

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:15 a.m. on 3.11.2016.
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

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

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

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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)

Transport Department (TD)

Mr Honson H.S. Yuen - Chief Transport Officer/New Territories South West (CTO/NTSW)

Mr Patrick K.H. Ho - Senior Engineer/Kwai Tsing (SE/KT)

Further Representers, Representers, Commenters and Their Representatives

F77 – 青衣美景花園業主立案法團

F1193 – Lau Siu Mee

F1250 – Huang Wing Yu

F1251 – 黃培燴

F1307 – Huang Chi Wang

F1552 – 張蘇女

F1579 – 馬興嬌

F1589 – 余珍珠

F1622 – Li Wing Sze

F1638 – 江遠興

F1656 – Lei Kuai Feng

F1662 – 金國彥

F1673 – Tsang Wing Keung

F1678 – Lau Hing Sheung

F1681 – Wong Si Ping

F1733 – Chun Wai Sum

F1753 – Wong Kit Ling

F1801 – Wong Ngai

F1827 – 馮家寶

F1839 – 陳淑妍

F2048 – 麥活寬

F2079 – 歐玉玲

F2086 – Shin Sik Kwan, Cindy

F2110 – 陳嘉莉

F2115 – 陳家亮

F2131 – Tang Hon Man

F2159 – Ho Tak Kwong

R86 – 歐陽燕玲

R906 – Lau Mei Wa

R925 – Sung Wang Lok

R927 – Wong Ka Bo

Ms Wong Ngai

- Further Representer and Further Representers’
and Representers’ representative

F296 – Yue Chi Wing

F541 – 村上耀文

F711 – 謝穎恩

F2000 – Lin Siu Ho

F2453 – Cheung Tsz Ying

F2469 – Chu Chong Him, Jonathan

R17 – 村上純一

R777 – Lam Yuk Yip

R779 – Lam Yuen Ching, Philomena

R781 – 招德輝

R786 – Chan Yui Hang

R787 – Lee Pak Wing

R794 – Teng Mee Sin, Sophianne

R805 – 黃淑儀

R806 – Tsang Wai Leung, Danny

R807 – 曾偉良

R808 – Tsang Yat To, Matthew

R810 – Tsang Yat Hei

R826 – Tse Pui Ling, Esther

R834 – 村上皓言

R839 – 林明儀

C69 – Lam Ming Yi, Maggie

Ms Chong Wai Fan, Joline - Further Representatives', Representatives' and
Commenter's representative

F551 – Wong Po Leung, Kaiser

R356 – Lam Ka Yee, Becky

R363 – 何嘉怡

R366 – 關明輝

R373 – Tam Kar Kin, Samuel

R386 – Yau Lok Keung

R398 – Ang Bee Sian

R416 – Kan Suk Man

R424 – Yue Ho Man

R433 – Ma Kam Wing

Mr Wong Po Leung Kaiser - Further Representative and Representatives'
representative

F2450 – 青鴻路建屋計劃關注組主席李志強

Mr Cheung Wai Ming - Further Representer's representative

R15 – Ng Wing Tsz

R234 – Christina Tong

R282 – Phyllis Cheng

R396 – Christine Cheng

R842 – 劉永強

R904 – Wong Oi Ling

R954 – Ho Ka Keung

R955 – Chau Wai Ping

C196 – Chow Chi Ming

C212 – Lau Kit Yan

C214 – 陳如柏

Ms Ng Wing Tsz - Representer and Representers' and Commenters' representative

R44 – Wong Hin Shing

Mr Wong Hin Shing - Representer

R83 – Ho Shu Kwong

R728 – 何承峯

Ms Cheung Kai Hung - Representers' representative

R346/C345 – Ma Yuk Chu, Judy

Ms Ma Yuk Chu, Judy - Representer and Commenter

4. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He said that the representatives of PlanD would first brief Members on the background, and the further representers/representers/commenters or their representatives would be invited to make oral submissions. He said that to ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each further representer/representer/commenter or his representative would be allotted 10 minutes for his 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 Town Planning Board (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.

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

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

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

7. The Chairman then invited the further representers, representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their written submissions.

F551 – Wong Po Leung, Kaiser

R356 – Lam Ka Yee, Becky

R363 – 何嘉怡

R366 – 關明輝

R373 – Tam Kar Kin, Samuel

R386 – Yau Lok Keung

R398 – Ang Bee Sian

R416 – Kan Suk Man

R424 – Yue Ho Man

R433 – Ma Kam Wing

8. Mr Wong Po Leung, Kaiser requested to have a verbatim record of his oral submission. In response, the Chairman said that notwithstanding the similar request of some previous presenters to have verbatim records of their oral submissions, it was the practice of the Board that its minutes of meeting were not recorded in verbatim and only the key points of discussion and decision would be recorded in the minutes to serve as official record of the meeting. However, the audio-recordings of the open part of the meetings would be available at the Board's website for a specific period of time for public access.

9. With the aid of some presentation materials, Mr Wong then made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed Amendment Item A to rezone the northern portion of the "Residential (Group A) 4" ("R(A)4") zone to "Open Space" ("O") zone on the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY/27 was welcome. However, the remaining "R(A)4" zone for the proposed public rental housing (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 Container Terminal No. 9 (CT9). Residential development within the buffer zone should be avoided;

The Original Representation Site as a Buffer Area

- (b) he asked Members whether they knew the definition and function of a buffer zone and the uses that could be permitted within a buffer zone. Based on the information gathered, the original representation site was intended to be a buffer zone, which could only be used for development of industrial buildings or active or passive open space;
- (c) he presented an aerial photo of the 1980s which showed that the area to the southeast of Mayfair Gardens covering the original representation site, Rambler Crest and CT9 was previously occupied by oil depots. When the oil depots were relocated later, the original representation site was designated as a buffer zone to separate the residential developments of

Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate from the surrounding land uses;

- (d) Tsing Yi used to be a fishing village at the outset. Later, a power station and some oil depots were built. To facilitate maintenance of the power station, Tsing Yi south bridge was constructed. Then, the development of housing estates began with Cheung Ching Estate being the first PRH estate and Mayfair Gardens being the first private housing estate in Tsing Yi. Mayfair Gardens was originally intended to be developed by three phases. However, as the site for Phase 3 was too close to the then oil depots, the residents raised objection. The developer then gave up the development of Phase 3 and surrendered the land to the Government, which was subsequently developed into the current Mei King Playground to serve as a buffer between Mayfair Gardens and the oil depots. CT9 had not yet been developed when the development of Mayfair Gardens was completed. As such, DPO/TWK's saying of Mei King Playground being a buffer between Mayfair Gardens and CT9 was inaccurate and misled the Board;

- (e) to cope with the growth of the shipping industry, the Government planned to develop CT9 in Tsing Yi. As the operation of CT9 would generate noise, air and glare impacts on the surrounding areas, the Government conducted an environmental assessment in the South-East Tsing Yi Port Development Planning & Engineering Feasibility Study for CT9 (the CT9 Study). The Final Report of the CT9 Study completed in August 1991 recommended the relocation of the oil depots to Tsing Yi Southwest and using the vacated site for the development of low-risk, high-tech industries, non-polluting industries and recreational facilities. The original representation site was planned as an open space to serve as a buffer between CT9 and the residential developments of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate. The intention to provide a landscaped buffer zone between CT9 and the residential developments of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate was reaffirmed by the then Secretary for Planning, Environment and Lands at the Legislative Council meeting held on

20.11.1991;

- (f) it was stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/6 that the original oil depot site at Tsing Yi Area 22 would be used for container-related uses and open space after the relocation of the oil depots, although a site at the north-western part of Tsing Yi Area 22 was later zoned as “Commercial” (“C”) on the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/12 to serve as a buffer for screening the noise and glare impacts of CT9 on the nearby residential developments. The designation of a “C” zone in Tsing Yi Area 22 would not affect the buffer function of the remaining open space which still covered a large area;
- (g) DPO/TWK also pointed out in the earlier meeting held in April 2016 for hearing of the representations and comments to the draft OZP that the original representation site was a buffer area and it would still be a buffer area upon the construction of the proposed PRH development. However, according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), a buffer area was not suitable for sensitive uses such as residential, school and hospital. The saying of DPO/TWK that the buffer area could be used for residential development had misled the Board. He then showed a video clip of the Apple Daily to reveal what DPO/TWK had said in the earlier meeting and the view of a professor that the original representation site was not suitable for residential use;
- (h) it was stated in paragraph 7.7.4 of the ES of the last version of the Tsing Yi OZP (i.e. the approved Tsing Yi No. S/TY/26) that the open space in front of the existing residential development at Mayfair Gardens would provide a variety of recreational facilities to the residents and the students of the adjacent technical institute, and it also served as a buffer area between the residential developments and the container terminal. However, the function of the said open space as a buffer area was deleted in the same paragraph of the ES of the prevailing draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27. That was contrary to the saying of DPO/TWK that the open space was a buffer area. He suspected if DPO/TWK was misleading the

Board again and requested Members to seek clarification from DPO/TWK in the Q&A session;

- (i) the HKPSG stated that a buffering distance of at least 100m should be maintained between port back-up and open storage uses and sensitive uses. Although DPO/TWK had said that there was a 'large' road in between the proposed PRH development and a container vehicle park to its south, there was no standard under the HKPSG on how a road would be considered as large or small. He requested Members to consider whether there was an adequate buffering distance between the proposed PRH development and the adjacent port back-up uses based on the actual circumstances;

Traffic Conditions

- (j) he showed a video clip recorded in the morning of 24.10.2016 to demonstrate that the roundabout of Tsing Hung Road outside Tower 1 of Rambler Crest was very congested in the morning with a number of tour coaches queuing along Tsing Hung Road and the hotel guests boarding the tour coaches disorderly, causing dangers to other road users;
- (k) he showed two other video clips recorded in the morning of 27.10.2016 to demonstrate that a number of heavy goods vehicles and container vehicles were actually using the upper section of Tsing Yi Road and some were going to the petrol filling station (PFS) there. Indeed, the traffic impact assessment conducted for Route 9 estimated that 20% of the vehicle trips at the upper section of Tsing Yi Road were generated by heavy vehicles. That meant there were about 110 vehicle trips of heavy vehicles at the upper section of Tsing Yi Road per hour out of the average total traffic flow of 550 vehicle trips per hour. That was contrary to the saying of DPO/TWK that most of the heavy vehicles would use the lower section of Tsing Yi Road and not many would go to the upper section of the road;
- (l) illegal on-street parking of heavy goods vehicles and container vehicles along the two sides of the upper section of Tsing Yi Road was common, in

particular at the section between the PFS and Tsing Yi IVE, leaving only one road lane for other vehicles to pass through. Moreover, there were frequent road works along the upper section of Tsing Yi Road. If there was traffic accident or vehicle breakdown at Tsing Yi south bridge, the upper section of Tsing Yi Road and Ching Hong Road would get congested immediately, affecting even Chung Mei and Tsing Yi Heung Sze Wui Road. When there was traffic jam at Tsing Yi south bridge, bus and mini-bus services in Tsing Yi South could not operate as normal. Residents of Tsing Yi South always had to wait for a long time before they could board a bus or mini-bus and the travelling time would also be much longer than normal. If the public transport services were not improved, it was impossible to add a further population of 10,000 to Tsing Yi South;

- (m) he showed a number of photos taken in October 2016 to illustrate the problematic conditions of road traffic and public transport services of the area, including the traffic congestions in the morning peak hours at the junction of Tsing Yi Road and Ching Hong Road, at Tsing Yi Road when there was a traffic accident in Tsing Yi south bridge, and at Tsing Hung Road caused by a long queue of tour coaches, the use of the upper section of Tsing Yi Road by container vehicles at different times of a day, and the long mini-bus queues at Rambler Crest, Mayfair Gardens and the terminal of green mini-bus (GMB) route No. 88G at Kwai Fong. While the normal travelling time of GMB route No. 88G between MTR Kwai Fong Station and Rambler Crest was about 15 minutes, his daughter had once taken over one and a half hour to return home by GMB route No. 88G as there were over 200 people queuing for the mini-bus at Kwai Fong;
- (n) while DPO/TWK had mentioned that the increase of bus frequency of 15 trips per day could meet the increased service demand arising from the additional population in Tsing Yi South, the problem of bus lost trips was particularly serious in Kwai Tsing district as reported by two newspapers in September and October 2016 respectively, and 85% of the bus routes had the problem. The bus operator, however, was not keen to resolve the lost trip problem, not to mention the increase of bus frequency or new bus

routes. The reorganisation of bus services in the district had also reduced some bus routes, and hence the choice of the residents;

- (o) as a proposed traffic improvement measure, the Government had a plan to widen the pavement of the upper section of Tsing Yi Road near Tsing Yi IVE by reducing one road lane. However, he worried that the reduction of one road lane would reduce the road capacity and exacerbate the current traffic congestion problem of the area;
- (p) while TD always indicated that it would closely monitor the traffic conditions of the area and make appropriate arrangements if necessary, its commitments were often not materialised. For example, when Kwai Luen Estate at Kwai Chung was planned several years ago, the Government had committed that public transport services would be increased to meet the demand from the additional population. However, there was no improvement or increase of services after completion of the development for nearly three years despite the repeated requests of the residents;

Air Pollution

- (q) he showed two photos of the original representation site taken in August 2015 and September 2016 respectively to illustrate that the atmosphere of the site was often hazy due to the polluted air blown from the Mainland. He also showed a newspaper clipping which pointed out that the atmospheric particulate matters with a diameter of 2.5 micrometres or less (PM2.5) were particularly detrimental to human health as they could lead to respiratory and other diseases. With the polluted air, he wondered if the remaining “R(A)4” zone was suitable for housing development as the future residents would become ‘human buffer’ themselves;
- (r) in a speech on 6.7.2016, the Director of Housing said that the Chairman of the Hong Kong Housing Authority had asked the public housing development of HD to go ‘back to basic’ by providing ‘no-frills’, safe and

healthy residences to the public. If the site was not suitable for human habitation for environmental reasons, he wondered whether the proposed PRH flats on it could be regarded as ‘no-frills’, safe and healthy. He expected that the future PRH residents would file enormous complaints to HD when they experienced the foreseeable health problems;

Noise Pollution

- (s) he presented two video clips showing the lower section of Tsing Yi Road to illustrate that the traffic noise was very serious at that road as it was heavily used by container vehicles;
- (t) the noise assessment conducted by HD’s consultant for the proposed PRH development was coarse as the measurement of noise was only carried out at three points. In another assessment conducted by a resident who was a layman, noise was measured at eight different points with the aid of professional equipment and three to four samples were taken at each measuring point. The assessment result of the resident revealed that the original representation site was subject to a very high noise level. He presented a newspaper clipping which showed that Hon Michael Tien Puk-sun had visited a flat at Rambler Crest and made some measurements, and that Hon Tien found that the noise and glare impacts from CT9 on Rambler Crest were very serious;
- (u) DPO/TWK had pointed out that the site to the immediate south of Rambler Crest at Tsing Hung Road was planned for the development of a multi-storey container vehicle park or logistics centre. He questioned if the noise, air and glare impacts of that proposed multi-storey container vehicle park or logistics centre had been taken into account in the planning of the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone;

Glare Pollution

- (v) he showed some photos taken at night at the lower section of Tsing Yi

Road and a flat of Rambler Crest to illustrate that Rambler Crest was facing serious glare impacts from CT9 and the adjacent Mapletree Logistics Hub. The proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone which was even closer to CT9 and Mapletree Logistics Hub than Rambler Crest would similarly experience serious glare problems;

- (w) excessive glare could affect people’s health, in particular eyes and skin, and was a nuisance. He wondered why there was no relevant legislation to monitor glare level in Hong Kong despite other advanced cities in the world had already had their own controls on glare impact;

Lack of Open Space

- (x) it was estimated that the population of Tsing Yi South would increase to about 50,000 upon completion of all the committed and proposed developments, which was much higher than the figure of 33,000 as indicated by DPO/TWK. According to Chapter 4 of the HKPSG, the “O” zone of the further representation site should not be counted as open space if it was not usable for active or passive recreation or was only an amenity area for planting purpose or as an environmental buffer. It was unfair to the residents of Tsing Yi South if the further representation site was counted towards the open space provision. Indeed, it was misleading that many areas in Tsing Yi which were covered only by tree plantings and was not accessible by the public nor provided with any recreational facilities had been taken into account in open space calculation;
- (y) DPO/TWK had mentioned that Cheung Tat Road Sitting-out Area and Ching Hong Road Playground were two of the open spaces for the residents of Tsing Yi South. He then showed two video clips and some photos to illustrate the poor environmental conditions of Cheung Tat Road Sitting-out Area which was small in size, lacked of facilities and next to a refuse collection point, public toilet and cooked food centre. The access road from Rambler Crest to Cheung Tat Road Sitting-out Area was also

dirty and narrow with most of the pavement being occupied by cargoes of the neighbouring industrial buildings. He also showed some photos of Ching Hong Road Playground which could only be accessed via a sloping and winding road and was only provided with two ball courts;

- (z) he presented another video clip to illustrate that instead of going to the public open spaces provided by the Government which were poor in environmental conditions and accessibility, many children of Rambler Crest would play in the open area between Rambler Crest and Hutchison Telecom Tower underneath the elevated Tsing Yi Road. However, that area was basically a pedestrian passageway;
- (aa) the provision of open space in Tsing Yi was not inadequate but most of the open spaces and recreational facilities, including Tsing Yi Park, Tsing Yi Northeast Park and Tsing Yi Sports Ground, were located in Tsing Yi North which were not easily accessible by the residents of Tsing Yi South. There were only two small open spaces in Tsing Yi South, i.e. Mei King Playground and Tsing Hung Road Playground, which had a more proper environment;

Tree Health

- (bb) he showed a photo taken on 22.10.2016 after the hoist of Typhoon Signal No. 8 to illustrate that the trees within the original representation site had remained strong and healthy, as contrary to the assessment result of the Government's consultant that the trees within the site were unhealthy and damaged;

Inadequate Public Consultation

- (cc) PlanD's consultation with the Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) on the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road was not properly conducted. While K&TDC had been consulted on the proposed PRH development on 14.5.2015, the information about the development

proposal was only received by the K&TDC members on 11.5.2015, allowing inadequate time for them to gather views of the local residents. During the meeting, the K&TDC members expressed concerns on the potential traffic and environmental impacts and the insufficient provision of community facilities. K&TDC unanimously passed a motion requesting the replanning of the site and the proposed PRH development be shelved until there was comprehensive planning for supporting transport, environmental and community facilities. Despite the objection of K&TDC, PlanD still submitted the proposed amendments to the OZP for facilitating the proposed PRH development to the Board for consideration. Similarly, for other cases such as the rezoning of “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites in Cheung Sha Wan for commercial development, PlanD had also neglected the concerns of the Sham Shui Po District Council and proceeded with the zoning amendments;

The Land Use Nature of Rambler Crest

- (dd) in view of the function of Rambler Crest as a buffer for screening off the environmental impacts of CT9, some residents of Rambler Crest queried if it was the negligence of the Government years ago to allow the developer to sell the strata titles of the service apartment units of Rambler Crest. Many residents were misled by the developer to purchase their service apartment units which were not suitable for habitation. The Government had never clarified with the residents whether the service apartment units of Rambler Crest were a residential use or commercial use. If it was a residential use, Rambler Crest might warrant a different treatment in the planning and provision of open spaces, community facilities and environmental mitigation facilities;

Alternative Means of Housing Land Supply

- (ee) he read out a joint declaration of 16 green groups which raised concerns on the Government’s action to comprehensively rezone “Green Belt”

("GB") sites in Hong Kong for residential development since 2014. The rezoning of "GB" sites deviated from the Government's previous planning objectives regarding "GB" zones and there was no formal public consultation on such a policy change. Instead of sacrificing the "GB" sites, the Government should explore the opportunities of developing the military barracks, golf courses and brownfield sites for housing use and formulate a population policy for Hong Kong; and

- (ff) he believed that the Board was not a rubber stamp and it would consider the zoning amendments objectively based on its established consideration criteria. There had been some cases in the past in which the Board did not agree with the Government's zoning amendments. As the remaining "R(A)4" zone was not suitable for housing development, he hoped that the Board could abandon the development proposal and revert the site to an open space.

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

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok arrived to join and Mr Alex T.H. Lai left this session of the meeting at this point.]

F296 – Yue Chi Wing

F541 – 村上耀文

F711 – 謝穎恩

F2000 – Lin Siu Ho

F2453 – Cheung Tsz Ying

F2469 – Chu Chong Him, Jonathan

R17 – 村上純一

R777 – Lam Yuk Yip

R779 – Lam Yuen Ching, Philomena

R781 – 招德輝

R786 – Chan Yui Hang

R787 – Lee Pak Wing

R794 – Teng Mee Sin, Sophianne

R805 – 黃淑儀

R806 – Tsang Wai Leung, Danny

R807 – 曾偉良

R808 – Tsang Yat To, Matthew

R810 – Tsang Yat Hei

R826 – Tse Pui Ling, Esther

R834 – 村上皓言

R839 – 林明儀

C69 – Lam Ming Yi, Maggie

10. Ms Chong Wai Fan, Joline read out the following main points on behalf of Mr Ng Kin (representative of F1313):

- (a) Mr Ng Kin requested to have a verbatim record of his 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) during the planning of CT9, the Government promised the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate to zone the original representation site as “O” to provide an open space serving as a buffer to mitigate the glare, noise and air pollution arising from the 24-hour operation of CT9 with a view to relieving the objections of the residents. However, the function of the site as a buffer to abate the adverse impacts of CT9 was now denied by DPO/TWK, who said that the site was only a planned open space for providing landscaping and recreational facilities for the nearby population. Even though the site was planned as an open space, the Government had not done anything substantial on the site over the years. With the Government tricking the local residents by its words

from time to time, its credibility was lost totally;

- (d) DPO/TWK said that the CT9 Study of 1990 had recommended the original representation site to be rezoned from “Industrial” (“I”) (where there were oil depots located at the site at that time) to “O”, whilst the site of Rambler Crest to be retained as “I” to serve as a buffer for screening off the noise and glare impacts from CT9 to Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate. It illustrated that the operation of CT9 would generate significant adverse noise and glare impacts and that a buffer should be in place to screen off the noise and glare impacts from CT9 to the nearby residential developments. In 1997, the site of Rambler Crest was rezoned from “I” to “C” with its buffer function maintained, and Rambler Crest with service apartment and hotel uses was later allowed to be developed on the site. The residents of Rambler Crest then became the first generation of ‘human buffer’ themselves and suffered severely from the noise and glare impacts of CT9;
- (e) the proposed PRH development on the remaining “R(A)4” zone would repeat the disaster of Rambler Crest and make the future residents on the site becoming ‘human buffer’ again. Apart from the noise, air and glare impacts from CT9, the residents of the remaining “R(A)4” zone also had to bear the inconvenience of living in the area owing to the lack of transport and other supporting facilities. Although the Government had suggested measures to alleviate the problems, including adoption of suitable building design and orientation, installation of acoustic windows and impermeable curtain, use of air-conditioning and provision of certain facilities, the heavily polluted environment of the site was not suitable for human habitation and the residents still had to travel to the outside areas frequently for accessing the basic facilities; and
- (f) Hong Kong all along faced a keen housing demand. While the Government was responsible for identifying sites for housing development, it should explore other suitable sites in the territory but not blindly choose the remaining “R(A)4” zone which was not suitable for human habitation

and was opposed by many people. For the sake of health of the future residents, he urged the Board to reject the Government's proposal of using the remaining "R(A)4" zone for PRH development.

11. Ms Chong Wai Fan, Joline also read out the following main points on behalf of Ms Lin Siu Ho (F2000):

- (a) Ms Lin Siu Ho requested to have a verbatim record of her submission;
- (b) Ms Lin was a resident of Mayfair Gardens and had been living in Tsing Yi since 1997;
- (c) 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. The Government should honour its promise of 1991 to the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate and maintain the original representation site as a green buffer;
- (d) the residents of Tsing Yi South always trusted the Government despite the area was not served by facilities such as Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Station, community centre and modern wet market. The Government's current proposal of rezoning the original representation site for PRH development had ruined the previous harmonious relationship with the residents;

Environmental Impacts

- (e) she agreed that more public housing should be provided in Hong Kong but the sites for public housing development should be supported with

adequate transport and community facilities. The remaining “R(A)4” zone, which was situated on a slope and subject to severe noise and glare impacts from CT9, was not suitable for housing development. The container vehicles of CT9 which travelled along Tsing Hung Road and Tsing Yi Road all day long had generated severe noise and air pollution on the site;

- (f) a friend of her had stayed in one of the hotels in Rambler Crest. Due to the excessive glare of CT9, her friend had to curtain off the window of the hotel room all the time. Nevertheless, her friend still could not sleep well in the hotel at night as the operation of CT9 and movement of the container vehicles was extremely noisy. If the impacts of CT9 could not be borne by a hotel guest who only stayed in the area for a short while, it would not be reasonable to expect the future residents of the remaining “R(A)4” zone to bear the long-term impacts of CT9 even with the adoption of mitigation measures such as installation of acoustic windows and roadside noise barriers;
- (g) the original representation site with about 1,800 trees was currently functioning as a green and breathing space for the nearby residents. Although the development of the proposed PRH blocks at the remaining “R(A)4” zone might benefit the residents of Mayfair Gardens as the new housing blocks could help shield off the dust and glare from CT9, the residents of Mayfair Gardens would not wish other people to suffer for them;

Poor Public Transport Services

- (h) she took bus route No. 948 at the Ching Wai House stop of Cheung Ching Estate to go to Hong Kong Island to work every day. Due to the large number of passengers in the bus queue during the morning peak hour, she had to wait for at least two buses before she could get on the bus. For the residents of Rambler Crest who took the bus at the next stop, i.e. the Ching Tao House stop of Cheung Ching Estate, they even had to wait for

at least four to five buses. For her family member who took GMB route No. 88C to MTR Kwai Fong Station and then changed to MTR to go to work in Hong Kong Island East, he had to reserve at least two hours' travelling time in the morning in order not to be late for work. As the current public transport services in the area were unable to meet the needs of the local residents, the situation would be further worsened after completion of the committed private residential development at Sai Shan Road and the proposed PRH development at the remaining "R(A)4" zone if no enhancement to the current public transport services was made;

- (i) besides the residents of Mayfair Gardens, the students of Tsing Yi IVE also relied on GMB route No. 88C to go to MTR Kwai Fong Station. While the normal travelling time of the mini-bus between Mayfair Gardens and MTR Kwai Fong Station was about 10 minutes, it could take over half an hour to wait for the mini-bus at the time when students of Tsing Yi IVE finished school. While there was another bus route, No. 249M, travelling between Mayfair Gardens and MTR Tsing Yi Station and it should take 10 minutes only to travel between the two places if the shortest route was taken, the actual travelling time of bus route No. 249M was nearly 30 minutes as the bus needed to pass by most areas of Tsing Yi. If the residents of Mayfair Gardens chose to walk to MTR Tsing Yi Station, it would take them at least 35 minutes to do so. The residents of Tsing Yi South relied heavily on public transport services but they were poorly supported by such;

Lack of Facilities

- (j) as regards the provision of facilities, there were only one supermarket in Mayfair Gardens, some wet market stalls in the nearby Cheung Ching Estate and the open space of Mei King Playground to serve the residents of Mayfair Gardens. Residents had to go to other areas of Tsing Yi, Tsuen Wan or Kwai Fong to get their daily necessities. All other recreational and community facilities, such as sports ground, swimming pool, indoor recreation centres and community centres, were located

around the town centre area in Tsing Yi North, which was not easily accessible by the residents of Tsing Yi South. The additional population from the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone and the committed private residential development at Sai Shan Road would impose burden on the existing facilities in the area;

Alternative Sites

- (k) there were other locations in Tsing Yi which could be used for housing development. The vacant site at Fung Shue Wo Road next to Tsing Yi Municipal Services Building, which was only used occasionally for festival functions, could be a suitable location as it was located next to market, sports centre, library and schools and was within a 10-minute walking distance from MTR Tsing Yi Station. Some sites near Tsing Yi Northwest Park could also be considered for development as that area was close to a cluster of existing public housing estates and was well supported by transport, retail and community facilities; and

- (l) her fellow neighbours, in particular members of the Mayfair Gardens Owners’ Corporation, had gathered a lot of information to demonstrate to the Board that the remaining “R(A)4” zone was not suitable for housing development. She hoped that Members could listen to their views earnestly. If the Government insisted on pursuing the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone, TD should conduct a comprehensive study on the traffic conditions of Tsing Yi South and resolve the current transport problems of the area first. The design and construction of the future housing blocks should also comply with the environmental standards on glare and noise insulation. If HD could have more stringent control on tenancy abuse, including stricter checking of household income and asset of the tenants, more of the existing PRH flats could be released to the eligible people and the demand for new PRH flats would decrease greatly.

F2450 – 青鴻路建屋計劃關注組主席李志強

12. Mr Cheung Wai Ming made the following main points:

- (a) the previous presenters had provided clear and justifiable reasons to the Board on why the remaining “R(A)4” zone was not suitable for housing development. He hoped that Members could concur with the views of the previous presenters;
- (b) he did not agree with DPO/TWK’s view that the capacity of Tsing Yi south bridge was still ample upon completion of the committed and proposed developments in Tsing Yi South. The traffic impact assessment conducted by the Government’s consultant to support the proposed PRH development at the original representation site had not taken the external factors into account, including the increase of vehicular traffic in Tsing Yi south bridge due to the commissioning of the Hong Kong–Zhuhai–Macau Bridge (HZMB);
- (c) the light industry production of Taishan, which was located to the west of Macau, accounted for about 40% of the total production of Guangdong Province. The travelling time from Taishan to Macau was about 2 hours. With the commissioning of HZMB, it was expected that the number of container vehicles transporting goods from the west bank of the Pearl River Delta Estuary to the container terminals in Hong Kong would increase significantly as it would only take about 45 minutes for them to go to the container terminals from Macau, and the number of container vehicles using Tsing Yi south bridge would also be increased notably. As the Government had no plan to expand the transport infrastructure of Tsing Yi South, including the construction of new roads linking the external areas, Tsing Yi south bridge should become saturated very soon and the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone would not be sustainable in traffic terms; and
- (d) he quoted the Cross Harbour Tunnel which he had involved in its

construction as an example, when the Cross Harbour Tunnel was built years ago, its capacity was not designed to serve the current volume of traffic. When the traffic demand of the tunnel kept increasing subsequently due to the progressive development of Hong Kong, the Government had to construct other new cross harbour tunnels and implement traffic measures to address the increasing demand. He also noted that the Government had a plan to relocate the Yau Mei Tei Wholesale Fruit Market to Tsing Yi but the operators were unwilling to accept the proposal due to the poor traffic conditions of Tsing Yi. He considered that the existing transport infrastructure of Tsing Yi South should be improved before permitting the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone. Otherwise, the roads in Tsing Yi would be paralysed and the 230,000 residents of Tsing Yi would be affected.

13. Ms Wong Ngai (F1801 and representative of other further representers and representers) requested to make her oral submission after all other presenters as her presentation would be the longest. Ms Ng Wing Tsz (R15 and representative of other representers and commenters) also requested to make her oral submission after Mr Wong Hin Shing (R44) as her presentation would be long. As no objection to the proposed arrangements was raised by other attendees, Members agreed to accede to their requests.

R44 – Wong Hin Shing

14. Mr Wong Hin Shing made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to using the original representation site, which was a green buffer, for housing development as it would be an irreparable mistake. The site was not suitable for human habitation as it was subject to severe air pollution arising from the exhaust fumes emitted from the container vehicles, heavy goods vehicles and vessels. The poor air quality could greatly affect the health of the future residents. Besides, the surrounding environment was congested. Traffic accidents also happened quite frequently on the narrow local roads; and

- (b) he requested the Board to avoid the mistake by keeping the original representation site as an open breathing space for the local residents. The Board should abandon the proposed housing development at the remaining “R(A)4” zone and find an alternative site for the project.

R15 – Ng Wing Tsz

R234 – Christina Tong

R282 – Phyllis Cheng

R396 – Christine Cheng

R842 – 劉永強

R904 – Wong Oi Ling

R954 – Ho Ka Keung

R955 – Chau Wai Ping

C196 – Chow Chi Ming

C212 – Lau Kit Yan

C214 – 陳如柏

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Ng Wing Tsz 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) the original representation site to be reserved as a green buffer for mitigating the adverse impacts of CT9 was a compensation to the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate promised by the Government in the 1990s when CT9 was planned;

- (d) she noted that many of the previous presenters had quoted the relevant sections of the HKPSG as regards the site planning matters. According to paragraph 6.7.4 of Chapter 12 of the HKPSG on port back-up and open storage uses, container yards should be located near waterfront areas or with good accessibility to points of distribution, and interface with residential uses should be avoided where traffic volumes were high. As explained by the previous presenters who had researched the relevant public documents including the CT9 Study, the original representation site being a buffer was not suitable for housing development. To ease the mind of the local residents, she asked if PlanD could provide documentary proof to the Board to demonstrate that the original representation site, being a buffer and open space, could be used for housing development or there were similar precedent cases for development, which was also a request of some Members;

Provision of Open Space

- (e) although the provision of open space in Tsing Yi as a whole was adequate, most of the open spaces were located in Tsing Yi North which were not easily accessible by the residents of Tsing Yi South. The HKPSG required the provision of 200,000m² of open space for every 100,000 persons. In a planning appeal case concerning the development of a proposed commercial/residential building in an “O” site at Yu Lok Lane, Sheung Wan, which was dismissed by the Town Planning Appeal Board on 20.7.2000, the Appeal Board had pointed out that an open space should be within a walking distance of 200m from the residents that it served. While DPO/TWK had said that the provision of open space in Tsing Yi South was also sufficient to meet the needs of the local residents, there were only a few open spaces within a 200m walking distance from the residential developments of Mayfair Gardens, Cheung Ching Estate and Rambler Crest in Tsing Yi South;
- (f) she showed a number of photos of Tsing Yi Promenade, Tsing Yi

Northeast Park, Tsing Yi Park and a children's playground within Tsing Yi Estate, which were located in Tsing Yi North, to illustrate the good quality of the environment and the sports and recreational facilities there. In contrast, she showed some photos of Cheung Tat Road Sitting-out Area, Mei King Playground, Tsing Hung Road Playground and a children's playground within Cheung Ching Estate, which were located in Tsing Yi South, to illustrate that the open spaces were much inferior in quality than those of Tsing Yi North and the facilities were generally obsolete. She considered that the original representation site should be developed into a large open space as originally planned to serve the needs of the Tsing Yi South residents;

- (g) noting that Cheung Ching Estate was the oldest PRH estate in Tsing Yi and the Government might have a plan to redevelop Cheung Ching Estate comprehensively in the foreseeable future, she suggested the proposed PRH development at the remaining "R(A)4" zone be forgone as the site was not suitable for residential use and that the required number of new PRH flats be provided in the Cheung Ching Estate redevelopment project;
- (h) the recently announced 'Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030' study aimed at enhancing the living space of Hong Kong people and proposed to adopt a higher ratio of open space provision of 2.5m² per person. If Cheung Ching Estate was to be redeveloped, the population of Tsing Yi South would likely increase further. As such, the original representation site should be retained for open space use to meet the requirement of the increased population;

Provision of GIC Facilities

- (i) the Government said that the provision of retail and GIC facilities, including a kindergarten with 6 classrooms, a neighbourhood elderly centre, an integrated support service for persons with severe physical disabilities, an early education and training centre and a special child care centre, within the proposed PRH development at the remaining "R(A)4"

zone could create synergy effect with the retail and welfare facilities in the area. However, she queried whether the proposed GIC facilities could really benefit the local residents;

- (j) as the Paper indicated that there was already a surplus provision of 52 kindergarten classrooms in Tsing Yi, she wondered why a kindergarten was proposed within the development. Since the kindergarten might serve students not only from the local district but also outside districts, it would generate additional traffic flow in the area and increase burden of the local roads;
- (k) for neighbourhood elderly centre, there was already a similar facility in Cheung Ching Estate. While it might not be necessary to provide one more neighbourhood elderly centre at the remaining “R(A)4” zone, she had no strong views on its provision as the centre could provide an activity space for the elderly people nearby;
- (l) as regards the integrated support service for persons with severe physical disabilities, she noted from the information of the Social Welfare Department that such a service centre was not for receiving those persons requiring the services on-site but was basically a premises for the station of their staff who would go out to different areas to provide services to the persons in need. It was expected that the proposed centre would serve an extensive service area and a number of trips would be generated in its operation. Moreover, rehabuses would likely be used in the centre to provide transport service for persons with disabilities. The narrowness of the local roads however might not be able to support the use of rehabuses which required more frequent boarding and alighting and larger road space for manoeuvring;
- (m) as regards the early education and training centre and the special child care centre, they were mainly to serve people from the outside districts and might only serve a few residents of Tsing Yi South. However, such centres would induce additional traffic in Tsing Yi South;

- (n) according to the Paper, Tsing Yi had a shortfall of 1,138 hospital beds. While it was said that some GIC facilities, e.g. hospital beds, were assessed on a wider district basis and the shortfall in the area could be addressed by the provision in the adjoining area, the capacities of Princess Margaret Hospital and Yan Chai Hospital in the neighbouring districts of Tsing Yi were full already. The addition of more population to Tsing Yi would only worsen the current situation on lack of medical facilities;

Traffic Conditions

- (o) she showed a video clip recorded in the morning of the day to demonstrate that the roundabout of Tsing Hung Road outside Tower 1 of Rambler Crest was very congested in the morning with a number of tour coaches queuing along Tsing Hung Road. The local residents were very concerned about the current poor traffic conditions of the area;

[Mr K.K. Cheung left this session of the meeting at this point.]

The Board's Decision

- (p) she attended the meeting for hearing of the representations and comments in April 2016 and noted from the minutes of meeting that Members had raised various questions on the suitability of the original representation site for PRH development. Some Members considered that the site was not suitable for development as it was too congested and there were technical difficulties, although the Chairman, Vice-chairman and some other Members considered that the proposed PRH site should not be given up easily in view of the long waiting list for PRH and the pressing housing demand. Since the deliberation session of the meeting was conducted behind closed door and the minutes of meeting were not a verbatim record, the public could not trace the decision-making process as to why part of the original representation site was eventually retained as "R(A)4" zone for PRH development. She hoped that with the involvement of more

residents of Mayfair Gardens in the hearing of the further representations, the Board could better understand the concerns of the affected local residents and make a more appropriate decision; and

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam left this session of the meeting at this point.]

Alternative Sites

- (q) she queried whether there was no other suitable land for housing development in Hong Kong. In Tsing Yi, the vacant site at Fung Shue Wo Road next to Tsing Yi Municipal Services Building as pointed out by other presenter and some sites in Tsing Yi North which were close to the MTR Station and well supported by community facilities should be more suitable than the site at Tsing Hung Road. The Government should also consider using the brownfield sites in the New Territories, the golf courses and the community hall sites within the existing PRH estates for PRH development. In view of the traffic and environmental constraints, it did not appear to be cost-effective to develop the three proposed PRH blocks at the remaining “R(A)4” zone.

16. The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 12:40 p.m.

17. The meeting was resumed at 2:00 p.m. on 3.11.2016.

18. 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

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Regional Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Louis P.L. Chan

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

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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

Transport Department (TD)

Mr Honson H.S. Yuen - Chief Transport Officer/New Territories South West (CTO/NTSW)

Mr Patrick K.H. Ho - Senior Engineer/Kwai Tsing (SE/KT)

Further Representers, Representers, Commenters and Their Representatives

F77 – 青衣美景花園業主立案法團

F1193 – Lau Siu Mee

F1250 – Huang Wing Yu

F1251 – 黃培燦

F1307 – Huang Chi Wang

F1552 – 張蘇女

F1579 – 馬興嬌

F1589 – 余珍珠

F1622 – Li Wing Sze

F1638 – 江遠興

F1656 – Lei Kuai Feng

F1662 – 金國彥

F1673 – Tsang Wing Keung

F1678 – Lau Hing Sheung

F1681 – Wong Si Ping

F1733 – Chun Wai Sum

F1753 – Wong Kit Ling

F1801 – Wong Ngai

F1827 – 馮家寶

F1839 – 陳淑妍

F2048 – 麥活寬

F2079 – 歐玉玲

F2086 – Shin Sik Kwan, Cindy

F2110 – 陳嘉莉

F2115 – 陳家亮

F2131 – Tang Hon Man

F2159 – Ho Tak Kwong

R86 – 歐陽燕玲

R906 – Lau Mei Wa

R925 – Sung Wang Lok

R927 – Wong Ka Bo

Ms Wong Ngai - Further Representer and Further Representers' and Representers' representative

F296 – Yue Chi Wing

F541 – 村上耀文

F711 – 謝穎恩

F2000 – Lin Siu Ho

F2453 – Cheung Tsz Ying

F2469 – Chu Chong Him Jonathan

R17 – 村上純一

R777 – Lam Yuk Yip

R779 – Lam Yuen Ching, Philomena

R781 – 招德輝

R786 – Chan Yui Hang

R787 – Lee Pak Wing

R794 – Teng Mee Sin Sophianne

R805 – 黃淑儀

R806 – Tsang Wai Leung, Danny

R807 – 曾偉良

R808 – Tsang Yat To, Matthew

R810 – Tsang Yat Hei

R826 – Tse Pui Ling, Esther

R834 – 村上皓言

R839 – 林明儀

C69 – Lam Ming Yi, Maggie

Ms Chong Wai Fan, Joline - Further Representers', Representers' and Commenter's representative

F551 – Wong Po Leung, Kaiser

R356 – Lam Ka Yee, Becky

R363 – 何嘉怡

R366 – 關明輝

R373 – Tam Kar Kin, Samuel

R386 – Yau Lok Keung

R398 – Ang Bee Sian

R416 – Kan Suk Man

R424 – Yue Ho Man

R433 – Ma Kam Wing

Mr Wong Po Leung, Kaiser - Further Representer and Representers' representative

F2450 – 青鴻路建屋計劃關注組主席李志強

Mr Cheung Wai Ming - Further Representer's representative

R15 – Ng Wing Tsz

R234 – Christina Tong

R282 – Phyllis Cheng

R396 – Christine Cheng

R842 – 劉永強

R904 – Wong Oi Ling

R954 – Ho Ka Keung

R955 – Chau Wai Ping

C196 – Chow Chi Ming

C212 – Lau Kit Yan

C214 – 陳如柏

Ms Ng Wing Tsz - Representer and Representers' and Commenters' representative

R44 – Wong Hin Shing

Mr Wong Hin Shing - Representer

R83 – Ho Shu Kwong

R728 – 何承峯

Ms Cheung Kai Hung - Representers' representative

R346/C345 – Ma Yuk Chu, Judy

Ms Ma Yuk Chu, Judy - Representer and Commenter

20. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited the further representers, representers/commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their further representations, representations/comments.

21. The representative of R83 and R728 requested to make her oral submission first as her presentation would be short. As no objection to the proposed arrangement was raised by other attendees, Members agreed to accede to her request.

R83 - Ho Shu Kwong

R728 - 何承峯

22. Ms Cheung Kai Hung made the following main points:

- (a) no more infill developments should be permitted in Tsing Yi South. Traffic was already congested there and the buses of route No. 42A were often full during the morning peak. People had to leave home early for school or work in order not to be late;
- (b) the bad air quality in Tsing Yi South had led to respiratory diseases such as asthma in her family members;
- (c) the traffic and air pollution problems would get worse after completion of the proposed public rental housing (PRH) development; and
- (d) given that many local residents had expressed objections, the Board should seriously consider their views.

F77 – 青衣美景花園業主立案法團

F1193 – Lau Siu Mee

F1250 – Huang Wing Yu

F1251 – 黃培燴

F1307 – Huang Chi Wang

F1552 – 張蘇女

F1579 – 馬興嬌

F1589 – 余珍珠

F1622 – Li Wing Sze

F1638 – 江遠興

F1656 – Lei Kuai Feng

F1662 – 金國彥

F1673 – Tsang Wing Keung

F1678 – Lau Hing Sheung

F1681 – Wong Si Ping

F1733 – Chun Wai Sum

F1753 – Wong Kit Ling

F1801 – Wong Ngai

F1827 – 馮家寶

F1839 – 陳淑妍

F2048 – 麥活寬

F2079 – 歐玉玲

F2086 – Shin Sik Kwan, Cindy

F2110 – 陳嘉莉

F2115 – 陳家亮

F2131 – Tang Hon Man

F2159 – Ho Tak Kwong

R86 – 歐陽燕玲

R906 – Lau Mei Wa

R925 – Sung Wang Lok

R927 – Wong Ka Bo

23. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation and the visualiser, Ms Wong Ngai made the following main points:

- (a) she represented the Incorporated Owners of Mayfair Gardens and also the residents of Mayfair Gardens, and requested to have a verbatim record of her oral presentation;

- (b) the proposed rezoning of the northern portion of the original “R(A)4” site to “O” (i.e. Amendment Item A) was supported. However, the remaining “R(A)4” zone for the proposed PRH should be reverted to “O” to accord with its original planning intention under the planning concept of Container Terminal No. 9 (CT9) development, which was to serve as a green and open space buffer for the polluting CT9 thus minimising its environmental impacts on the nearby residential developments including Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate. The Government should not propose any residential development on buffer area for polluting use;
- (c) her presentation would provide an analysis on why the remaining “R(A)4” site was unsuitable for residential developments in particular PRH development from various aspects. She would also sum up in a systematic manner the views expressed by the residents of Mayfair Gardens in the previous hearing sessions so that Members could apprehend their views more readily;

Questionnaire Survey

- (d) when the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27 incorporating the amendments for the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road was published in 2015, the Incorporated Owners of Mayfair Gardens was yet to be formed and also the residents of Mayfair Gardens had been busy in handling the building rehabilitation work of their estate. While the District Council member had helped reflecting the views of residents of Mayfair Gardens to the Board, only a few residents had attended the representation meeting;
- (e) subsequently, residents of Rambler Crest informed them that the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road had not been endorsed and upon publication of the proposed amendment from “R(A)4” to “O”, there was another opportunity for the public to express their views on the proposed PRH development. Hence, a questionnaire survey was

conducted by the Incorporated Owners of Mayfair Gardens from 1-10 August 2016 to collect the residents' views on the proposed PRH development. The survey result was appended in Enclosure VII of the Paper and the main findings of the survey and views of the residents were summarised as follows:

- (i) about 93% of the surveyed residents objected to the proposed PRH development on the Tsing Hung Road because the original representation site was the only green space in the area and there were inadequate supporting transport and community facilities to serve the residents;
- (ii) about 92% of the surveyed residents opined that the transport system and the provision of community facilities such as market and playground could not meet the daily needs of the local residents. In particular, the lack of transport facilities was considered a major problem by the residents since after the recent re-arrangement of bus services, the operation of bus route No. 43C had been limited to peak hours and there was only one bus route No. 42A connecting Mayfair Gardens with Kowloon. Thus, residents travelling to Kowloon had to take green mini-bus (GMB) service for transfers to the MTR station;
- (iii) over 96% of the surveyed residents considered that traffic issue was their prime concern if the proposed PRH development was to proceed;
- (iv) in the past, residents of Mayfair Gardens seldom objected to government's planning proposal even for the rezoning of the Sai Shan Road site which was zoned "Green Belt" ("GB") for private housing development. It was partly because the Incorporated Owners of Mayfair Gardens had not yet been set up then and partly because they did not think the Government would listen to them. The residents however decided to put forward their views

this time as the proposed amendment had showcased that local views would be taken on board by the Board;

- (v) given that there was no improvement measure for CT9 and its surrounding environment, the Tsing Hung Road site should be retained for open space use in accordance with the original planning concept of CT9, which was to serve as a buffer between the polluting uses and Mayfair Gardens as well as Cheung Ching Estate; and
- (vi) while residents of Mayfair Gardens did not object to the Government's policy to build public housing to meet the imminent needs of grass-root people, new public housing developments should only be provided at suitable locations. To safeguard the living quality of the grass-root people and to minimise bifurcation of the society, the scarce open space in Tsing Yi South should not be sacrificed for meeting public housing targets;

Air Ventilation Impact

- (f) according to the Air Ventilation Assessment - Expert Evaluation (AVA(EE)) for the public housing development at Tsing Hung Road conducted by the consultants of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA), without the proposed PRH development, the southerly wind could reach Mayfair Gardens, Mei King Playground and the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Tsing Yi)(Tsing Yi IVE) directly. However, the wind at those areas would inevitably be obstructed by the proposed PRH development;
- (g) assessments of the impacts of development proposals on the pedestrian wind environment were guided by the 'Technical Guide for Air Ventilation Assessment for Developments in Hong Kong' (Technical Guide) published by the Government. According to the Technical

Guide, wind velocity ratio (VR) should be used as an indicator of wind performance for the AVA, and wind VR was defined as $V_{\text{pedestrian}}/V_{\text{infinity}}$, with $V_{\text{pedestrian}}$ captured the wind velocity at the pedestrian level (2m above ground) after taking into account the effects of buildings and urban features while V_{infinity} captured the wind velocity at the top of the wind boundary layer which was taken as the wind availability of the site;

- (h) as illustrated in the wind VR diagrams of the AVA(EI) Report in Appendix IXa of TPB Paper No. 10085, Mayfair Gardens had been assumed as one single rectangular block for air ventilation assessment while in reality, Mayfair Gardens was composed of eight residential blocks arranged in a U-shape. Such assumption had affected the accuracy of the AVA findings and in particular, the impact of the proposed PRH development on the wind availability around Mayfair Gardens had been under-estimated;

Landscape and Visual Impacts

- (i) according to the visual appraisal, the visual impact of the proposed PRH development was regarded as acceptable. However, the two viewpoints (i.e. VP6 – Ching Hong Road near the bus stop of Mayfair Gardens, and VP7 – Mei King Playground) adopted in the visual appraisal on the proposed PRH development were located at Tsing Hung Road (Appendix VIII of TPB Paper No. 10085) which could not illustrate the actual visual impact of the proposed PRH development on Mayfair Gardens as they were not within Mayfair Gardens. From the perspective of the residents, the more suitable viewpoint which should be adopted for the visual appraisal was within the podium of Mayfair Gardens. Should that viewpoint be adopted for appraisal, it was highly likely that the open view of the sky in front of Mayfair Gardens would be totally blocked by the proposed PRH development. According to the Guidance Notes for ‘Preparation of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment under the Environmental Impact Assessment

Ordinance’, ‘*both positive and negative landscape and visual impacts should be given due consideration in the process*’. Thus, it would be unfair to the residents of Mayfair Gardens if the negative impacts of the proposed PRH development were not fully considered by the Board. PlanD should include the above viewpoint in the visual appraisal so as to comprehensively assess the visual impact of the proposed PRH development;

Dioxins

- (j) the Chemical Waste Treatment Centre (CWTC) in Tsing Yi had been providing collection, treatment and disposal services for chemical wastes. The transportation of chemical wastes and their treatment in the CWTC had been a major concern of the residents in Tsing Yi South as the said processes could lead to the emission of dioxins which were persistent organic pollutants potentially lethal to humans and could adversely affect the environment. As a matter of fact, in 2004, the residents of Tsing Yi had conducted a protest to block the transportation of dioxin-contaminated soils removed from Penny’s Bay to the CWTC for treatment;

- (k) a monitor station was set up at the roof-top of Ching Yung House at Cheung Ching Estate to monitor the ambient dioxins level and the data were regularly uploaded to the Environmental Protection Department’s website for information of the public. While the level of dioxins was relatively low at present, with the anticipated reduction in wind availability around Mayfair Gardens upon replacing the green buffer by the proposed PRH development, the ambient levels and concentration of toxic chemicals and pollutants near Mayfair Gardens would increase. Although the air ventilation impact of the proposed PRH development was considered acceptable in the AVA(EI) Report, no detailed assessment on the air quality impact had been conducted;

Suitable Location for Public Housing Development

- (l) the vision of the HA was to help low-income families with housing need gain access to affordable housing; and one of its missions was to provide affordable quality housing, management, maintenance and other housing related services to meet the needs of the community. Though the Director of Housing had indicated in the public that HD would adopt a practical approach to provide public housing for the community, it was worth reconsidering whether the remaining “R(A)4” zone was suitable for PRH development given the associated traffic, noise, air ventilation and glare problems;

- (m) according to Chapter 9 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) which was the government’s manual for land use planning, buffer area was defined as an area of land separating incompatible land uses, being of sufficient extent to minimise the potential conflict between them and might contain non-sensitive structures or uses; and sensitive uses such as residential development should not be placed on buffer areas. The objective to minimise the environmental nuisances generated by CT9 on sensitive receivers including Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate and the need for an effective buffer between CT9 and the sensitive uses had been documented in the South-East Tsing Yi Port Development Planning & Engineering Feasibility Study for CT9 (the CT9 Study). The recommendations of the CT9 Study were subsequently incorporated into the OZP;

- (n) according to the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the approved Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/10 published in September 1994, there were several references to the provision of buffer areas between the CT9 development and Mayfair Gardens. Paragraph 6.4.4 of the ES for “Industrial” (“I”) zone stated that one of the purposes of the industrial site reserved to the northeast of Area 22 was to act as a buffer to screen off the noise and lights from the proposed CT9 to reduce their effects on the residential developments of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Chung

Estate. In paragraph 6.6.4 of the ES for “O” zone, it was stated that the open space in front of the existing residential developments at Mayfair Gardens (i.e. Mei King Playground) would also serve as a buffer area between the residential developments and the proposed CT9. As such, both the “I” site and Mei King Playground were intended to act as buffer areas on the OZP;

- (o) in the approved Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/19, the “I” site to the northeast of Area 22 had been rezoned to “Commercial” (“C”) for development of Rambler Crest and hotels. According to paragraphs 7.1.1 to 7.1.3 of the ES for the “C” zone, one of the purposes of the hotel and commercial development was to act as a buffer to screen off the possible noise and glare from the proposed CT9 and to reduce their effects on the nearby residential developments. In the “Other Specified Uses (Container-related Uses)¹” (“OU(CRU 1)”) zone located to the further east, land had been reserved for container related uses including a noise barrier which would be built in form of a screen building with the intention to screen off the noise and glare from CT9. As for the Mei King Playground within the “O” zone, the intention to serve as a buffer area for CT9 remained unchanged. As such, the “C” site, the “O” zone of Mei King Playground and the “OU(CRU 1)” site were all intended to served the function of buffer on the OZP;
- (p) given the CT9 Study’s recommendations and the planning intentions of the relevant zones as stipulated in the Tsing Yi OZPs No. S/TY/10 and S/TY/19, and that nothing in the said documents indicated that the original representation site was not included as the buffer area, reasonable inference could be drawn that the original representation site, together with the “C” and “OU(CRU)” sites on its east and Mei King Playground on its west, was as a whole planned as one large buffer area for the CT9 development. If PlanD considered otherwise, sufficient reasons should be given to explain why the original representation site was not intended for a buffer area;

Glare Impact

- (q) it was required under the Factories and Industrial Undertakings (Cargo and Container Handling) Regulations (Cap 59K) that all working places and any dangerous parts of the regular road or way over a dock, quay or wharf should be efficiently lighted. The whole of CT9 and the adjoining Mapletree Logistics Hub building therefore had to be lit up during night-time resulting in severe glare impacts on the nearby residents in Rambler Crest and Mayfair Gardens. The proposed PRH development in the remaining “R(A)4” site, which was located closer to CT9, would be subject to even more severe glare impact;
- (r) in order to alleviate the glare impact of CT9, residents of Mayfair Gardens needed to keep their windows closed and turn on air conditioning during night-time. Similar measures might not be feasible and/or affordable for the future PRH residents. They might have no choice but to tolerate and live under such adverse conditions caused by CT9 which would be unfair to them;

Noise Impact

- (s) in reply to a question raised by a Legislative Council (LegCo) Member, the then Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works said that the Rambler Crest development was the subject of an approved planning application for service apartments, for which the developer had given due consideration to the noise impact of the nearby existing roads and the then Route 8 (which was later renamed as Route 9). The developer of Rambler Crest also undertook to provide the apartments with central ventilation and proper insulating glass as noise mitigation measures and the planning application was subsequently approved based on this condition. While the proposed PRH development at the remaining “R(A)4” site would also be subject to adverse noise impact, it was unlikely that similar noise mitigation measures such as central ventilation and proper insulating glass would be provided to future

residents of the PRH development;

- (t) according to HKPSG, a buffer distance of 300m was recommended between residential uses and trunk roads, and the buffer distance could be reduced to 50m if the truck road was provided with screening. It was unlikely that such buffer distances could be provided between the proposed PRH development and Route 9;
- (u) the effectiveness of acoustic windows, noise barriers, architectural fins and building setback as noise mitigation measures for the proposed PRH development was doubtful. Even though Rambler Crest had been provided with central ventilation and insulating glass, the measured noise level at some of its units was barely within the acceptable level of 70dB(A);

[Mr Franklin Yu left this session of the meeting at this point.]

Clarification for Ms Chong Wai Fan

- (v) in the presentation of Ms Chong Wai Fan made on 26.10.2016, her arguments for a buffer area for CT9 was referring to paragraph 4.8 of TPB Paper No. 10190 instead of No. 10090;
- (w) by making reference to the ES of Tsing Yi OZPs No. S/TY/6, S/TY/9 and S/TY/12, it was clear that the original representation site was intended to serve as a buffer area between CT9 and sensitive uses including Mayfair Gardens. The intention remained unchanged on Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/26 when the Sai Shan Road site was rezoned from “GB” for residential use;
- (x) she had lived in Tsing Yi South since 1980s. The Government treated Tsing Yi South residents unfairly by introducing the original rezoning proposal and now by replacing the open space with the proposed PRH. The residents of Tsing Yi South had been generally satisfied with the

status quo in the past and seldom objected to government's proposals including the rezoning of the Sai Shan Road site in 2014. However, the residents of Mayfair Gardens had been living in anxiety due to the building rehabilitation work of Mayfair Gardens at first and then the rezoning of the original representation site. After the proposed rezoning was known by the residents, they had been extremely busy and tirelessly studying the voluminous public papers and documents and attending meetings to ensure that all the relevant information including the merits and demerits of the proposal were squarely placed before the Board for its consideration. They would not need to do so if the Government had carried out adequate studies to ascertain the appropriateness of the proposal before putting forth the proposed amendments. Thus, the Board was respectfully requested to take a fair and reasonable approach to consider the proposed amendment as well as the arguments of the residents;

Traffic Impact

- (y) there was a proposal to relocate the existing Vehicle Examination Centre (VEC) at Kowloon Bay to Sai Tso Wan in Tsing Yi which was recently rejected by the Development Panel of LegCo in May 2016 due to the potential adverse traffic impact on the road network in Tsing Yi. To address the traffic issues, it was recommended that necessary mitigation measures for the VEC project be provided, which included, among others, the enhancement of two signalised junctions at Tsing Yi Road/Tsing Yi Road West/Sai Tso Wan Road, and at Tsing Hung Road/Tsing Yi Road. As previously pointed out by another representer, since vehicles going to Sai Tso Wan would usually take the route through Ching Hong Road instead of Tsing Yi Road, the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures at Tsing Yi Road was doubtful. Moreover, as some 200 employees would be working in the proposed new VEC at Sai Tso Wan, additional impact on the road network as well as the demand for public transport provision would be generated. The proposed VEC as well as other new developments in

Tsing Yi would inevitably further aggravate the already congesting traffic condition in Tsing Yi South. The Government should resolve the existing traffic problem before considering any new developments in Tsing Yi, otherwise, strong public objections would be attracted;

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

- (z) according to the experience of some professional drivers, vehicles going from Kwai Chung and Kowloon to Sai Tso Wan would prefer using the route of Tsing Yi south bridge/Ching Hong Road/Tsing Yi Road West to both Tsing Tsuen Road/Tsing Yi Road West and Tsing Yi south bridge/Tsing Yi Road/Nam Wan Tunnel as psychologically that route was more direct and convenient. As such, many container vehicles would pass through the road network near Mayfair Gardens causing disturbances to the residents;

[Mr David Y.T. Lui arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (aa) the proposals to maintain the section of Tsing Yi Road along the remaining “R(A)4” site as a cul-de-sac for access to the PRH development and to provide bus/mini-bus lay-bys along that section thus narrowing the existing dual carriageway from four lanes to two lanes could not help solve the existing traffic congestion and illegal parking problems in the area. To effectively improve the traffic condition in Tsing Yi South, heavy vehicles should be restricted from using the road network in the area;

Conclusion

- (bb) there were clear and undisputable facts to demonstrate that the remaining “R(A)4” site formed part of the buffer area between CT9 and the residential developments including Mayfair Gardens. While the reference to the buffer area was stated in paragraph 7.7.4 of the ES of Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/26, it was subsequently deleted from the same

paragraph in the ES of Tsing Yi OZPs No. S/TY/26A and S/TY/27. No reason had been given by PlanD for such change in planning intention;

- (cc) although the remaining “R(A)4” zone was not an amendment item subject to further representation, it formed an integral part of the buffer area between CT9 and the residential developments including Mayfair Gardens. She urged the Board to consider carefully all the relevant facts and information submitted by the local residents and reconsider reverting the zoning of the remaining “R(A)4” site to “O”; and
- (dd) the residents did not object to public housing development. However, any public housing development should only be built at suitable location and backed up by comprehensive studies and assessments so that the future occupants could enjoy a comfortable living environment.

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

24. As the presentations from the further representers, representers, commenters or their representatives were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

25. A Member asked Mr Wong Po Leung, Kaiser (F551) whether the coaches and GMBs were using the same road network for access to the hotels and Rambler Crest respectively. Mr Wong said that both the coaches and GMB route No. 88M would use the same section of Tsing Yi Road to the east of Ramblers Crest. As the coaches often stopped at the roundabout near the car park entrance of Rambler Hotels/Rambler Crest at the end of Tsing Hung Road to pick up the visitors, it had caused traffic congestion on the road and safety problems to both the residents and visitors. In particular, the fact that the visitors, especially young children, did not follow the traffic regulations had made them prone to accidents.

26. The same Member followed up and asked whether the traffic condition of Tsing Hung Road would affect the operation of GMBs. By referring to a photograph, Mr Wong said that although the visitors mainly arrived at the hotels by coach, many of them

would also take GMB routes No. 88G and 88F from the podium of Rambler Crest for shopping and sight-seeing trips in the morning. Since the visitors often did not queue up and often rushed forwards when the GMBs or taxis arrived, it had also caused traffic congestion and safety issues on the podium level. Moreover, given the public transport services for Rambler Crest was inadequate, it was very difficult for the residents to get on the GMBs in the morning. For example, his daughter had to allow more than an hour for travelling to school when the journey should normally take only 8 to 10 minutes. The same applied to the return trip, and therefore he sometimes chose to walk back home from Maritime Square after work. Mr Wong also said that since Tsing Yi Road often had illegal parking on both sides, the proposed reduction of lanes for provision of bus/mini-bus lay-bys would further aggravate the traffic condition of the area.

27. A Member asked DPO/TWK to elaborate on the potential impacts of the proposed PRH development on Mayfair Gardens in terms of air ventilation, level of dioxins and visual amenity. By referring to a Powerpoint slide, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the AVA was carried out in accordance with the established technical procedure and methodology. As the AVA model was designed to simulate the wind environment at pedestrian level, appropriate simplification was required. Thus, in re-creating the development profile in the AVA model, podium structures were to be assumed as part of the developments and Mayfair Gardens was broadly shown as one rectangular block instead of a U-shape in the AVA model. Such modeling technique had also been applied in other developments in the AVA including Rambler Crest. Mr Chau continued to say that according to the findings of the AVA, with the addition of four building blocks at the original “R(A)4” site, the Site Wind Velocity Ratio (SVR) would be reduced by 10% from 0.21 to 0.19 while the Local Wind Velocity Ratio (LVR) would be reduced by 5% from 0.2 to 0.19. The results showed that based on a 4-block scheme, the wind availability around the “R(A)4” site and in the locality would only be slightly reduced and hence the impact would not be significant. The AVA consultant advised that based on a qualitative analysis, with the proposed reduction in number of buildings blocks from four to three, the resultant air ventilation impact would also be reduced since the prevailing winds were north-easterly and south-westerly for the whole year and the summer season respectively.

28. In terms of visual impact, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, referred to several PowerPoint slides and said that a comprehensive visual appraisal had been carried

out for the proposed PRH development taking into account views from a number of viewing points in long, medium and short distances identified in accordance with the technical guidelines. As it was important to protect public views, the identified viewpoints were basically key public viewing points including pedestrian nodes, bus stops and popular areas used by the public such as playgrounds and sitting-out areas. Thus, for visual impact from short distance, the views from Ching Hong Road near the bus stop and Mei King Playground had been taken into account for assessment purpose. According to the findings of the visual appraisal, the proposed PRH development would not result in significant visual impact on the public viewers and would generally be compatible with the existing built environment, local character and the surroundings in visual terms.

29. In response to the question of the Chairman, Ms Wong Ngai (F1801) said that the podium of Mayfair Gardens should have the highest concentration of people and pedestrian flow as it was the most popular place for residents to play or take rest and where the GMB stops were located. That point should also be selected for the purposes of visual impact and air ventilation assessments.

30. On air quality, Mr Chow Kwok Sang, CE of HD, said that there was no stipulated standard for the level of dioxins in the HKPSG. By referring to a Powerpoint slide, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, supplemented that the reduction in both SVR and LVR resulted from the previous 4-block PRH scheme was only 10% and 5% respectively. The impact on air ventilation and hence air quality would be even less significant, if based on the current scheme with three blocks.

31. The same Member asked Ms Wong Ngai what the reasons for the decline in the provision of market facilities in Tsing Yi South were. Ms Wong said that in the 1980s, the market in Ching Yung House was vibrant with a range of stalls selling meat, fishes, fruits, vegetables and gadgets serving mainly residents of Cheung Ching Estate and Mayfair Gardens. In the light of the aging population of the area and many of younger population had either moved out of Tsing Yi South or worked late, coupled with the poor management of the market, fewer and fewer people shopped in the market and its business had been running down. As Link REIT had no plan to redevelop or revitalise the market, many stalls had closed down gradually. Thus, the number of stalls had been declining with only a few stalls left and stalls selling fresh meat were limited.

32. A Member asked DPO/TWK to elaborate on how the conversion of two lanes at Tsing Yi Road for bus/mini-bus lay-bys could improve the traffic condition of the area. By referring to several Powerpoint slides, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that as that section of Tsing Yi Road would be maintained as a cul-de-sac, the traffic flow was anticipated to be limited. The main purposes of the proposed road improvement works were for provision of bus/mini-bus lay-bys as well as widening of the footpath. To improve the local traffic condition, the TIA also recommended the widening of the Ching Hong Road/Tsing Yi Road roundabout. Mr Patrick K.H. Ho, SE/KT of TD, supplemented that the existing Ching Hong Road/Tsing Yi Road roundabout was relatively small. In view of the envisaged population increase in the area, the TIA proposed to enlarge that roundabout so that two large vehicles would be able to pass through it at the same time. As for the section of Tsing Yi Road between Sai Shan Road and the cul-de-sac, since it would be serving only the proposed PRH development, the estimated traffic flow was not high. In order to cater for the public transport and pedestrian needs upon completion of the proposed PRH development, the TIA had proposed to convert two lanes of the existing Tsing Yi Road for bus/mini-bus lay-bys and a footpath of about 6m in width.

33. The Chairman asked whether there would be any restriction on heavy vehicles along that section of Tsing Yi Road. By referring to a Powerpoint slide, Mr Patrick K.H. Ho said that at present there was no plan for imposing such restriction. Nonetheless, restrictions on the use of articulated vehicles had currently been imposed in certain sections of Ching Hong Road, Chung Mei Road and Tsing Chin Street from midnight to six o'clock in the morning. The imposition of such restrictions was for noise protection purpose as those sections of roads were close to residential areas.

34. A Member asked whether Tsing Hung Road would serve as the access road for the proposed PRH development. By referring to a Powerpoint slide, Mr Patrick K.H. Ho said that the proposed PRH site was bounded by Tsing Yi Road to its west and Tsing Hung Road to its south-east. The vehicular access for the proposed PRH development would be located at the cul-de-sac of Tsing Yi Road, while Tsing Hung Road would mainly serve the hotels as well as the sites for container-related uses. Hence, the proposed PRH development would not be affected by the traffic condition along Tsing Hung Road. Another Member commented that the fact that Tsing Hung Road was frequently used by

coaches might be due to its accessible connection to the strategic road network.

35. Upon the enquiry of a Member, Ms May S.S. Yeung, A of HD, said that the vehicular access at Tsing Yi Road would be the main vehicular access to the PRH development. There would be a secondary vehicular access at Tsing Hung Road for service vehicles such as refuse collection trucks and lorries, services of which would be occasional and infrequent. Should there be any need for changes to these arrangements in the future, they would be subject to the agreement of TD.

36. Noting that some further representers alleged that the remaining “R(A)4” site had all along been planned as a buffer area between the container terminals and the sensitive receivers of Mayfair Gardens and Tsing Yi IVE, a Member asked DPO/TWK to explain whether the buffer area was still required. By referring to a Powerpoint slide, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that in view of the potential adverse noise and glare impacts of CT9 on the nearby sensitive receivers, requirement for the buffer areas had been recommended in the CT9 Study. According to the CT9 Study, there were two types of buffer area. The first type of buffer area referred to those sites which surrounded the container terminal and were in line-of-sight of those sensitive receivers. Those sites were recommended to be designated for industrial use to shield off the noise and glare from the container terminal. Such recommendation was subsequently incorporated into the Tsing Yi OZP and the concerned sites (including the Rambler Crest site) had been zoned as “I”. With the proposed industrial buildings as environmental shield, the second type of buffer area referred to those sites in between the sensitive receivers and the industrial buildings including the original representation site which should be environmentally acceptable uses in order to satisfy the 100m buffer distance recommended under HKPSG between industrial buildings and residential areas. Such recommendation was also incorporated into the Tsing Yi OZP and the concerned sites (i.e. Mei King Playground and the original representation site) had been zoned as “O”. Mr Chau continued to say that subsequent to the rezoning of the existing Rambler Crest and hotel site from “I” to “C”, the second type of buffer area was no longer required since commercial and residential uses were compatible. The requirement for buffer areas had taken into account the CT9 Study, Chapter 9 of the HKPSG on ‘Environment’, and Chapter 12 of the HKPSG concerning container-related uses. The amendment in the ES of OZP No. S/TY/27 to delete the reference to the buffer function of the “O” sites was to reflect the changing planning

circumstances.

37. In response to the follow up question of the same Member, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that the ES of Tsing Yi OZPs No. S/TY/9 to S/TY/26 stated that the “O” sites of Mei King Playground and the original representation site were intended to serve as a buffer. In fact, from a technical point of view, upon rezoning of the existing Rambler Crest site from “I” to “C” in 1997, the requirement for such a buffer was no longer required although the relevant section of the ES was not updated at that time. In the light of the proposed amendments in OZP No. S/TY/27, opportunity had been taken to updating the ES by deleting the reference to the buffer function of the “O” sites and the original representation site had been proposed to be rezoned to “R(A)4”.

38. The same Member enquired about the buffer requirement for container-related uses. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that buffer areas between container-related uses and sensitive receivers was encouraged in the HKPSG as the former would generate adverse environmental impacts such as noise and air pollutions on the latter. While Chapter 9 of the HKPSG did not set out any recommended buffer distance, Chapter 12 of the HKPSG stipulated that the buffer distances would vary according to the scale and nature of land use, the nature of its surroundings and the presence of screening features, and that container-related uses should be subject to the appropriate level of the EIA process. In the present case, the existing Tsing Hung Road would serve as a buffer between the proposed PRH development and the container-related use site. There would also be building setback from Tsing Hung Road within the PRH site and noise impact assessment was also required.

39. In response to the enquiry of the same Member about utilities to the PRH site, Ms May S.S. Yeung said that HD had consulted the concerned departments and utility companies and envisaged no particular technical problem regarding the supply of water and electricity to the proposed PRH development. A drainage impact assessment had also been conducted which confirmed that the existing drainage system would be able to accommodate the proposed PRH development.

40. Noting that many local residents had expressed dissatisfaction on the existing public transport provision in Tsing Yi South and considered that no further development

should be permitted until the situation was improved, a Member sought government's representatives' response on the residents' views. Mr Honson H.S. Yuen, CTO/NTSW of TD, said that surveys on public transport services for Mayfair Gardens and Rambler Crest had been regularly conducted by TD. According to the survey results, the major GMB and franchised bus services for Mayfair Gardens and Rambler Crest were considered acceptable. The relevant survey results were summarised in the following:

GMB Route No. 88C (Mayfair Gardens to/from Kwai Fong MTR Station)

- (a) the demand for GMB services was high in both directions during the morning peak;
- (b) for the service to Kwai Fong MTR Station, all GMBs were fully occupied during the morning peak. Nonetheless, given the service was frequent at an interval of about 3 minutes, the waiting time was less than 10 minutes for about 99% of the passengers;
- (c) for the service to Mayfair Gardens, although the IVE students attended school in the morning, the survey indicated that the waiting time was less than 10 minutes for about 98% of the passengers;

GMB Route No. 88F (Rambler Crest to/from MTR Tsing Yi Station)

- (d) for the service to Tsing Yi MTR Station, the waiting time was less than 10 minutes for about 99% of the passengers;

GMB Route No. 88G (Rambler Crest to/from MTR Kwai Fong Station)

- (e) for the service to Kwai Fong MTR Station, the waiting time was less than 10 minutes for about 99% of the passengers;

Bus Route No. 42A (Cheung Hang to/from Jordan)

- (f) for the service to Jordan, the average hourly patronage was about 69%

during peak hours. Although for two of the buses, some passengers could not get on the bus, those passengers were able to get on board the next bus given the service was quite frequent at an interval of about 4 to 5 minutes; and

Bus Route No. 948X (Cheung On to/from Tin Hau)

- (g) for the service to Tin Hau, the average hourly patronage was about 97% during peak hours. Although for one of the buses, some passengers could not get on board, those passengers were able to board onto the next bus within 10 minutes.

41. The Chairman asked the representatives of TD whether waiting time was a standard indicator for assessing the adequacy of GMB service. Mr Honson Y.S. Yuen said that TD was vested with the responsibility to monitor the adequacy of public transport services and a 10-minute waiting time was used as an indicator for assessment purpose. For those public transport services with waiting time over 10 minutes during peak hours, they would be considered unsatisfactory and follow up actions might be required after taking into account other relevant factors.

42. In response to the question of a Member, Mr Honson H.S. Yuen said that public transport services were being monitored by TD on a regular basis. Except the survey on the service of GMB route No. 88C from MTR Kwai Fong Station to Mayfair Gardens which was conducted in August 2016, the other surveys were carried out in May 2016.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang and Dr F.C. Chan left this session of the meeting at this point.]

43. Noting that the GMBs were often fully occupied during the morning peak, a Member asked the representatives of TD whether it was feasible to deploy larger vehicles to serve those busy GMB routes. Mr Honson H.S. Yuen said that in considering the appropriate mode for provision of public transport services, a number of factors including cost-effectiveness and frequency had to be taken into account. A GMB had only 16 seats while the passenger capacity of a double-decker bus was about 120 to 130 (of which about

30% were seats). If double-decker buses were to be deployed on GMB routes, their frequency would inevitably be reduced. In order to enhance the operational efficiency of GMB services, the Government had been examining the feasibility to increase the capacity of GMB vehicles from 16 to 19 seats. While the GMB trade had already been consulted on such proposal, it would be subject to completion of other necessary procedures, including legislative amendment, and hence its implementation programme was uncertain at the moment.

44. The same Member asked the representatives of TD if any of the public transport services for Mayfair Gardens and Rambler Crest could be routed through Nam Wan Tunnel and Stonecutters Bridge, which were convenient road linkages between Tsing Yi with other destinations such as West Kowloon. Mr Honson H.S. Yuen said it would be more convenient and direct for the public transport services to go to Kwai Fong via the existing Tsing Yi north and south bridges.

45. In response to the enquiry of a Member regarding noise levels, Mr Chow Kwok Sang said that for the proposed PRH development, the background noise at the facades facing Cheung Ching Estate would be higher than those facing the container terminal. It was because the traffic flow along Tsing Yi Road was higher than that of Tsing Hung Road.

46. Noting that the demand for public transport facilities from Mainland visitors would increase substantially during golden week periods, a Member asked the representatives of TD if there were any planned measures to cope with such acute demand. Mr Honson H.S. Yuen said that the timetable and frequency of GMB services were subject to administrative regulation. Given that the daily operational cost of a GMB was about HK\$2,700 to \$2,900, the increase in GMB services might not be considered viable in particular after the golden week holidays, the patronage would resume to the normal level, and it would not be cost-effective for increasing the vehicle allocation only to meet the short-term upsurge of passenger demand. With a view to improving the situation, TD had been discussing with the hotel operators on the possibility of providing some more efficient, cost-effective and flexible modes such as non-franchised shuttle bus services for hotel occupants.

47. The same Member asked if the existing illegal parking problem along the section of Tsing Yi Road outside Tsing Yi IVE would persist after completion of the proposed PRH development. Mr Patrick K.H. Ho said that under the current proposal, that section of Tsing Yi Road would be converted to a single carriageway upon completion of the PRH development. TD would further liaise with HD on the detailed traffic management measures such as designation of double yellow lines and imposition of restrictions on loading/unloading activities with a view to minimising illegal parking along Tsing Yi Road.

48. In response to the questions of the same Member, Mr Honson H.S. Yuen said that the frequencies of GMB services quoted above were average figures derived based on the total number of vehicles arrived/departed within an hour. While there would be fluctuations in terms of the actual time intervals between each GMB trip, the differences would be insignificant given the high average frequency of services. Since the passenger demand during the evening peak was not as concentrated as that during the morning peak, the average passenger demand/hour would be lower and hence the passenger waiting times might be shorter.

49. Noting that there were concerns from local residents on the traffic noise nuisance from container vehicles on Rambler Crest and the proposed PRH development, a Member enquired about the extent of the existing noise barriers along Tsing Sha Highway and the programme for any proposed extension. By referring to a Powerpoint slide, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that there were existing noise barriers along the section of Tsing Sha Highway adjoining the southern boundary of the remaining "R(A)4" site. There was no information on hand regarding any proposal to extend those noise barriers. The Chairman said that such information could be provided in the subsequent meeting sessions for Members' information. The Member said that examples of highways and roundabouts covered with noise barriers were found along Eastern Corridor and in Tseung Kwan O. Consideration should be given to extending the existing noise barriers eastwards towards Rambler Crest and the Tsing Sha Highway/Tsing Yi Road/Tsing Yi Hong Wan Road roundabout.

[The Vice-chairman and Mr David Y.T. Lui left this session of the meeting at this point.]

50. In response to the question of another Member, Mr Honson H.S. Yuen said that for public transport services, a waiting time within 10 minutes was considered acceptable.

51. The same Member asked the representatives of TD whether container vehicles arriving Hong Kong via the future Hong Kong - Zhuhai - Macao Bridge (HZMB) would have any adverse traffic impact on the local road network in Tsing Yi. Mr Patrick K.H. Ho said that Tsing Yi was conveniently linked to other parts of Hong Kong by an efficient road network comprising Tsing Ma Bridge, Ting Kau Bridge, Stonecutters Bridge and the Tsing Yi north and south bridges. As container vehicles usually took the most accessible route to reach their destinations, it was anticipated that those container vehicles arriving Hong Kong via the HZMB would likely follow the route of Tsing Ma Bridge/Nam Wan Tunnel/Stonecutters Bridge to access CT9 or the container terminals at Kwai Chung.

52. Noting that many local residents had expressed dissatisfaction with the existing public transport services, the same Member asked how the transport facilities could be improved to cope with the increase in population. Mr Honson H.S. Yuen said that as an on-going task, the provision of public transport services, including franchised bus and GMB, was under regular review, e.g. the annual Route Planning Programme for franchised bus services, by TD. For new developments such as the proposed PRH development, detailed planning of public transport services would be carried out about two years before completion of the development, in which consideration would be given to introducing new routes, amalgamating routes and improving frequency taking into account the existing public transport services and changes in population and passenger demand. Mr Yuen continued to say that a section of about 100m in length along Tsing Yi Road had been reserved for franchised bus/GMB lay-bys for the proposed PRH development. In the light that the existing GMB routes serving Tsing Yi South were already saturated, it was envisaged that new GMB service would be introduced to serve the new population. As for franchised bus services, since the proposed PRH development would be completed in 5 to 6 years' time and there might be changes in the routing and passenger demand in the interim, the future bus routes and frequency of service could not be ascertained at the current stage. The need for rationalising franchised bus services to cater for the population increase would be kept under close monitoring and TD would endeavour to meet the public transport needs arising from the new developments.

53. The Chairman followed up and asked whether bus and/or mini-bus terminus would be provided at the proposed PRH development. Mr Honson H.S. Yuen said that the GMB lay-by would likely be designated as a terminating stop as a new GMB service would be introduced to serve the population. As for designating a bus terminating stop, it would depend on a number of factors including future bus routing and passenger demands in the locality and other parts of Tsing Yi. Generally speaking, for shorter hauls (for example to Tsuen Wan), the passenger demand would be higher which might justify the designation of a bus terminating stop at the proposed PRH development while for longer hauls (for example to Kowloon), the demand might be accommodated through the rationalisation of bus routes taking into account passenger demands in the locality and other parts of Tsing Yi.

54. A Member asked DPO/TWK to elaborate on the standards for provision and distribution of open spaces in Tsing Yi. Mr Lawrence Y.C Chau said that based on the HKPSG, the standard for provision of open space was a minimum of 2m² of open space per person (i.e. 1m² per person for district open space and local open space respectively). In accordance with the existing population distribution (i.e. about 150,000 persons in Tsing Yi North and 23,000 persons in Tsing Yi South), the district open spaces were mainly provided in the northern and central parts of Tsing Yi. As for Tsing Yi South, the existing and planned provisions of local open space was about six hectares after taking into account the rezoning of part of the original representation site to “R(A)4” and the provision of about 6,500m² of local open space within the proposed PRH development. Such provision was generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population of about 33,000 in Tsing Yi South.

55. Noting that the logistic building within the “OU(CRU)” zone was lit up throughout the night-time, a Member asked whether it was feasible to install certain types of window screen at the building so as to reduce its glare impact on the nearby residents. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that he had no such information on hand.

56. As Members had no further questions, the Chairman said that the meeting session was finished. There would be two more meeting sessions on 7.11.2016 and 10.11.2016 respectively. Afterwards, 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.

57. The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.