 5,099 | 5,190 | 5,104 | 5,195 | 5,111 | 5,198 | 1.09 | 1.10 | 1.09 | 1.11 | 1.09 | 1.11 |
| L4 | Tuen Mun Road | NB | 4,700 | 4,700 | 6,103 | 7,445 | 6,115 | 7,456 | 6,131 | 7,469 | 1.30 | 1.59 | 1.30 | 1.59 | 1.30 | 1.59 |
|  |  | SB | 4,700 | 4,700 | 6,135 | 5,542 | 6,147 | 5,548 | 6,163 | 5,557 | 1.31 | 1.18 | 1.31 | 1.18 | 1.31 | 1.18 |
| L5 | San Hing Road | 2-way | 800 | 800 | 174 | 80 | 187 | 84 | 212 | 91 | 0.22 | 0.10 | 0.23 | 0.11 | 0.27 | 0.11 |
| L6 | Ng Lau Road (north of J9) | 2-way | 744 | 800 | 251 | 370 | 251 | 370 | 251 | 370 | 0.34 | 0.46 | 0.34 | 0.46 | 0.34 | 0.46 |
| L7 | Ng Lau Road (south of J2) | 2-way | 800 | 800 | 411 | 436 | 467 | 497 | 512 | 508 | 0.51 | 0.55 | 0.58 | 0.62 | 0.64 | 0.64 |
| L8 | Lam Tei Interchange (between J3 and J5) | EB | 2,800 | 2,800 | 1,731 | 1,180 | 1,752 | 1,191 | 1,784 | 1,208 | 0.62 | 0.42 | 0.63 | 0.43 | 0.64 | 0.43 |
|  |  | WB | 2,800 | 2,800 | 1,779 | 1,705 | 1,798 | 1,722 | 1,826 | 1,742 | 0.64 | 0.61 | 0.64 | 0.62 | 0.65 | 0.62 |
| L9 | Tsing Lun Road | NB | 1,900 | 1,900 | 823 | 628 | 842 | 657 | 827 | 633 | 0.43 | 0.33 | 0.44 | 0.35 | 0.44 | 0.33 |
|  |  | SB | 1,900 | 1,900 | 1,275 | 929 | 1,282 | 932 | 1,296 | 933 | 0.67 | 0.49 | 0.67 | 0.49 | 0.68 | 0.49 |

$N B$ - northbound $\quad S B$ - southbound $\quad E B$ - eastbound $\quad W B$ - westbound
4.22 The above results show that the assessed road links operate with sufficient capacity, except for Yuen Long Highway (L3) and Tuen Mun Road (L4), both which operate with V/C ratios at 1.2 or above during the AM and PM peak hours in Year 2033. In view that there are no changes on the V/C ratios to L3 and L4 for cases without Proposed Development, with Approved Scheme and with Proposed Development, it can be concluded that the traffic generated due to the Proposed Development have negligible impact. With the planned strategic road improvement works, both Yuen Long Highway and Tuen Mun Road are expected to operate with sufficient capacity in Year 2033.

### 5.0 IMPACT TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES

## 2033 Public Transport Occupancy Forecasting

5.12033 peak hour public transport occupancy is estimated based on (i) public transport demand growth from 2024 to 2033; and (ii) public transport demand generated by the Proposed Development and planned / committed developments in the vicinity.

Annual Public Transport Demand Growth Rate between 2024-2033
5.2 To establish the local public transport demand growth rate from 2024 to 2033, reference is made to several sources of information including:

- 2024 - 2029: "Projections of Population Distribution 2021 - 2029" published by Planning Department
- 2029 - 2033: "Hong Kong Population Projections" from the Census and Statistics Department
5.3 The "Projections of Population Distribution 2021 - 2029" has Tertiary Planning Units ("TPU"), i.e., the local area population projections up to 2025, and reference is made to 5 relevant TPUs, which are presented in Table 5.1.

TABLE 5.1 POPULATION PROJECTIONS OF THE 5 TPUS

| Year | TPU |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{4 2 3 ~ \& ~ 4 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 2}$ |  |
| 2024 | 225,800 | 70,200 | 16,600 | 7,100 | 319,700 |
| 2025 | 227,100 | 71,300 | 16,300 | 7,100 | 321,800 |
| Average Annual Growth 2024 to $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 8 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 6 \%}$ |

5.4 Table 5.1 shows that the average annual population growth between 2024 and 2025 is $0.66 \%$.
5.5 Between 2025 and 2029, reference is made to the population growth of Tuen Mun New Town, and population projections are presented in Table 5.2.

## TABLE 5.2 TUEN MUN NEW TOWN POPULATION PROJECTIONS

| Year | Tuen Mun New Town Population |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2025 | 557,400 |
| 2029 | 575,400 |
| Average Annual Growth 2025 to 2029 | $\mathbf{0 . 8 0 \%}$ |

5.6 Table 5.2 shows that the average annual population growth in the Tuen Mun New Town between 2025 and 2029 is $0.8 \%$.
5.7 Beyond 2029, reference is made to the "Hong Kong Population Projections" from the Census and Statistics Department, which is presented in Table 5.3.

## TABLE 5.3 HONG KONG POPULATION PROJECTIONS FROM CENSUS AND STATISTICS DEPARTMENT

| Year | Hong Kong Resident Population ('000) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2029 | $7,731.1$ |
| 2033 | $7,903.6$ |
| Average Annual Growth 2029 to 2033 | $\mathbf{0 . 5 5 \%}$ |

5.8 Table 5.3 shows that the average annual population growth in Hong Kong between $2029-2033$ is $0.55 \%$.
5.9 Based on the above, the annual growth factors adopted are $0.66 \%$ from 2024 to 2025, 0.8\% between 2025 and 2029, and 0.55\% between 2029 and 2033.

## Estimated Peak Hour Mechanised Trip Generation of Subject Site

5.10 The mechanised trip generation of the Subject Site is estimated with reference to Travel Characteristic Survey 2011 and are presented in Table 5.4.

TABLE 5.4 ESTIMATED PEAK HOUR MECHANISED TRIP GENERATION OF THE SUBJECT SITE

| Parameter | Calculation | Unit | Approved <br> Scheme | Proposed <br> Development |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Flats | A | flats | 307 | 1,385 |
| Average domestic household size in Tuen Mun ${ }^{(1)}$ | B | persons/ flat | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Population | $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{A}$ | persons | 812 | 966 |
| Average Daily Mechanised Trips ${ }^{(2)}$ | D | trips/ persons/ day | 1.83 | 1.83 |
| Peak hour factor of Daily Mechanised Trips ${ }^{(3)}$ | E | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $12 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Estimated Peak Hour Mechanised Trip <br> Generation | $\mathrm{D}=$ <br> $\mathrm{A} \times \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{C}$ | persons/hr | 176 | 791 |

${ }^{(1)}$ Extracted from Census and Statistic Department website
${ }^{(2)}$ From Table 3.3, Travel Characteristics Survey 2011 Final Report
${ }^{(3)}$ From Para. 3.3.7, Travel Characteristics Survey 2011 Final Report

## Estimated Public Transport Demand Generated by the Subject Site

5.11 The transport mode of the Subject Site in the vicinity is assumed with reference to "Travel Characteristic Survey 2011" and is presented in Table 5.4, and the estimated public transport demand is calculated and shown in Table 5.5.

TABLE 5.5 TRANSPORT MODE OF THE SUBJECT SITE

| Transport Mode |  | Ratio ${ }^{(1)}$ | The Subject Site |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Proposed Development [b] | Net Increase in Passenger Demand $[C]=[b]-[a]$ |
| Public Transport | Rail-based [a] |  | 44\% ${ }^{(2)}$ | 77 | 348 | +271 |
|  | Road-based $[\mathrm{b}]$ | 38\% ${ }^{(2)}$ | 67 | 301 | +234 |
|  | Sub-total $[c]=[a]+[b]$ | 82\% | 144 | 649 | +505 |
| Private Car/ Taxi [d] |  | 18\% | 32 | 142 | +110 |
| Total | [ e$]=[\mathrm{c}]+[\mathrm{d}]$ | 100\% | 176 | 791 | +615 |

(1) From Table 3.6, Travel Characteristics Survey 2011 Final Report
${ }^{(2)}$ Adjusted based on local public transport provision near the subject site
5.12 Table 5.5 shows that compared with the Approved Scheme, the Proposed Development is expected to generate additional public transport demand of 505 passengers per hour (2-way) during both AM and PM peak hours. The roadbased public transport demand generated by the subject site is summarised in Table 5.6.

## TABLE 5.6 ESTIMATED ROAD-BASED PUBLIC TRANSPORT DEMAND GENERATED BY THE SUBJECT SITE

| Development |  | Road-based Public Transport Demand (persons / hour) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  | Generation | Attraction | Generation | Attraction |
| The Subject Site | Approved Scheme: 307 Flats [a] | 61 | 6 | 6 | 61 |
|  | Proposed Development: 1,385 Flats [b] | 271 | 30 | 30 | 271 |
|  | Net increase of road-based Passenger | 210 | 24 | 24 | 210 |
|  | Demand [b] - [a] | +234 (2-way) |  | +234 (2-way) |  |

5.13 Tables 5.6 shows that compared with the Approved Scheme, the Proposed Development is expected to generate additional road-based public transport demand of 234 passengers per hour (2-way) during both AM and PM peak hours.

Public Transport Demand Generated by Planned / Committed Developments in the Vicinity
5.14 The public transport demand generated by planned / committed developments in the vicinity as presented in Table 4.3 is considered in the Year 2033 public transport demand. Public transport interchanges are provided for the 2 planned development areas, i.e., "Tuen Mun Area 54" and "Development at San Hing Road and Hong Po Road, Tuen Mun". It is assumed that the public transport services provided would be sufficient to serve the demand generated by these development areas.

## 2033 Road-based Public Transport Occupancies

5.15 Year 2033 road-based public transport occupancies were derived with reference to the (i) observed road-based public transport occupancies in Table 2.4; (ii) annual public transport demand growth rate; and (iii) expected road-based public transport demand due to the planned / committed developments between 2024 - 2033 and the subject site.
5.16 Year 2033 road-based public transport occupancies were derived as follows:

2033 without the $=2024$ observed occupancy + adopted road-based public

Proposed Development
[A] Scheme [B] Development [C]

2033 with the Approved $=[A]+$ estimated road-based public transport demand

2033 with the Proposed $=[B]+$ net increase in estimated road-based public transport demand growth from 2024 to 2033 + estimated road-based public transport demand due to the planned / committed developments due to Approved Scheme transport demand by Proposed Development
5.17 The Year 2033 road-based public transport occupancies for the three cases are summarised in Table 5.7.

## TABLE 5.7 YEAR 2033 ROAD-BASED PUBLIC TRANSPORT OCCUPANCY OPERATING NEARBY DURING PEAK HOURS

| Direction | Case | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No. of Passenger |  | Occupancy$[c]=[b] /[a]$ | No. of Passenger |  | Occupancy$[f]=[e] /[d]$ |
|  |  | Capacity <br> [a] | Occupied <br> [b] |  | Capacity <br> [d] | Occupied [e] |  |
| To other districts | Without Proposed Development | 11,821 | 4,621 | 39\% | 2,776 | 846 | 30\% |
|  | With Approved Scheme | 11,821 | 4,682 | 40\% | 2,776 | 852 | 31\% |
|  | With Proposed Development | 11,821 | 4,892 | 41\% | 2,776 | 876 | 32\% |
| From other districts | Without Proposed Development | 3,181 | 1,049 | 33\% | 9,121 | 2,031 | 22\% |
|  | With Approved Scheme | 3,181 | 1,055 | 33\% | 9,121 | 2,092 | 23\% |
|  | With Proposed Development | 3,181 | 1,079 | 34\% | 9,121 | 2,302 | 25\% |

5.18 Table 5.7 shows that the road-based public transport demand associated with the Proposed Development has negligible impact.

## 2033 Rail-Based Public Transport Occupancies

5.19 Table 5.5 shows that the demand on rail-based public transport services, i.e. MTR Tuen Ma Line, associated with the Proposed Development is no more than 348 passengers during the peak hours. As shown in Table 2.5, the MTR Tuen Ma Line has a maximum carrying capacity of 70,000 passenger / hour. Hence, the additional passenger demand is only $0.5 \%$ of the maximum carrying capacity [Calculation: $348 \div 70,000=0.5 \%$ ], which is negligible on the MTR Tuen Ma Line.

### 6.0 PEDESTRIAN IMPACT

## 2033 Pedestrian Flow Forecasting

6.1 2033 peak 15-minute pedestrian flows are produced by estimating (i) the pedestrian growth from 2024 to 2033; and (ii) expected pedestrian generated by the Proposed Development and planned / committed developments in the vicinity.

Annual Pedestrian Growth Rate between 2024-2033
6.2 Growth rates of $0.66 \%$ per annum from 2024 to $2025,0.8 \%$ per annum for the period between 2025 and 2029, and $0.55 \%$ per annum for the period between 2029 and 2033, are adopted, and reference to these are found in Paragraphs 5.2 - 5.9.

## Peak 15-minute Pedestrian Generated by Planned / Committed Developments in the Vicinity

6.3 Peak 15-minute pedestrian generated by planned / committed developments in the vicinity as presented in Table 4.3 is included in the Year 2033 pedestrian flow.

Peak 15-minute Pedestrian Generation of by the Proposed Development
6.4 Based on public transport demand presented in Table 5.5, the peak 15-minute pedestrian generations of the Subject Site are shown in Table 6.1.

TABLE 6.1 PEDESTRIAN GENERATIONS OF THE SUBJECT SITE

| Developments |  | Pedestrian Generations (ped / 15-minute) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  | GEN | ATT | GEN | ATT |
| The | Approved Scheme: 307 Flats [a] | 21 | 2 | 2 | 21 |
| Subject | Proposed Development: 1385 Flats [b] | 91 | 10 | 10 | 91 |
| Site | Net Increase of Pedestrian Generation[b] - [a] | +70 | +8 | +8 | +70 |
|  |  | + 78 (2-way) |  | +78 (2-way) |  |

6.5 Tables 6.1 shows that compared with the Approved Scheme, the additional pedestrian generated by the Proposed Development is 78 persons (2-way) during both AM and PM peak 15 minutes.

## Year 2033 Pedestrian Flows

6.6 Year 2033 pedestrian flows are produced with reference to (i) the observed 2024 pedestrian flows, (ii) annual pedestrian growth rate between 2024 - 2033, (iii) expected pedestrian generation due to the planned / committed developments between 2024-2033 and the Subject Site.
6.7 Year 2033 pedestrian flows for the footpath analysis were derived as follows:

Proposed Rezoning from "Residential (Group B)1" Zone to "Residential (Group B)4"

2033 without Proposed $=2024$ observed pedestrian flows + Adopted pedestrian

Development [A]

2033 with Approved $=[A]+$ pedestrian generation due to Approved Scheme Scheme [B]

2033 with Proposed $=[B]+$ net increase in pedestrian generation due to Development [C] growth from 2024 to 2033 + estimated pedestrian due to the planned / committed developments

## Year 2033 LOS Analysis

6.8 Year 2033 peak 15-minute pedestrian flows for the three cases are estimated and presented in Figure 6.1 and the corresponding LOS assessment is presented in Table 6.2.

## TABLE 6.2 YEAR 2033 LOS ASSESSMENT

| Location | Clear Width ${ }^{(1)}$ [Effective Width] (m) | Peak Period | 2033 without <br> Proposed Development |  |  | 2033 with Approved Scheme |  |  | 2033 with <br> Proposed Development |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Flow | Flow rate | LOS | Flow | Flow rate | LOS | Flow | Flow rate | LOS |
| P1. Footpath on $\begin{aligned} & \text { footbridge } \\ & \\ & \\ & \text { Ng Lau Road }\end{aligned}$ | 2.0[1.5] | AM | 80 | 3.6 | A | 92 | 4.1 | A | 131 | 5.8 | A |
|  |  | PM | 62 | 2.8 | A | 74 | 3.3 | A | 113 | 5.0 | A |
| P2. Footpath between Lam Tei LRT stop and bus stop at Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei | 2.5[1.5] | AM | 130 | 5.8 | A | 136 | 6.0 | A | 156 | 6.9 | A |
|  |  | PM | 93 | 4.1 | A | 99 | 4.4 | A | 119 | 5.3 | A |
| P3. Footbridge over Castle Peak Road - Lam Tei | 2.5[1.5] | AM | 79 | 3.5 | A | 85 | 3.8 | A | 105 | 4.7 | A |
|  |  | PM | 40 | 1.8 | A | 46 | 2.0 | A | 66 | 2.9 | A |

Note: Flows in pedestrian / 15 minutes flow rates in pedestrian / 15 minutes / meter
${ }^{(1)}$ The width excludes railing and obstructions.
6.9 The results in Table $\mathbf{6 . 2}$ show that the assessed footpaths operate with LOS A, i.e., have sufficient capacity to accommodate the expected pedestrian growth and additional pedestrian generated due to Proposed Development.

### 7.0 SUMMARY

7.1 The Subject Site is located in D.D.130, Lam Tei, Tuen Mun. At present, the Subject Site is unoccupied, and access to the Subject Site is via an existing unnamed road which is connected to Ng Lau Road.
7.2 Manual classified counts were conducted at junctions which are located in the vicinity in order to establish the existing traffic flows during AM Peak and PM peak hours.
7.3 The internal transport facilities provided comply with recommendations of the HKPSG and comments from Transport Department.
7.4 Year 2033 peak hour traffic flows for the junction capacity analysis is produced (i) with reference to the BDTM; (ii) estimated growth from 2031 to 2033; (iii) expected traffic generation by the planned / committed developments in the vicinity; and (iv) expected traffic generation by the 2 cases, i.e., Approved Scheme and Proposed Development.
7.5 Compared to the Approved Scheme, the Proposed Development will generate only 100 and 51 additional pcu (2-way) in AM peak and PM peak respectively.
7.6 The assessment of the nearby public transport services found that the Proposed Development has negligible impact. The assessment of footpaths found that the Proposed Development has negligible impact.
7.7 This TIA concluded that compared with the Approved Scheme, the traffic generated by the Proposed Development is negligible. The Proposed Development is acceptable from traffic engineering terms.
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Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | Unnamed Road / Access Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2023 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | Existing Condition |  |  | P. 1 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by $D, E, F$ are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $Y=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v-r B A$, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry :

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| W | 5.70 | V-rBA | 100 | w-BA | 2.05 | D | 0.8093 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 100 | w-BC | 2.05 | E | 0.8343 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 100 | w-CB | 2.70 | F | 0.8943 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 100 |  |  | Y | 0.8034 |  |

Analysis :

| Traffic Flows, pcu/hr | AM |  | PM Capacity, pcı | AM | PM |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| q-CA | 9 | 16 | Q-BA | 502 | 501 |
| q-CB | 0 | 0 | Q-BC | 617 | 618 |
| q-AB | 0 | 0 | Q-CB | 662 | 662 |
| q-AC | 18 | 16 | Q-BAC | 502 | 501 |
| q-BA | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| q-BC | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| f | 0.000 | 0.000 |  |  |  |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| B-C | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| C-B | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| B-AC | 0.000 | 0.000 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | Unnamed Road / Access Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | Without Development |  |  | P. 2 |

## Access Road (Arm C) <br> Unnamed Road (Arm A)

| $\underline{0}$ | 0 | $\longrightarrow$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where
$\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v-r B A$, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.90 | V-rBA | 60 | w-BA | 4.70 | D | 0.8093 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 90 | w-BC | 0.00 | E | 0.8343 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 0.00 | W-CB | 0.00 | F | 0.8943 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 55 |  |  | Y | 0.8034 |  |

Analysis :

| Traffic Flows, pcu/hr | AM |  | PM Capacity, pcu/hr | AM | PM |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| q-CA | 0 | 0 | Q-BA | 506 | 506 |
| q-CB | 0 | 0 | Q-BC | 620 | 620 |
| q-AB | 15 | 20 | Q-CB | 662 | 661 |
| q-AC | 0 | 0 | Q-BAC | 506 | 506 |
| q-BA | 28 | 25 |  |  |  |
| q-BC | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| f | 0.000 | 0.000 |  |  |  |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.055 | 0.049 |
| B-C | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| C-B | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| B-AC | 0.055 | 0.049 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | Unnamed Road / Access Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | With Approved Scheme |  |  | P. 3 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by $D, E, F$ are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $Y=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry :

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| W | 6.90 | V-rBA | 60 | W-BA | 4.70 | D | 0.8093 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 90 | W-BC | 0.00 | E | 0.8343 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 0.00 | W-CB | 0.00 | F | 0.8943 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 55 |  |  | Y | 0.8034 |  |

Analysis :

| Traffic Flows, pcu/hr | AM |  | PM | Capacity, pcu/hr | AM |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| q-CA | 36 | 17 | Q-BA | 496 | 498 |
| q-CB | 0 | 0 | Q-BC | 615 | 615 |
| q-AB | 15 | 20 | Q-CB | 657 | 656 |
| q-AC | 21 | 21 | Q-BAC | 496 | 498 |
| q-BA | 28 | 25 |  |  |  |
| q-BC | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| f | 0.000 | 0.000 |  |  |  |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.056 | 0.050 |
| B-C | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| C-B | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| B-AC | 0.056 | 0.050 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | Unnamed Road / Access Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | With Proposed Scheme |  |  | P. 4 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by $D, E, F$ are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-$ rBA -120$)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $Y=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v-r B A$, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry :

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| W | 6.90 | V-rBA | 60 | w-BA | 4.70 | D | 0.8093 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 90 | W-BC | 0.00 | E | 0.8343 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 0.00 | W-CB | 0.00 | F | 0.8943 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 55 |  |  | Y | 0.8034 |  |

Analysis :

| Traffic Flows, pcu/hr | AM | PM | Capacity, pcu/hr | AM | PM |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| q-CA | 100 | 40 | Q-BA | 477 | 487 |
| q-CB | 0 | 0 | Q-BC | 606 | 607 |
| q-AB | 15 | 20 | Q-CB | 647 | 647 |
| q-AC | 59 | 52 | Q-BAC | 477 | 487 |
| q-BA | 28 | 25 |  |  |  |
| q-BC | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| f | 0.000 | 0.000 |  |  |  |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.059 | 0.051 |
| B-C | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| C-B | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| B-AC | 0.059 | 0.051 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | Ng Lau Road / Unnamed Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2023 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | Existing Condition |  |  | P. 5 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where
$\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 8.65 | V-rBA | 30 | W-BA | 2.05 | D | 0.7574 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 100 | W-BC | 2.05 | E | 0.7808 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 30 | W-CB | 4.70 | F | 1.0394 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 60 |  |  | Y | 0.7016 |  |

Analysis :
Traffic Flows, pcu/hr
$q-C A$
$q-C B$
$q-A B$
$q-A C$
$q-B A$
$q-B C$
$f$

| AM | PM | Capacity, pcu/hr | AM | PM |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 116 | 231 | Q-BA | 422 | 411 |
| 8 | 14 | Q-BC | 545 | 549 |
| 1 | 2 | Q-CB | 725 | 730 |
| 186 | 165 | Q-BAC | 545 | 537 |
| 0 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 18 | 15 |  |  |  |
| 1.000 | 0.938 |  |  |  |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.000 | 0.002 |
| B-C | 0.033 | 0.027 |
| C-B | 0.011 | 0.019 |
| B-AC | 0.033 | 0.030 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | Ng Lau Road / Unnamed Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | Without Development |  |  | P. 6 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{BA}=\mathrm{D}[627+14 \mathrm{~W}-\mathrm{CR}-\mathrm{Y}(0.364 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+0.144 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB}+0.229 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{CA}+0.52 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{CB})]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where
$\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| W | 7.50 | V-rBA | 20 | w-BA | 2.05 | D | 0.7574 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 90 | w-BC | 2.05 | E | 0.7808 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 20 | w-CB | 4.70 | F | 1.0394 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 25 |  |  | Y | 0.7016 |  |

Analysis :
Traffic Flows, pcu/hr
$q-C A$
$q-C B$
$q-A B$
$q-A C$
$q-B A$
$q-B C$
$f$

| AM | PM |
| ---: | ---: |
| 219 | 252 |
| 15 | 20 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 219 | 187 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 28 | 25 |
| 1.000 | 1.000 |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| B-C | 0.052 | 0.046 |
| C-B | 0.021 | 0.028 |
| B-AC | 0.052 | 0.046 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | Ng Lau Road / Unnamed Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | With Approved Scheme |  |  | P. 7 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where
$Y=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| W | 7.50 | V-rBA | 20 | w-BA | 2.05 | D | 0.7574 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 90 | w-BC | 2.05 | E | 0.7808 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 20 | w-CB | 4.70 | F | 1.0394 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 25 |  |  | Y | 0.7016 |  |

Analysis :
Traffic Flows, pcu/hr
$q-C A$
$q-C B$
$q-A B$
$q-A C$
$q-B A$
$q-B C$
$f$

| AM | PM |
| ---: | ---: |
| 219 | 252 |
| 35 | 39 |
| 1 | 2 |
| 219 | 187 |
| 14 | 3 |
| 50 | 39 |
| 0.781 | 0.929 |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.035 | 0.008 |
| B-C | 0.093 | 0.072 |
| C-B | 0.049 | 0.054 |
| B-AC | 0.128 | 0.079 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | Ng Lau Road / Unnamed Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | With Proposed Scheme |  |  | P. 8 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where
$Y=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 7.50 | V-rBA | 20 | w-BA | 2.05 | D | 0.7574 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 90 | W-BC | 2.05 | E | 0.7808 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 20 | w-CB | 4.70 | F | 1.0394 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 25 |  |  | Y | 0.7016 |  |

Analysis :
Traffic Flows, pcu/hr
$q-C A$
$q-C B$
$q-A B$
$q-A C$
$q-B A$
$q-B C$
$f$

| AM | PM |
| ---: | ---: |
| 219 | 252 |
| 71 | 68 |
| 3 | 4 |
| 219 | 187 |
| 38 | 8 |
| 90 | 57 |
| 0.703 | 0.877 |


| Capacity, pcu/hr | AM | PM |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Q-BA | 386 | 389 |
| Q-BC | 538 | 544 |
| Q-CB | 715 | 724 |
| Q-BAC | 482 | 519 |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.098 | 0.021 |
| B-C | 0.167 | 0.105 |
| C-B | 0.099 | 0.094 |
| B-AC | 0.266 | 0.125 |

Signal Junction Analysis






| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total | $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{c}}$ * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 101 | 109 | 760 | 197 |  |  |  |  | 1167 | 253 |
| From B | 181 | 0 | 76 | 21 |  |  |  |  | 278 | 1231 |
| From C | 504 | 41 | 10 | 29 |  |  |  |  | 584 | 610 |
| From D | 328 | 39 | 53 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 421 | 946 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1114 | 189 | 899 | 248 |  |  |  |  | 2450 |  |

PM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total | $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{c}}$ * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 204 | 90 | 692 | 311 |  |  |  |  | 1297 | 201 |
| From B | 91 | 0 | 67 | 22 |  |  |  |  | 180 | 1350 |
| From C | 404 | 32 | 18 | 37 |  |  |  |  | 491 | 720 |
| From D | 160 | 26 | 33 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 221 | 839 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 859 | 148 | 810 | 372 |  |  |  |  | 2189 |  |


| Legend |  | Geometric Parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arm | Road (in clockwise order) | Arm | e (m) | v (m) | r (m) | L (m) | D (m) | $\varnothing\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | S |
| A | Slip Road from Lam Tei Interchange | From A | 10.0 | 7.3 | 20.0 | 10.0 | 55 | 45 | 0.4 |
| B | Access Road from Siu Hong Station | From B | 9.0 | 6.8 | 28.0 | 4.0 | 55 | 19 | 0.9 |
| C | Tsing Lun Road | From C | 11.5 | 7.8 | 100.0 | 9.0 | 55 | 23 | 0.7 |
| D | Hong Po Road | From D* | 6.0 | 4.5 | 27.0 | 6.0 | 55 | 10 | 0.4 |
| E |  | From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  | From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  | From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| H |  | From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Geometric Parameters
Predictive Equation $Q_{E}=K\left(F-f_{c} q_{c}\right)$

| $Q_{E}$ | Entry Capacity |
| :--- | :--- |
| $q_{c}$ | Circulating Flow across the Entry |
| $K$ | $=1-0.00347(\varnothing-30)-0.978[(1 / r)-0.05]$ |
| $F$ | $=303 x_{2}$ |
| $f_{c}$ | $=0.210 t_{D}\left(1+0.2 x_{2}\right)$ |
| $t_{D}$ | $=1+0.5 /(1+\mathrm{M})$ |
| $M$ | $=\exp [(D-60) / 10]$ |
| $x_{2}$ | $=v+(e-v) /(1+2 S)$ |
| $S$ | $=1.6(e-v) / L$ |

* Parameter in existing condition is adjusted for TTA

| Limitation |
| :--- |
| e |
| Entry Width |
| v |
| r |
| Approach Half Width |
| L Entry Radius |
| D |
| Effective Length of Flare |
| $\varnothing$ Inscribed Circle Diameter |
| S |
| Entry Angle |
| Sharpness of Flare |

Ratio-of-Flow to Capacity (RFC)

| Arm | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | M | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | K | F | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 8.748 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 0.948 | 2651 | 0.757 | 2331 | 2369 | 1167 | 1297 | 0.501 | 0.548 |
| From B | 7.597 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.051 | 2302 | 0.694 | 1522 | 1435 | 278 | 180 | 0.183 | 0.125 |
| From C | 9.398 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.063 | 2848 | 0.793 | 2514 | 2421 | 584 | 491 | 0.232 | 0.203 |
| From D | 5.333 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.082 | 1616 | 0.569 | 1166 | 1232 | 421 | 221 | 0.361 | 0.179 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Without Development |  |  | Page |  | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year 2033 | Job Number | J7265 | Date | 21 Feb | 2024 |


| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total | $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{c}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 329 | 0 | 995 | 503 |  |  |  |  | 1827 | 427 |
| From B | 196 | 0 | 86 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 302 | 2148 |
| From C | 796 | 50 | 11 | 121 |  |  |  |  | 978 | 1048 |
| From D | 699 | 56 | 310 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1065 | 1382 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2020 | 106 | 1402 | 644 |  |  |  |  | 4172 |  |

PM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 418 | 0 | 801 | 604 |  |  |  |  | 1823 |
| From B | 107 | 0 | 76 | 25 |  |  |  |  | 267 |
| From C | 539 | 41 | 20 | 146 |  |  |  |  | 746 |
| From D | 431 | 40 | 166 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1154 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1495 | 81 | 1063 | 775 |  |  |  |  |  |

Legend

| Arm | Road (in clockwise order) |
| :---: | :--- |
| A | Slip Road to Lam Tei Interchange |
| B | Access Road to Siu Hong Station |
| C | Tsing Lun Road |
| D | Hong Po Road |
| E |  |
| F |  |
| G |  |
| H |  |

Predictive Equation $Q_{E}=K\left(F-f_{c} q_{c}\right)$

| $Q_{E}$ | Entry Capacity |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | Circulating Flow across the Entry |
| K | $=1-0.00347(\varnothing-30)-0.978[(1 / \mathrm{r})-0.05]$ |
| F | $=303 \mathrm{x}_{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | $=0.210 \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}\left(1+0.2 \mathrm{x}_{2}\right)$ |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | $=1+0.5 /(1+\mathrm{M})$ |
| M | $=\exp [(\mathrm{D}-60) / 10]$ |
| $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $=\mathrm{v}+(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) /(1+2 \mathrm{~S})$ |
| S | $=1.6(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) / \mathrm{L}$ |


| Arm | $\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\varnothing\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 11.0 | 7.8 | 30.0 | 10.0 | 55 | 20 | 0.5 |
| From B | 9.0 | 6.8 | 28.0 | 6.0 | 55 | 19 | 0.6 |
| From C | 11.5 | 7.8 | 100.0 | 9.0 | 55 | 23 | 0.7 |
| From D | 14.0 | 8.5 | 40.0 | 10.0 | 55 | 10 | 0.9 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Limitation

| e | Entry Width | $4.0-15.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| v | Approach Half Width | $2.0-7.3 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| r | Entry Radius | $6.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| L | Effective Length of Flare | $1.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| D | Inscribed Circle Diameter | $15-100 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\varnothing$ | Entry Angle | $10^{\circ}-60^{\circ}$ |
| S | Sharpness of Flare | $0.0-3.0$ |

Ratio-of-Flow to Capacity (RFC)

| Arm | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | M | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | K | F | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 9.381 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.051 | 2842 | 0.792 | 2632 | 2765 | 1827 | 1823 | 0.694 | 0.659 |
| From B | 7.812 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.051 | 2367 | 0.706 | 895 | 998 | 302 | 208 | 0.337 | 0.208 |
| From C | 9.398 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.063 | 2848 | 0.793 | 2144 | 2055 | 978 | 746 | 0.456 | 0.363 |
| From D | 10.493 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.094 | 3179 | 0.853 | 2188 | 2428 | 1065 | 637 | 0.487 | 0.262 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Location | Tsing Lun Road / Hong Po Road / Lam Tei Interchange |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario | With Approved Scheme |  | Page |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design Year | 2033 | Job Number | J7265 |  | Date |  |  |  |

AM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 347 | 0 | 995 | 503 |  |  |  |  | 1845 |
| From B | 196 | 0 | 86 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 435 |
| From C | 798 | 50 | 11 | 121 |  |  |  | 980 | 2174 |
| From D | 699 | 56 | 318 | 0 |  |  | 1073 | 1402 |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2040 | 106 | 1410 | 644 |  |  |  |  |  |

PM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 435 | 0 | 801 | 604 |  |  |  |  | 1840 |
| From B | 107 | 0 | 76 | 25 |  |  |  |  | 269 |
| From C | 541 | 41 | 20 | 146 |  |  |  |  | 208 |
| From D | 0 | 40 | 168 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 748 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1083 | 81 | 1065 | 775 |  | 3004 |  |  |  |

Legend

| Arm | Road (in clockwise order) |
| :---: | :--- |
| A | Slip Road to Lam Tei Interchange |
| B | Access Road to Siu Hong Station |
| C | Tsing Lun Road |
| D | Hong Po Road |
| E |  |
| F |  |
| G |  |
| H |  |

Predictive Equation $Q_{E}=K\left(F-f_{c} q_{c}\right)$

| $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | Entry Capacity |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | Circulating Flow across the Entry |
| K | $=1-0.00347(\varnothing-30)-0.978[(1 / \mathrm{r})-0.05]$ |
| F | $=303 \mathrm{x}_{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | $=0.210 \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}\left(1+0.2 \mathrm{x}_{2}\right)$ |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | $=1+0.5 /(1+\mathrm{M})$ |
| M | $=\exp [(\mathrm{D}-60) / 10]$ |
| $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $=\mathrm{v}+(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) /(1+2 \mathrm{~S})$ |
| S | $=1.6(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) / \mathrm{L}$ |


| Arm | $\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\varnothing\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | S |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 11.0 | 7.8 | 30.0 | 10.0 | 55 | 20 | 0.5 |
| From B | 9.0 | 6.8 | 28.0 | 4.0 | 55 | 19 | 0.9 |
| From C | 11.5 | 7.8 | 100.0 | 9.0 | 55 | 23 | 0.7 |
| From D | 14.0 | 8.5 | 40.0 | 10.0 | 55 | 10 | 0.9 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Limitation

| e | Entry Width | $4.0-15.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| v | Approach Half Width | $2.0-7.3 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| r | Entry Radius | $6.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| L | Effective Length of Flare | $1.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| D | Inscribed Circle Diameter | $15-100 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\varnothing$ | Entry Angle | $10^{\circ}-60^{\circ}$ |
| S | Sharpness of Flare | $0.0-3.0$ |

Ratio-of-Flow to Capacity (RFC)

| Arm | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | M | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | K | F | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 9.381 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.051 | 2842 | 0.792 | 2625 | 2764 | 1845 | 1840 | 0.703 | 0.666 |
| From B | 7.597 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.051 | 2302 | 0.694 | 834 | 941 | 302 | 208 | 0.362 | 0.221 |
| From C | 9.398 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.063 | 2848 | 0.793 | 2129 | 2041 | 980 | 748 | 0.460 | 0.367 |
| From D | 10.493 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.094 | 3179 | 0.853 | 2169 | 2410 | 1073 | 208 | 0.495 | 0.086 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Roundabout Analysis

| Location | Tsing Lun Road / Hong Po Road / Lam Tei Interchange |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Scenario |  |  |  |  |  |
| With Proposed Scheme |  | Page | 16 |  |  |
| Design Year | $\underline{2033}$ | Job Number | $\underline{J 7265}$ | Date | $\underline{21 \text { February } 2024}$ |

AM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 380 | 0 | 995 | 503 |  |  |  |  | 1878 |
| From B | 196 | 0 | 86 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 450 |
| From C | 801 | 50 | 11 | 121 |  |  |  |  | 902 |
| From D | 699 | 56 | 333 | 0 |  |  |  | 1088 | 1438 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2076 | 106 | 1425 | 644 |  |  |  |  |  |

## PM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 460 | 0 | 801 | 604 |  |  |  |  | 1865 |
| From B | 107 | 0 | 76 | 25 |  |  |  |  | 272 |
| From C | 545 | 41 | 20 | 146 |  |  |  |  |  |
| From D | 0 | 40 | 171 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 752 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1112 | 81 | 1068 | 775 |  |  |  |  |  |

Legend

| Arm | Road (in clockwise order) |
| :---: | :--- |
| A | Slip Road to Lam Tei Interchange |
| B | Access Road to Siu Hong Station |
| C | Tsing Lun Road |
| D | Hong Po Road |
| E |  |
| F |  |
| G |  |
| H |  |

Predictive Equation $Q_{E}=K\left(F-f_{c} q_{c}\right)$

| $Q_{E}$ | Entry Capacity |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | Circulating Flow across the Entry |
| K | $=1-0.00347(\varnothing-30)-0.978[(1 / \mathrm{r})-0.05]$ |
| F | $=303 \mathrm{x}_{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | $=0.210 \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}\left(1+0.2 \mathrm{x}_{2}\right)$ |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | $=1+0.5 /(1+\mathrm{M})$ |
| M | $=\exp [(\mathrm{D}-60) / 10]$ |
| $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $=\mathrm{v}+(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) /(1+2 \mathrm{~S})$ |
| S | $=1.6(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) / \mathrm{L}$ |


| Arm | $\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\varnothing\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | S |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 11.0 | 7.8 | 30.0 | 10.0 | 55 | 20 | 0.5 |
| From B | 9.0 | 6.8 | 28.0 | 4.0 | 55 | 19 | 0.9 |
| From C | 11.5 | 7.8 | 100.0 | 9.0 | 55 | 23 | 0.7 |
| From D | 14.0 | 8.5 | 40.0 | 10.0 | 55 | 10 | 0.9 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Limitation

| e | Entry Width | $4.0-15.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| v | Approach Half Width | $2.0-7.3 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| r | Entry Radius | $6.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| L | Effective Length of Flare | $1.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| D | Inscribed Circle Diameter | $15-100 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\varnothing$ | Entry Angle | $10^{\circ}-60^{\circ}$ |
| S | Sharpness of Flare | $0.0-3.0$ |

Ratio-of-Flow to Capacity (RFC)

| Arm | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | M | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | K | F | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 9.381 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.051 | 2842 | 0.792 | 2613 | 2761 | 1878 | 1865 | 0.719 | 0.675 |
| From B | 7.597 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.051 | 2302 | 0.694 | 799 | 920 | 302 | 208 | 0.378 | 0.226 |
| From C | 9.398 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.063 | 2848 | 0.793 | 2101 | 2020 | 983 | 752 | 0.468 | 0.372 |
| From D | 10.493 | 0.607 | 1.311 | 1.094 | 3179 | 0.853 | 2136 | 2383 | 1088 | 211 | 0.509 | 0.089 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Roundabout Analysis

| Location |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Scenario |  |  |  | Page |  |
|  | Existing Condition |  |  | 17 |  |
| Design Year | $\underline{2023}$ |  | Job Number | $\underline{J 7265}$ | Date |

AM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 16 | 0 | 878 |  |  |  |  |  | 894 |
| From B | 292 | 3 | 275 |  |  |  |  |  | 605 |
| From C | 317 | 589 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 625 | 592 | 1166 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

PM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 7 | 0 | 891 |  |  |  |  |  | 898 |
| From B | 266 | 0 | 380 |  |  |  |  |  | 448 |
| From C | 175 | 422 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  | 646 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 448 | 422 | 1297 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Legend

| Arm | Road (in clockwise order) |
| :---: | :--- |
| A | Slip Road to Castle Peak Road |
| B | Slip Road to Tuen Mun Road |
| C | Slip Road to Tsing Lun Road |
| D |  |
| E |  |
| F |  |
| G |  |
| H |  |

Predictive Equation $Q_{E}=K\left(F-f_{c} q_{c}\right)$

| $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | Entry Capacity |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | Circulating Flow across the Entry |
| K | $=1-0.00347(\varnothing-30)-0.978[(1 / \mathrm{r})-0.05]$ |
| F | $=303 \mathrm{x}_{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | $=0.210 \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}\left(1+0.2 \mathrm{x}_{2}\right)$ |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | $=1+0.5 /(1+\mathrm{M})$ |
| M | $=\exp [(\mathrm{D}-60) / 10]$ |
| $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $=\mathrm{v}+(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) /(1+2 \mathrm{~S})$ |
| S | $=1.6(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) / \mathrm{L}$ |


| Arm | $\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\varnothing\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 7.3 | 7.3 | 40.0 | 1.0 | 45 | 22 | 0.0 |
| From B | 8.8 | 7.3 | 65.0 | 3.0 | 45 | 26 | 0.8 |
| From C | 7.7 | 6.0 | 100.0 | 8.0 | 45 | 17 | 0.3 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Limitation

| e | Entry Width | $4.0-15.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| v | Approach Half Width | $2.0-7.3 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| r | Entry Radius | $6.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| L | Effective Length of Flare | $1.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| D | Inscribed Circle Diameter | $15-100 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\varnothing$ | Entry Angle | $10^{\circ}-60^{\circ}$ |
| S | Sharpness of Flare | $0.0-3.0$ |

Ratio-of-Flow to Capacity (RFC)

| Arm | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | M | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | K | F | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 7.300 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.052 | 2212 | 0.728 | 1864 | 1984 | 894 | 898 | 0.480 | 0.453 |
| From B | 7.877 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.048 | 2387 | 0.762 | 1777 | 1763 | 570 | 646 | 0.321 | 0.366 |
| From C | 7.012 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.084 | 2125 | 0.711 | 2064 | 2093 | 919 | 623 | 0.445 | 0.298 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lam Tei Interchange |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario Without Development |  |  | Page 18 |
| Design Year 2033 | Job Number J7265 | Date | 21 February 2024 |


| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total | $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{c}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 18 | 0 | 1162 |  |  |  |  |  | 1180 | 995 |
| From B | 323 | 0 | 775 |  |  |  |  |  | 1098 | 1192 |
| From C | 632 | 983 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 1627 | 341 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 973 | 983 | 1949 |  |  |  |  |  | 3905 |  |

PM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 15 | 0 | 1137 |  |  |  |  |  | 1152 |
| From B | 283 | 0 | 759 |  |  |  |  |  | 703 |
| From C | 379 | 677 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  | 1042 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1178 |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 677 | 677 | 1922 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Legend

| Arm | Road (in clockwise order) |
| :---: | :--- |
| A | Slip Road to Castle Peak Road |
| B | Slip Road to Tuen Mun Road |
| C | Slip Road to Tsing Lun Road |
| D |  |
| E |  |
| F |  |
| G |  |
| H |  |

Predictive Equation $Q_{E}=K\left(F-f_{c} q_{c}\right)$

| $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | Entry Capacity |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | Circulating Flow across the Entry |
| K | $=1-0.00347(\varnothing-30)-0.978[(1 / \mathrm{r})-0.05]$ |
| F | $=303 \mathrm{x}_{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | $=0.210 \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}\left(1+0.2 \mathrm{x}_{2}\right)$ |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | $=1+0.5 /(1+\mathrm{M})$ |
| M | $=\exp [(\mathrm{D}-60) / 10]$ |
| $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $=\mathrm{v}+(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) /(1+2 \mathrm{~S})$ |
| S | $=1.6(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) / \mathrm{L}$ |


| Arm | $\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\varnothing\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | S |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 7.3 | 7.3 | 40.0 | 1.0 | 45 | 22 | 0.0 |
| From B | 8.8 | 7.3 | 65.0 | 3.0 | 45 | 26 | 0.8 |
| From C | 7.7 | 6.0 | 100.0 | 8.0 | 45 | 17 | 0.3 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Limitation

| e | Entry Width | $4.0-15.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| v | Approach Half Width | $2.0-7.3 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| r | Entry Radius | $6.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| L | Effective Length of Flare | $1.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| D | Inscribed Circle Diameter | $15-100 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\varnothing$ | Entry Angle | $10^{\circ}-60^{\circ}$ |
| S | Sharpness of Flare | $0.0-3.0$ |

Ratio-of-Flow to Capacity (RFC)

| Arm | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | M | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | K | F | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 7.300 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.052 | 2212 | 0.728 | 1565 | 1789 | 1180 | 1152 | 0.754 | 0.644 |
| From B | 7.877 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.048 | 2387 | 0.762 | 1549 | 1560 | 1098 | 1042 | 0.709 | 0.668 |
| From C | 7.012 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.084 | 2125 | 0.711 | 2041 | 2074 | 1627 | 1082 | 0.797 | 0.522 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


AM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 18 | 0 | 1168 |  |  |  |  |  | 1186 |
| From B | 323 | 0 | 787 |  |  |  |  |  | 1008 |
| From C | 637 | 996 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 1110 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 978 | 996 | 1967 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

PM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 15 | 0 | 1142 |  |  |  |  |  | 1157 |
| From B | 283 | 0 | 771 |  |  |  |  |  | 711 |
| From C | 382 | 685 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  | 1054 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1183 |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 680 | 685 | 1939 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Legend

| Arm | Road (in clockwise order) |
| :---: | :--- |
| A | Slip Road to Castle Peak Road |
| B | Slip Road to Tuen Mun Road |
| C | Slip Road to Tsing Lun Road |
| D |  |
| E |  |
| F |  |
| G |  |
| H |  |

Predictive Equation $Q_{E}=K\left(F-f_{c} q_{c}\right)$

| $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | Entry Capacity |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | Circulating Flow across the Entry |
| K | $=1-0.00347(\varnothing-30)-0.978[(1 / \mathrm{r})-0.05]$ |
| F | $=303 \mathrm{x}_{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | $=0.210 \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}\left(1+0.2 \mathrm{x}_{2}\right)$ |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | $=1+0.5 /(1+\mathrm{M})$ |
| M | $=\exp [(\mathrm{D}-60) / 10]$ |
| $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $=\mathrm{v}+(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) /(1+2 \mathrm{~S})$ |
| S | $=1.6(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) / \mathrm{L}$ |


| Arm | $\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\varnothing\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 7.3 | 7.3 | 40.0 | 1.0 | 45 | 22 | 0.0 |
| From B | 8.8 | 7.3 | 65.0 | 3.0 | 45 | 26 | 0.8 |
| From C | 7.7 | 6.0 | 100.0 | 8.0 | 45 | 17 | 0.3 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Limitation

| e | Entry Width | $4.0-15.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| v | Approach Half Width | $2.0-7.3 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| r | Entry Radius | $6.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| L | Effective Length of Flare | $1.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| D | Inscribed Circle Diameter | $15-100 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\varnothing$ | Entry Angle | $10^{\circ}-60^{\circ}$ |
| S | Sharpness of Flare | $0.0-3.0$ |

Ratio-of-Flow to Capacity (RFC)

| Arm | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | M | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | K | F | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 7.300 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.052 | 2212 | 0.728 | 1555 | 1783 | 1186 | 1157 | 0.762 | 0.649 |
| From B | 7.877 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.048 | 2387 | 0.762 | 1544 | 1556 | 1110 | 1054 | 0.719 | 0.677 |
| From C | 7.012 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.084 | 2125 | 0.711 | 2041 | 2074 | 1645 | 1093 | 0.806 | 0.527 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Location L | ntercha |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario W | osed S |  |  |  | Page | 20 |
| Design Year | 2033 | Job Number | J7265 | Date | 21 Feb | 2024 |

AM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 18 | 0 | 1180 |  |  |  |  |  | 1198 |
| From B | 323 | 0 | 808 |  |  |  |  |  | 1031 |
| From C | 647 | 1019 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 1131 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 988.4237 | 1019 | 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

PM Peak

| Arm | To A | To B | To C | To D | To E | To F | To G | To H | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 15 | 0 | 1150 |  |  |  |  |  | 1165 |
| From B | 283 | 0 | 788 |  |  |  |  |  | 721 |
| From C | 387 | 695 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  | 1071 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1191 |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 685 | 695 | 1964 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Legend

| Arm | Road (in clockwise order) |
| :---: | :--- |
| A | Slip Road to Castle Peak Road |
| B | Slip Road to Tuen Mun Road |
| C | Slip Road to Tsing Lun Road |
| D |  |
| E |  |
| F |  |
| G |  |
| H |  |

Predictive Equation $Q_{E}=K\left(F-f_{c} q_{c}\right)$

| $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | Entry Capacity |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | Circulating Flow across the Entry |
| K | $=1-0.00347(\varnothing-30)-0.978[(1 / \mathrm{r})-0.05]$ |
| F | $=303 \mathrm{x}_{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | $=0.210 \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}\left(1+0.2 \mathrm{x}_{2}\right)$ |
| $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | $=1+0.5 /(1+\mathrm{M})$ |
| M | $=\exp [(\mathrm{D}-60) / 10]$ |
| $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $=\mathrm{v}+(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) /(1+2 \mathrm{~S})$ |
| S | $=1.6(\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{v}) / \mathrm{L}$ |


| Arm | $\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{m})$ | $\varnothing\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | S |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 7.3 | 7.3 | 40.0 | 1.0 | 45 | 22 | 0.0 |
| From B | 8.8 | 7.3 | 65.0 | 3.0 | 45 | 26 | 0.8 |
| From C | 7.7 | 6.0 | 100.0 | 8.0 | 45 | 17 | 0.3 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Limitation

| e | Entry Width | $4.0-15.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| v | Approach Half Width | $2.0-7.3 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| r | Entry Radius | $6.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| L | Effective Length of Flare | $1.0-100.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| D | Inscribed Circle Diameter | $15-100 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| $\varnothing$ | Entry Angle | $10^{\circ}-60^{\circ}$ |
| S | Sharpness of Flare | $0.0-3.0$ |

Ratio-of-Flow to Capacity (RFC)

| Arm | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | M | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{D}}$ | K | F | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From A | 7.300 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.052 | 2212 | 0.728 | 1538 | 1775 | 1198 | 1165 | 0.779 | 0.656 |
| From B | 7.877 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.048 | 2387 | 0.762 | 1535 | 1550 | 1131 | 1071 | 0.737 | 0.691 |
| From C | 7.012 | 0.223 | 1.409 | 1.084 | 2125 | 0.711 | 2041 | 2074 | 1678 | 1108 | 0.822 | 0.534 |
| From D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | San Hing Road / Ng Lau Road (Southern) |  | Date: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2023 Job Number: | J7265 |  | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | Existing Condition |  |  | P. 29 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.65 | V-rBA | 23 | W-BA | 2.40 | D | 0.7441 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 23 | W-BC | 2.40 | E | 0.8078 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 26 | W-CB | 3.00 | F | 0.8857 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 57 |  |  | Y | 0.7706 |  |

Analysis :
Traffic Flows, pcu/hr
$q-C A$
$q-C B$
$q-A B$
$q-A C$
$q-B A$
$q-B C$
$f$

| AM | PM |
| ---: | ---: |
| 166 | 152 |
| 7 | 1 |
| 24 | 18 |
| 93 | 214 |
| 21 | 15 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 0.160 | 0.000 |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.050 | 0.037 |
| B-C | 0.007 | 0.000 |
| C-B | 0.011 | 0.002 |
| B-AC | 0.057 | 0.037 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: Design Year: Scenario: | San Hing Road / Ng Lau Road (Southern) |  |  | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2033 | Job Number: | J7265 |  |  |  |
|  | Without Development |  |  |  |  | P. 30 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $Y=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry :

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.65 | V-rBA | 23 | w-BA | 2.40 | D | 0.7441 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 23 | w-BC | 2.40 | E | 0.8078 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 26 | w-CB | 3.00 | F | 0.8857 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 57 |  |  | Y | 0.7706 |  |

Analysis :

| Traffic Flows, pcu/hr | AM | PM | Capacity, pcu/hr | AM | PM |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| q-CA | 185 | 165 | Q-BA | 411 | 399 |
| q-CB | 10 | 2 | Q-BC | 571 | 553 |
| q-AB | 139 | 60 | Q-CB | 605 | 597 |
| q-AC | 80 | 192 | Q-BAC | 426 | 399 |
| q-BA | 34 | 22 |  |  |  |
| q-BC | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |
| f | 0.128 | 0.000 |  |  |  |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.083 | 0.055 |
| B-C | 0.009 | 0.000 |
| C-B | 0.017 | 0.003 |
| B-AC | 0.091 | 0.055 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | San Hing Road / Ng Lau Road (Southern) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | With Approved Scheme |  |  | P. 31 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{BA}=\mathrm{D}[627+14 \mathrm{~W}-\mathrm{CR}-\mathrm{Y}(0.364 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+0.144 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB}+0.229 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{CA}+0.52 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{CB})]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.65 | V-rBA | 23 | W-BA | 2.40 | D | 0.7441 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 23 | W-BC | 2.40 | E | 0.8078 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 26 | W-CB | 3.00 | F | 0.8857 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 57 |  |  | Y | 0.7706 |  |

Analysis :

| Traffic Flows, pcu/hr | AM | PM | Capacity, pcu/hr | AM | PM |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| q-CA | 185 | 165 | Q-BA | 410 | 399 |
| q-CB | 10 | 2 | Q-BC | 570 | 553 |
| q-AB | 153 | 63 | Q-CB | 602 | 596 |
| q-AC | 80 | 192 | Q-BAC | 425 | 399 |
| q-BA | 35 | 24 |  |  |  |
| q-BC | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |
| f | 0.125 | 0.000 |  |  |  |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.085 | 0.060 |
| B-C | 0.009 | 0.000 |
| C-B | 0.017 | 0.003 |
| B-AC | 0.094 | 0.060 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: Design Year: Scenario: | San Hing Road / Ng Lau Road (Southern) |  |  | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2033 | Job Number: | J7265 |  |  |  |
|  | With | cheme |  |  |  | P. |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{BA}=\mathrm{D}[627+14 \mathrm{~W}-\mathrm{CR}-\mathrm{Y}(0.364 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+0.144 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB}+0.229 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{CA}+0.52 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{CB})]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.65 | V-rBA | 23 | W-BA | 2.40 | D | 0.7441 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 23 | W-BC | 2.40 | E | 0.8078 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 26 | W-CB | 3.00 | F | 0.8857 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 57 |  |  | Y | 0.7706 |  |

Analysis :
Traffic Flows, pcu/hr
$q-C A$
$q-C B$
$q-A B$
$q-A C$
$q-B A$
$q-B C$
$f$

| AM | PM |
| ---: | ---: |
| 185 | 165 |
| 10 | 2 |
| 177 | 68 |
| 80 | 192 |
| 37 | 26 |
| 5 | 0 |
| 0.119 | 0.000 |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.091 | 0.065 |
| B-C | 0.009 | 0.000 |
| C-B | 0.017 | 0.003 |
| B-AC | 0.100 | 0.065 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: Design Year: Scenario: | San Hing Road / Ng Lau Road (Northern) |  |  | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2023 | Job Number: | J7265 |  |  |  |
|  | Existing Condition |  |  |  | P. 33 |  |

San Hing Road (Arm C)
Ng Lau Road (Arm A)


The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{BC}=\mathrm{E}[745-\mathrm{Y}(0.364 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+0.144 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by $D, E, F$ are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $Y=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry :

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.63 | V-rBA | 45 | W-BA | 1.90 | D | 0.7207 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 25 | W-BC | 1.90 | E | 0.7768 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 42 | W-CB | 3.50 | F | 0.9344 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 62 |  |  | Y | 0.7714 |  |

Analysis:

| Traffic Flows, pcu/hr | AM |  | PM Capacity, pcu/hr | AM | PM |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| q-CA | 9 | 15 | Q-BA | 432 | 430 |
| q-CB | 8 | 13 | Q-BC | 561 | 561 |
| q-AB | 165 | 141 | Q-CB | 648 | 652 |
| q-AC | 18 | 26 | Q-BAC | 436 | 433 |
| q-BA | 93 | 207 |  |  |  |
| q-BC | 4 | 8 |  |  |  |
| f | 0.041 | 0.037 |  |  |  |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.216 | 0.482 |
| B-C | 0.007 | 0.014 |
| C-B | 0.012 | 0.020 |
| B-AC | 0.223 | 0.496 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: Design Year: Scenario: | San Hing Road / Ng Lau Road (Northern) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
|  | Without Development |  |  | P. 34 |

San Hing Road (Arm C) $\quad$ Ng Lau Road (Arm A)


The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by $D, E, F$ are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-$ rBA -120$)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v-r B A$, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry :

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.63 | V-rBA | 45 | W-BA | 1.90 | D | 0.7207 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 25 | W-BC | 1.90 | E | 0.7768 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 42 | W-CB | 3.50 | F | 0.9344 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 62 |  |  | Y | 0.7714 |  |

Analysis :

| Traffic Flows, pcu/hr | AM | PM Capacity, pcu/hr | AM | PM |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| q-CA | 48 | 59 | Q-BA | 424 | 423 |
| q-CB | 11 | 14 | Q-BC | 559 | 560 |
| q-AB | 184 | 152 | Q-CB | 643 | 650 |
| q-AC | 19 | 24 | Q-BAC | 430 | 429 |
| q-BA | 80 | 182 |  |  |  |
| q-BC | 5 | 10 |  |  |  |
| f | 0.059 | 0.052 |  |  |  |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.189 | 0.430 |
| B-C | 0.009 | 0.018 |
| C-B | 0.017 | 0.022 |
| B-AC | 0.198 | 0.448 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | San Hing Road / Ng Lau Road (Northern) |  | Date: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 |  | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | With Approved Scheme |  |  | P. 35 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by $D, E, F$ are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v-r B A$, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry :

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.63 | V-rBA | 45 | w-BA | 1.90 | D | 0.7207 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 25 | w-BC | 1.90 | E | 0.7768 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 42 | w-CB | 3.50 | F | 0.9344 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 62 |  |  | Y | 0.7714 |  |

Analysis :

| Traffic Flows, pcu/hr | AM | PM Capacity, pcu/hr | AM | PM |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| q-CA | 48 | 59 | Q-BA | 424 | 423 |
| q-CB | 11 | 14 | Q-BC | 559 | 560 |
| q-AB | 184 | 152 | Q-CB | 643 | 650 |
| q-AC | 19 | 24 | Q-BAC | 430 | 429 |
| q-BA | 80 | 182 |  |  |  |
| q-BC | 5 | 10 |  |  |  |
| f | 0.059 | 0.052 |  |  |  |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.189 | 0.430 |
| B-C | 0.009 | 0.018 |
| C-B | 0.017 | 0.022 |
| B-AC | 0.198 | 0.448 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | San Hing Road / Ng Lau Road (Northern) |  | Date: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 |  | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | With Proposed Scheme |  |  | P. 36 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by $D, E, F$ are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry :

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.63 | V-rBA | 45 | W-BA | 1.90 | D | 0.7207 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 25 | W-BC | 1.90 | E | 0.7768 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 42 | W-CB | 3.50 | F | 0.9344 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 62 |  |  | Y | 0.7714 |  |

Analysis:

| Traffic Flows, pcu/hr | AM | PM Capacity, pcu/hr | AM | PM |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| q-CA | 48 | 59 | Q-BA | 424 | 423 |
| q-CB | 11 | 14 | Q-BC | 559 | 560 |
| q-AB | 184 | 152 | Q-CB | 643 | 650 |
| q-AC | 19 | 24 | Q-BAC | 430 | 429 |
| q-BA | 80 | 182 |  |  |  |
| q-BC | 5 | 10 |  |  |  |
| f | 0.059 | 0.052 |  |  |  |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.189 | 0.430 |
| B-C | 0.009 | 0.018 |
| C-B | 0.017 | 0.022 |
| B-AC | 0.198 | 0.448 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | T-junction of San Hing Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2023 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | Existing Condition |  |  | P. 37 |

San Hing Road (Arm C) San Hing Road (Arm A)


The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where
$\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.00 | V-rBA | 25 | W-BA | 2.50 | D | 0.7912 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 100 | W-BC | 2.50 | E | 0.8156 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 25 | W-CB | 3.00 | F | 0.8586 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 25 |  |  | Y | 0.7930 |  |

Analysis:
Traffic Flows, pcu/hr
$q-C A$
$q-C B$
$q-A B$
$q-A C$
$q-B A$
$q-B C$
$f$

| AM | PM |
| ---: | ---: |
| 23 | 15 |
| 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 2 |
| 24 | 17 |
| 3 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.000 | 0.000 |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.006 | 0.000 |
| B-C | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| C-B | 0.002 | 0.002 |
| B-AC | 0.006 | 0.000 |

Priority Junction Analysis



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{BA}=\mathrm{D}[627+14 \mathrm{~W}-\mathrm{CR}-\mathrm{Y}(0.364 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+0.144 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB}+0.229 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{CA}+0.52 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{CB})]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where
$\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.00 | V-rBA | 45 | w-BA | 4.00 | D | 0.9343 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 100 | W-BC | 4.00 | E | 0.9632 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 45 | w-CB | 3.00 | F | 0.8586 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 25 |  |  | Y | 0.7930 |  |

Analysis:
Traffic Flows, pcu/hr
$q-C A$
$q-C B$
$q-A B$
$q-A C$
$q-B A$
$q-B C$
$f$

| AM | PM |
| ---: | ---: |
| 39 | 22 |
| 7 | 1 |
| 113 | 42 |
| 36 | 20 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 40 | 50 |
| 1.000 | 1.000 |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| B-C | 0.058 | 0.071 |
| C-B | 0.012 | 0.002 |
| B-AC | 0.058 | 0.071 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | T-junction of San Hing Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | With Approved Scheme |  |  | P. 39 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by $D, E, F$ are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where
$\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.00 | V-rBA | 45 | w-BA | 4.00 | D | 0.9343 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 100 | W-BC | 4.00 | E | 0.9632 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 45 | w-CB | 3.00 | F | 0.8586 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 25 |  |  | Y | 0.7930 |  |

Analysis:
Traffic Flows, pcu/hr
$q-C A$
$q-C B$
$q-A B$
$q-A C$
$q-B A$
$q-B C$
$f$

| AM | PM |
| ---: | ---: |
| 39 | 22 |
| 7 | 1 |
| 127 | 45 |
| 36 | 20 |
| 1 | 2 |
| 40 | 50 |
| 0.976 | 0.962 |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.002 | 0.003 |
| B-C | 0.058 | 0.071 |
| C-B | 0.012 | 0.002 |
| B-AC | 0.059 | 0.074 |

Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | T-junction of San Hing Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2033 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | With Proposed Scheme |  |  | P. 40 |



The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$Q-B C=E[745-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where
$\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 6.00 | V-rBA | 45 | W-BA | 4.00 | D | 0.9343 |  |
| W-CR | 0.00 | V-IBA | 100 | W-BC | 4.00 | E | 0.9632 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 45 | W-CB | 3.00 | F | 0.8586 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 25 |  |  | Y | 0.7930 |  |

Analysis:
Traffic Flows, pcu/hr
$q-C A$
$q-C B$
$q-A B$
$q-A C$
$q-B A$
$q-B C$
$f$

| AM | PM |
| ---: | ---: |
| 39 | 22 |
| 7 | 1 |
| 151 | 50 |
| 36 | 20 |
| 3 | 4 |
| 40 | 50 |
| 0.930 | 0.926 |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.005 | 0.007 |
| B-C | 0.058 | 0.071 |
| C-B | 0.012 | 0.002 |
| B-AC | 0.063 | 0.078 |

Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Priority Junction Analysis

| Junction: | Hong Po Road / Yan Tin Estate Access Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Year: | 2023 Job Number: | J7265 | Date: | 21 Feb 2024 |
| Scenario: | Existing Condition |  |  | P. 45 |

Unnamed Road (Arm C) Unnamed Road (Arm A)


The predictive equations of capacity of movement are:
$Q-B A=D[627+14 W-C R-Y(0.364 q-A C+0.144 q-A B+0.229 q-C A+0.52 q-C B)]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{BC}=\mathrm{E}[745-\mathrm{Y}(0.364 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+0.144 \mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{CB}=\mathrm{F}[745-0.364 \mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AC}+\mathrm{q}-\mathrm{AB})]$
The geometric parameters represented by D, E, F are:
$D=[1+0.094(w-B A-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B A-120)][1+0.0006(V-I B A-150)]$
$E=[1+0.094(w-B C-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r B C-120)]$
$F=[1+0.094(w-C B-3.65)][1+0.0009(V-r C B-120)]$
where $\mathrm{Y}=1-0.0345 \mathrm{~W}$
$q-A B$, etc = the design flow of movement $A B$, etc
W = major road width
W-CR = central reserve width
w-BA, etc = lane width to vehicle
$v$-rBA, etc $=$ visibility to the right for waiting vehicles in stream BA, etc
$v$-IBA, etc $=$ visibility to the left for waiting vehicles in stream $B A$, etc
Geometry

| Input |  | Input |  |  | Input |  | Calculated |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| W | 9.50 | V-rBA | 55 | w-BA | 4.40 | D | 0.9323 |  |
| W-CR | 3.00 | V-IBA | 25 | w-BC | 4.40 | E | 1.0079 |  |
|  |  | V-rBC | 55 | w-CB | 3.18 | F | 0.9042 |  |
|  |  | V-rCB | 60 |  |  | Y | 0.6723 |  |

Analysis:
Traffic Flows, pcu/hr
$q-C A$
$q-C B$
$q-A B$
$q-A C$
$q-B A$
$q-B C$
$f$

| AM | PM |
| ---: | ---: |
| 394 | 215 |
| 2 | 2 |
| 31 | 16 |
| 215 | 355 |
| 27 | 4 |
| 5 | 2 |
| 0.156 | 0.333 |


| Capacity, pcu/hr | AM | PM |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Q-BA | 515 | 510 |
| Q-BC | 695 | 662 |
| Q-CB | 619 | 592 |
| Q-BAC | 536 | 552 |


| Ratio-of-flow to Capacity | AM | PM |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| B-A | 0.052 | 0.008 |
| B-C | 0.007 | 0.003 |
| C-B | 0.003 | 0.003 |
| B-AC | 0.060 | 0.011 |

Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Signal Junction Analysis


Appendix B Public Transport Survey Result

Proposed Rezoning from "Residential (Group B)1" Zone to "Residential (Group B)4" Zone for Medium-Density Housing Development to Include a Footpath for Public use at Various Lots and Adjacent Government Land in DD130, Lam Tei, Tuen Mun

Traffic Impact Assessment (Application no. Y/TM-LTYY/11)

TABLE B1 DETAILED INFORMATION OCCUPANCY SURVEY RESULT ON THE PUBLIC TRANSPORT NEAR THE SUBJECT SITE

| Direction | Routes | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No. of Trips | No. of Passenger |  | Occu-pancy$[c]=[b] /[a]$ | No. of Trips | No. of Passenger |  | Occu-pancy$[c]=[b] /[a]$ |
|  |  |  | Capacity [a] | Occupied [b] |  |  | Capacity [a] | Occupied [b] |  |
| To other districts | СТВ 50 | 3 | 405 | 203 | 50\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | СТВ 55 | 3 | 405 | 270 | 67\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | СТВ 56 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | CTB 56A | 4 | 540 | 378 | 70\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | СТВ 950 | 2 | 270 | 169 | 63\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | CTB 955 | 1 | 135 | 68 | 50\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | CTB B3A | 1 | 135 | 122 | 90\% | 1 | 135 | 68 | 50\% |
|  | KMB 53 | 2 | 270 | 102 | 38\% | 2 | 270 | 135 | 50\% |
|  | KMB 63X | 5 | 675 | 380 | 56\% | 2 | 270 | 68 | 25\% |
|  | KMB 67M | 12 | 1620 | 354 | 22\% | 5 | 675 | 68 | 10\% |
|  | KMB 67X | 10 | 1350 | 280 | 21\% | 3 | 405 | 102 | 25\% |
|  | KMB 68A | 6 | 810 | 439 | 54\% | 3 | 405 | 152 | 38\% |
|  | KMB 258P | 2 | 270 | 135 | 50\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | KMB 261P | 5 | 675 | 169 | 25\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | KMB 267X | 3 | 405 | 122 | 30\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | KMB 960A | 2 | 270 | 27 | 10\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | KMB 960C | 2 | 270 | 14 | 5\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | KMB 960P | 6 | 810 | 463 | 57\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | KMB 960X | 9 | 1215 | 152 | 13\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | LWB A34 | 2 | 270 | 50 | 18\% | 1 | 135 | 11 | 8\% |
|  | LWB E33P | 4 | 540 | 115 | 21\% | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | NLB B2 | 3 | 405 | 203 | 50\% | 3 | 405 | 152 | 38\% |
|  | GMB42 | 4 | 76 | 46 | 60\% | 4 | 76 | 31 | 40\% |
| From other districts | CTB 50 | 0 | - | - | - | 3 | 405 | 102 | 25\% |
|  | СТВ 55 | 0 | - | - | - | 3 | 405 | 102 | 25\% |
|  | СТВ 56 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | СТВ 56A | 2 | 270 | 135 | 50\% | 3 | 405 | 304 | 75\% |
|  | СТВ 950 | 0 | - | - | - | 1 | 135 | 68 | 50\% |
|  | СТВ 955 | 0 | - | - | - | 1 | 135 | 81 | 60\% |
|  | CTB B3A | 1 | 135 | 68 | 50\% | 2 | 270 | 203 | 75\% |
|  | KMB 53 | 2 | 270 | 102 | 38\% | 2 | 270 | 203 | 75\% |
|  | KMB 63X | 2 | 270 | 102 | 38\% | 3 | 405 | 304 | 75\% |
|  | KMB 67M | 6 | 810 | 61 | 8\% | 10 | 1350 | 422 | 31\% |
|  | KMB 67X | 4 | 540 | 75 | 14\% | 7 | 945 | 237 | 25\% |
|  | KMB 68A | 3 | 405 | 237 | 58\% | 5 | 675 | 394 | 58\% |
|  | KMB 258P | 0 | - | - | - | 3 | 405 | 102 | 25\% |
|  | KMB 261P | 0 | - | - | - | 1 | 135 | 54 | 40\% |
|  | KMB 267X | 0 | - | - | - | 2 | 270 | 68 | 25\% |
|  | KMB 960A | 0 | - | - | - | 1 | 135 | 54 | 40\% |
|  | KMB 960C | 0 | - | - | - | 1 | 135 | 68 | 50\% |
|  | KMB 960P | 0 | - | - | - | 2 | 270 | 68 | 25\% |
|  | KMB 960X | 0 | - | - | - | 9 | 1215 | 608 | 50\% |
|  | LWB A34 | 0 | - | - | - | 2 | 270 | 27 | 10\% |
|  | LWB E33P | 0 | - | - | - | 3 | 405 | 41 | 10\% |
|  | NLB B2 | 3 | 405 | 178 | 44\% | 3 | 405 | 254 | 63\% |
|  | GMB42 | 4 | 76 | 20 | 26\% | 4 | 76 | 25 | 33\% |

Appendix C - Planned Road Works to be implemented by the Owner

Proposed Rezoning from "Residential (G roup B)1" Zone to "Residential (Group B)4" Zone for Medium-Density Housing Development to Include a Footpath for Public use at Various Lots and Adjacent G overnment Land in D D 130, Lam Tei, Tuen Mun

Traffic Impact Assessment (Application no. Y/TM-LTYY/11)






Appendix E-
Extract of Planned Road Works under Agreement No. CE 39/2021 (CE) by CEDD



Appendix F -
Extract of Planned Road Works under Agreement No. CE 01/2020 (CE) by CEDD


