

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 2.11.2016.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

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

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

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

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

Assistant Director (Regional 3), Lands Department
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

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

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

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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

Housing Department (HD)

Ms Emily W.M. Ip - Planning Officer (PO)

Ms May S.S. Yeung - Architect (A)

Mr Chow Kwok Sang

- Civil Engineer (CE)

Further Representers, Representers, Commenters and their representatives

F1285- 石俊萍

F1318 - Chan Ka Li

F1319 - Wong Kwok Yiu Danny

F1649 - 黎凱明

F1650 - Edith Lee

F1663 - 梁堃慈

F1666 - 李妙蓮

F1667 - 黃啟業

F1671 - 潘嘉莉

F2451 - Poon Miu Kuen Karen

F2452 - Tam Pak Wai

F2473 - Santi Padul

C320 - 陳卓煒

C323 - 陳卓鍵

C324 - Kwan Koon Ho Taft

C329 - Kan Hon Pun

C331 - 俞英娣

C332 - 曹日光

C339 - Tse Pui Ling

C341 - Lo Chui Wan Lychee

C343 - 阮國媚

Ms Poon Miu Kuen Karen

- Further Representer and Further
Representers' and Commenters'
representative

F1406 - 王春峰

F1486 - Chu Kwok Hung

F1521 - 吳慧心

F1718 - Pak Yin Tat Eddie

F1720 - 龔文娣

- Mr Pak Yin Tat Eddie - Further Representer and Further
Representer's representative
- Ms Chong Wai Fan - Further Representer's representative

F1185 - Li Yuk Ngor

R541 - Ng Yik Ling Winnie

R551 - Chee Kee Tat

- Ms Ho Yuk Mui - Further Representer's and Representers'
representative

R190/C218 - Yeung Shiu Ting

- Ms Yeung Shiu Ting - Representer and Commenter

6. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He said that the representatives of PlanD would first brief Members on the background, and the further representers/representers/commenters or their representatives would be invited to make oral submissions. He said that to ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each further representer/representer/commenters or their representatives would be allotted 10 minutes for their oral submission. The further representers/representers/commenters had been informed about the arrangement before the meeting. There was a timer device to alert the further representers/representers/commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire and when the allotted time limit was up. After the oral submission, there would be a Question and Answer (Q&A) session in which Members could direct their questions to government representatives or further representers/representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the meeting on the day would be adjourned. After hearing all the oral submissions from the further representers/representers/commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the further representations in closed meeting, and inform the further representers/representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

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

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

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

9. The Chairman then invited the further representers, representers, commenters and their representatives to give their oral submissions.

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

F1285- 石俊萍

F1318 - Chan Ka Li

F1319 - Wong Kwok Yiu Danny

F1649 - 黎凱明

F1650 - Edith Lee

F1663 - 梁堃慈

F1666 - 李妙蓮

F1667 - 黃啟業

F1671 - 潘嘉莉

F2451 - Poon Miu Kuen Karen

F2452 - Tam Pak Wai

F2473 - Santi Padul

C320 - 陳卓煒

C323 - 陳卓鍵

C324 - Kwan koon Ho Taft

C329 - Kan Hon Pun

C331 - 俞英娣

C332 - 曹日光

C339 - Tse Pui Ling

C341 - Lo Chui Wan Lychee

C343 - 阮國媚

10. With the aid of plans, photos, video clip and extract of government documents shown in the visualiser, Ms Poon Miu Juen Karen made the following main points:

- (a) many of the further representers had requested to have verbatim record of their oral submissions as it was noticed that some of the key points made by the representers/commenters were missing in the minutes of 21.4.2016 and 2.6.4.2016. Subsequently, they requested the minutes to be revised but were informed by the Secretariat of the Board that only a summary of the presentation would be recorded in the minutes;
- (b) she objected to the proposal to use the remaining “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)4”) zone for residential development. The original representation site was a buffer area which, as stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), was a separation between two incompatible land uses and not suitable for residential development;

Incompatibility in land uses and the need for buffer area

- (c) quoting paragraph 3.3.2 of Chapter 9 of HKPSG, she said that acceptable uses in the buffer area included godowns, cold storages, carparks, amenity areas and open spaces, and there were some constraints for active open space uses. Other less sensitive uses such as commercial and government/institutional facilities could also be considered. However, those uses should be comparatively low-rise, air-conditioned and the distance between buildings and the industrial sites should exceed 30m. She then made reference to Appendix 2.1 of the same chapter of HKPSG and further pointed out that according to the Planning Department, (i) sensitive uses referred to land uses which, by virtue of the nature of the activities thereon or resources therein, were susceptible to the influence of residuals or physical changes generated by polluting uses. Examples included schools and residential areas; and (ii) a buffer area was an area of land separating incompatible land uses, being of sufficient extent to minimise the potential conflict between them and those areas may contain

non-sensitive structures or uses. The remaining “R(A)4” zone, being a buffer zone for the Container Terminal 9 (CT9) development, should not be used for residential development. Also, within the buffer area were industrial buildings and logistics centres which caused glare impact to the nearby residents;

- (d) Mayfair Gardens was in close proximity to an oil depot and a land exchange was executed to relocate the oil depot for safety reason. Strong local objections were received during the development of CT9. The then Secretary for Planning, Environment and Lands, Mr Graham Barnes, told the then Legislative Council (LegCo) Members that a buffer would be provided for Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate so that the residents would not be affected;
- (e) she made reference to a report of the “South-East Tsing Yi Port Development Planning & Engineering Feasibility Study For Container Terminal No. 9” which she obtained from the website of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), and said the original representation site was meant to be a buffer area;
- (f) in October 2015 the Owners’ Committee (the OC) of Rambler Crest had made a submission to the Board pointing out that according to paragraph 7.74 of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY/26, the open space in front of Mayfair Gardens would provide a variety of recreational facilities to the residents and the students of the adjacent technical institute. The open space was also meant to be a buffer area between the residential developments and the container terminal. However, the part regarding the “buffer area” had been subsequently removed in the ES of OZP No. S/TY/26A. On 21.4.2016, in response to Members’ enquiry, DPO/TWK said that it had been mentioned in a paper submitted to the Metro Planning Committee for consideration on 6.12.1991 that original representation site was to serve as a buffer area. However, he later denied the abovementioned function of the same site during the Q&A session held on 26.4.2016. In May 2016,

the OC provided relevant documents to the Board as evidence; yet the documents were not accepted as they were not submitted within the statutory time limit;

- (g) although Rambler Crest was considered by the government as commercial rather than residential development, in some occasions it was mentioned together with Mayfair Gardens as residential developments by government officials;
- (h) the Ngau Tau Kok fire showed the potential danger arising from the lack of a buffer area between industrial and residential uses. When the government wanted to develop CT9, it told the then Legislative Councillors that a buffer area would be provided along the development. However, some twenty years later now the government was saying that planning in the area needed to be changed. Referring to the PowerPoint presentation made by DPO/TWK, she pointed out that according to the CT9 Study the whole stretch of area coloured purple was meant to be a buffer area. Yet site 9a, i.e. the remaining “R(A)4” zone currently being proposed for public housing development, was designated as an open space since there was an under-provision of open space in Tsing Yi South;

Traffic concerns

- (i) while DPO/TWK had stated that container vehicles would not use Tsing Yi Road as it was a cul-de-sac, she observed that the road was actually used by container vehicles and there was traffic jam every morning on Tsing Yi south bridge. Traffic accidents involving container vehicles were also seen at Tsing Yi Road;
- (j) the proposed Block 4 of the public housing development would face directly CT9 and the container yards as well as the patrol filling station at Tsing Yi Road to its immediate north ;
- (k) the traffic consultant’s assessment on waiting time for public transport did

not reflect the real situation and the queues were usually very long. There were occasions that the waiting time for the green mini-bus (GMB) to Rambler Crest during rush hours in the evening was up to about 1.5 hours;

Environmental concerns

Noise and glare

- (l) the residents of Rambler Crest were upset that their hotel and service apartment development was situated in a buffer zone. The sewage treatment plant to the north and the CT9 to the east and southeast of Rambler Crest operated around the clock. There were container trucks passing outside their homes at 2:00 a.m. and there was also noise nuisance from coaches in the morning. While DPO/TWK had claimed that Tsing Hung Road was a cul-de-sac and mainly served traffic to Rambler Crest, tour coaches often queued up near the roundabout at Tsing Hung Road since early morning;
- (m) she showed a video clip recorded in the morning to demonstrate the traffic condition of Tsing Hung Road was generally chaotic with pedestrians walking on the carriageway. In some occasions, noise level up to 76dB(A) was recorded in the vicinity;
- (n) quoting paragraphs 6.3.5 and 6.7.4 of Chapter 12 of HKPSG, she said that many open storage, port backup uses container yards uses were located within areas not suitable for this type of use, being in close proximity to residential and government, institution and community (GIC) uses, or sensitive environmental areas such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) where ecology systems might be disturbed, or areas of unspoilt countryside. Adverse environmental impacts on sensitive receivers such as noise from movements of heavy vehicles and container handling operations, air pollution from vehicular movements and visual intrusion were a result of such poor land use interface. Container yards should be located near waterfront areas or with good accessibility to points of

distribution. Requirements for container yards included good security, 24-hour working conditions and good infrastructure and services, such as power supplies for refrigerated containers. On-site queuing areas for vehicles were required during peak periods and interface with residential uses should be avoided where traffic volumes were high. DPO/TWK's explanation that buffer areas were not required as the land adjacent to the remaining "R(A)4" zone was no longer used for industrial purpose was not in line with the requirements under HKPSG;

- (o) the service apartments above 40/F in Rambler Crest were not screened off from the glare of CT9 by the hotel block and the strong lights and noise from CT9 had caused great nuisance and health hazards to the residents. The situation had been reported in the news. LegCo Member Hon. Michael Tien had visited the affected units in Rambler Crest and recorded noise level above 70dB(A) after 9 p.m. It might be better for the container yards to be developed as self-contained industrial buildings which would bring less glare impact to the surrounding residents;

[Dr Wilton W.T Fok arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (p) the consultant's assessment on noise impact was flimsy. As shown in Figure 2.1 of the Broad Environmental Assessment Report (BEA) in Appendix VII of Enclosure I of the Paper, background noise level was taken by the government's consultant at three spots within the original representation site and in the range of about 50dB(A) to 68dB(A). The measurements were taken during both daytime, in particular during lunch hours, and night time each over a period of 30 minutes. However, only background noise level, but not the traffic noise, was measured. She had taken her own measurement at additional spots along the periphery of the original representation site at Tsing Yi Road, Tsing Hung Road and at her residence at Rambler Crest. Multiple samples were taken at each spot and the maximum noise level recorded were up to 94 dB(A) during daytime. During the Q&A session on 26.4.2016, a Member asked the study consultant about the methodology used for measurement and

considered that the averaged noise figure might not reflect the spike in noise level caused by container vehicles passing by. She added that the CT9 operated on a 24-hour basis and the intermittent traffic noise of container vehicles had caused great nuisance to the nearby residents. The traffic noise had also been increasing since she moved there 12 years ago;

Landscape

- (q) the trees planted by the locals in the remaining “R(A)4” zone should not be felled as they were in healthy conditions;

Safety concerns

- (r) there were container-related uses in the area and the potential of stacked containers collapsing under strong wind posed a safety hazard to the public. Additionally, the container-related use was not meant to be a buffer between the industrial and residential uses. It was the CT9 development that required a screening from the residential use. There might be dangerous goods, chemicals and batteries inside the containers and would pose a threat to the future residents. In fact, since 1984 most of the development in Tsing Yi had concentrated in the north as Tsing Yi South was mainly occupied by heavy industries;
- (s) the operation of CT9 had attracted complaints from residents of Rambler Crest and Mayfair Gardens. As a result, measures, such as reducing the volume of the warning signals on the operating container cranes, were taken to minimise the nuisance caused to the residents. However, CT9’s operation was affected as such measure might pose safety issues to the workers in CT9;

Insufficient open space

- (t) there was a shortage of open space and residents had to walk for 15 minutes to reach the sitting out area at Cheung Tat Road, which had a size

no bigger than the Board's meeting room and was surrounded by restaurants and public toilets. There was no indoor sports centre in Tsing Yi South and it took more than one hour for the residents to get to Tsing Yi Northeast Park;

Alternative sites for development

- (u) on 18.9.2015 DPO/TWK said that the original representation site was the only piece of land in the district suitable for public housing development. On the contrary, a total of 13 sites in Kwai Tsing district, including a site adjacent to Mayfair Gardens, had in fact been identified for housing developments. There were also many other sites suitable for public housing developments in Tsing Yi, including (i) sites at Wok Tai Wan and Tsing Yi North Coastal Road near the shipyards and Tsing Yi Northeast Park; (ii) the open space to the south of Tsing Yi market which was vacant and formed; and (iii) a site to the north of Tsing Yi Park and Tsing Yi Estate which was vacant and had easy access to Tsing Yi MTR Station and various GIC facilities. However, on 21.4.2016 and 26.4.2016 DPO/TWK said that the site to the north of Tsing Yi Park and Tsing Yi Estate was generally covered with vegetation from the 1970s and therefore not suitable for development. Yet, based on her visit to this site, she believed there was no Old and Valuable Tree there;

- (v) there were already new public housing developments at Ching Chun Court and Cheung Wang Estate as well as the upcoming private residential development in Sai Shan Road. The residents of Rambler Crest had not objected to these developments. However, the remaining "R(A)4" zone which was proposed for public housing development was a buffer area surrounded by noisy and polluting land uses such as sewage treatment plant, CT9 and logistic centres and in close proximity to Tsing Sha Highway. Even for a layman like herself was able to identify many alternative sites which did not involve complicated technical issues and were more suitable for housing developments;

- (w) the Hong Kong Jockey Club International BMX Park at the restored Gin Drinkers Bay Landfill had very low usage. The government might consider moving some of the logistic uses to that site. Rather than squeezing new high-density residential blocks into the space between existing high-rise buildings, a more holistic land use planning approach should be adopted. The development in Tsueng Kwan O was a good example of comprehensive planning;

Summary

- (x) quoting Mr Stanley Y.H. Ying, Director of Housing, the core value of HD was to provide practical, safe and healthy living place for residents. The remaining “R(A)4” zone was not suitable for housing development and many special mitigation measures would need to be adopted for the public housing units; and
- (y) the current shortage in public housing was mainly caused by misuse of the public housing units. The Board should consider carefully whether the remaining “R(A)4” zone should be used for residential development.

F1406 - 王春峰

F1486 - Chu Kwok Hung

F1521 - 吳慧心

F1718 – Pak Yin Tat Eddie

F1720 - 龔文娣

11. Mr Pak Yin Tat Eddie made the following main points:

- (a) he requested to have a verbatim record of his oral submission;
- (b) the proposed Amendment Item A to rezone the northern portion of the “R(A)4” zone to “O” zone on the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27 was welcome. However, the remaining “R(A)4” zone for the proposed PRH development should also be rezoned to “O” so as to maintain its

original function of being a buffer zone for Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate arising from the construction of CT9. Residential development within the buffer zone should be avoided;

- (c) as a background, in order to relocate the oil depot that was near Mayfair Gardens, a land exchange between the government and the developer was executed. As a result, the site originally intended for blocks 1 to 4 of Mayfair Gardens was now owned by the government. After many failed attempts, the OC of Mayfair Gardens was finally set up in November 2015 and when the OC was fully occupied with the rehabilitation programme for Mayfair Gardens, the government broke its promise and rezoned the buffer area for residential development. The owners of Mayfair Gardens had no spare capacity to participate in the public consultation and entrusted their District Councillor to handle the matter. However, since the District Councillor had not objected to the rezoning proposal, the government assumed that the residents of Mayfair Gardens had no objection to the rezoning proposal;
- (d) the questionnaire he received from the OC of Mayfair Gardens was misleading and tricky. The residents were asked to select an aspect that was under most pressure but in fact issues on traffic, air quality, population mix and community facilities aspects were all reaching a tipping point;
- (e) he had been living in Mayfair Gardens for more than 30 years. The bus and GMB services to Mayfair Gardens were infrequent and it would take him 30 mins to walk to MTR Tsing Yi Station;
- (f) there was more than 1,200 ha of brownfield sites in Hong Kong and the government could have developed them first, instead of adding more buildings in Tsing Yi South. There were also sites available for residential development near the shipyards at Tam Kon Shan Road in Tsing Yi North; and
- (g) there were strong local objections during the development of CT9 and to

settle the issue, the buffer area was set up as an exchange between the government and the residents of Mayfair Gardens. Taking back what was given to the residents was equivalent to “moving the goalposts”.

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

F1185 - Li Yuk Ngor

R541 - Ng Yik Ling Winnie

R551 - Chee Kee Tat

12. With the aid of some photographs shown in the visualiser, Ms Ho Yuk Mui made the following main points:

- (a) she requested to have a verbatim record of her oral submission;
- (b) the new public housing would affect air ventilation for Mayfair Gardens. Without the buffer area which provided a separation from the polluting uses, air quality in the area would further degrade;
- (c) she lived in Mayfair Gardens and there was very limited public transport serving the area. No improvement was seen even after complaining to the bus company. Sometimes the residents had to detour and take MTR to Kwai Fong or Tsing Yi before taking bus or mini-bus to the area. With the addition of three public housing blocks, there might be more than 10,000 people and the traffic would become the most problematic issue;
- (d) the area only had a small market with limited stores, which was not sufficient to meet the needs of the nearby residents; and
- (e) the existing pedestrian path along the road was already very narrow. Tsing Yi Road would be further narrowed from four-lanes to two-lanes upon completion of the public housing development.

R190/C218 - Yeung Shiu Ting

13. Ms Yeung Shiu Ting made the following main points:
- (a) she requested to have a verbatim record of her oral submission;
 - (b) the proposed Amendment Item A to rezone the northern portion of the “R(A)4” zone to “O” zone on the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27 was welcome. However, the remaining “R(A)4” zone for the proposed PRH development should also be rezoned to “O” so as to maintain its original function of being a buffer zone for Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate arising from the construction of CT9. Residential development within the buffer zone should be avoided;
 - (c) she had been a resident of Rambler Crest since 2009. Rambler Crest was located in close proximity to CT9 and the remaining “R(A)4” zone was not suitable for residential development. However due to some loopholes Rambler Crest was built. The government should not make the same mistake again by placing additional residential development in the area. Units in Rambler Crest were fitted with central air-conditioning and extra thick windows to mitigate environmental nuisances. Hon. Michael Tien had visited Rambler Crest to measure the noise level at night time. If public housing was to be developed in the adjacent “R(A)4” zone, similar mitigation measures would be required;
 - (d) the government failed to keep its promise by taking back the buffer area for Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate for housing development. Container Terminals 1 to 8 did not have residential development in such a close proximity. Mei Foo Sun Chuen was much further away from the terminals and had a large park as buffer;
 - (e) Tsing Yi South had very limited public transport and recreational facilities. Most of the community facilities were concentrated in Tsing Yi North;

- (f) there were Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) flats near Cheung Ching Estate and new private residential development at Sai Shan Road. The new public housing development would bring additional population on top of the existing population of 23,000 persons in Rambler Crest, Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate. However, no improvement on road network and public transportation facilities had been proposed. There were already many container vehicles and heavy vehicles in the area and how the additional construction vehicles could be accommodated was questionable as the access roads were very narrow. Members were requested to pay a site visit to the area to find out more about the situation;
- (g) Rambler Crest mainly depended on public transport service provided by GMB routes No. 88G and 88F but their availability fluctuated greatly. The service was particularly insufficient in late 2015 and the situation did not improve until Chinese New Year in 2016. In October 2016, there were days when more than 100 people queued up in each of the GMB and taxi lines in the morning;
- (h) the 4-year waiting time for public housing was not considered excessive. In fact, more resources should be deployed for the development of elderly facilities;
- (i) she had doubts on the accuracy of the estimated additional population brought by the public housing and HOS developments. The new population would mainly consist of young families and she believed children under 18 years of age had been excluded from the projection. In a few years, the community facilities would not be able to cope with the demand; and
- (j) if the government had no plan to provide major transportation system in Tsing Yi South, the plan to use the buffer area for residential development should be abandoned permanently. Alternatively, the government could give a written pledge to the local residents assuring them that the traffic in the area would not be affected by the public housing development.

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

15. In response to a Member's enquiry and with the aid of the visualiser, Ms Poon Miu Kuen Karen (F2451) said that she had taken noise measurements from both roadsides and inside an apartment at Rambler Crest. The spike in roadside noise level up to 80 dB(A) - 90 dB(A) was caused by passing vehicles. The background noise level inside the apartments at Rambler Crest was up to 75.5 dB(A) at around 9:30 p.m. In comparison, the readings taken by the government's consultant, Mott Macdonald Hong Kong, which was about 60dB(A) was on average background noise over a period of 30 mins to one hour.

16. In response to a Member's enquiry and with the aid of the visualiser, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, said that the container related uses might cause nuisance including noise and air quality impact. He referred to paragraphs 6.8.2 and 6.10 of Chapter 12 of HKPSG and said that whilst there was no specific requirement, in determining an appropriate buffer distances, the surrounding environment, including nearby roads, should be taken into consideration. It was stipulated that sites which were screened from sensitive receivers by non-sensitive buildings, major transport alignments, natural vegetation and topography should be taken into consideration. Environmental Impact Assessment would also be carried out as appropriate. He further said that the proposed public housing site was about 30m to 100m away from the container related use to its south with the down-ramp of Tsing Sha Highway and Tsing Hung Road serving as physical separations. The public housing development would also set back from the southern boundary which was facing the container related use.

17. A Member asked whether the long queue for public transport in Rambler Crest was an everyday situation. Ms Poon Miu Kuen Karen (F2451) replied that most of the residents took GMB routes No. 88G and 88F for commuting to MTR Tsing Yi and Kwai Fong Stations. On regular days more than 100 persons would be waiting at the GMB stations. The situation had not been properly reflected in the reports prepared by the government's consultant. Furthermore, if there was an accident on Tsing Yi south bridge, the traffic in the area would be severely affected and on some occasions residents had to walk to Tsing Yi North due to shortage of buses.

18. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Poon Miu Kuen Karen (F2451) said that the OC of Rambler Crest had been liaising with the government on provision of noise barrier however it had not been successful. A noise barrier was once put up near Rambler Crest during the construction of Tsing Sha Highway but the barrier was removed after completion of the construction works. According to the Environmental Protection Department, Rambler Crest was a commercial development and the noise level should be measured without opening the windows. In comparison, noise barriers along Tsing Sha Highway were provided for the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Training (Tsing Yi).

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

19. A Member asked whether adopting mitigation measures at noise and air pollution sources i.e. the road and container yards had been considered. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau replied that there were existing noise barriers on certain sections of Tsing Sha Highway. Mr Chow Kwok Sang, CE/HD, supplemented that based on the findings of the BEA, the remaining "R(A)4" zone had sufficient buffer distance from air pollution sources as per the requirements of HKPSG. For noise aspect, the proposed mitigation measures such as architectural fins, acoustic windows and acoustic balconies should be sufficient to reduce the noise to an acceptable level.

20. In response to a Member's observation that many of the attendees in the current and previous hearing sessions had expressed concerns on the traffic impact of the construction work of the public housing development and the validity of the population estimate, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that according to the Traffic Impact Assessment, bus and mini-bus lay-bys would be provided along Tsing Yi Road and the pedestrian path would also be widened. Regarding the issue on population estimate, the existing population at Cheung Ching Estate, Mayfair Gardens and Rambler Crest was about 14,000, 4,800 and 4,200 persons respectively. The future development including Ching Chun Court, a private residential development at Sai Shan Road which had been tendered and the public housing development at Tsing Hung Road would bring about 10,000 additional population to the area. Ms Emily W.M. Ip, PO/HD, supplemented that in estimating the new population of the public housing development, HD had made reference to average household size of different flat types in public housing units. Mr Chow Kwok Sang further

said that before commencement of the construction work of the public housing development, the ingress/egress arrangement to the remaining “R(A)4” zone would have to be scrutinised by the Transport Department and the Hong Kong Police Force. Relevant departments would also take suitable action including enforcement to ensure a smooth traffic during the construction phase.

21. In response to another Member’s enquiry and with the aid of the visualiser, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that most of the container vehicle traffic would use Tsing Yi Road (lower section) to access CT9 whereas traffic to the residential areas would use Tsing Yi Road (upper section). The cul-de-sac at the end of Tsing Yi Road (upper section) was not connected to the down-ramp of Tsing Sha Highway and there was no plan to connect them in the future. There was no plan to reduce the size of the roundabout at the cul-de-sac but improvement works to provide bus stops would be carried out at Tsing Yi Road (upper section) together with the public housing development.

22. As there were no more questions from Members, the meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.