

**Minutes of the 1181st Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on
2.8.2018, 6.8.2018, 7.8.2018 and 8.8.2018**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West)

Transport Department

Mr Patrick K.H. Ho (2.8.2018 and 6.8.2018)

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)

Transport Department

Mr Ricky W.K. Ho (7.8.2018 and 8.8.2018)

Chief Engineer (Works)

Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Mr Elvis W.K. Au (2.8.2018)

Mr C.F. Wong (8.8.2018)

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Raymond W.M. Wong (6.8.2018 and 7.8.2018)

Assistant Director (Regional 1)

Lands Department

Mr Simon S.W. Wang (2.8.2018 and 8.8.2018)

Assistant Director (Regional 3)

Lands Department

Mr Edwin W.K. Chan (6.8.2018 and 7.8.2018)

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board
Mr Kevin C.P. Ng (2.8.2018 a.m. and 7.8.2018)
Ms April K.Y. Kun (2.8.2018 p.m. and 6.8.2018)
Mr Stephen K.S. Lee (8.8.2018)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Mr Raymond H.F. Au (2.8.2018 a.m.)

Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu (2.8.2018 p.m. and 8.8.2018)

Ms Annie H.Y. Wong (6.8.2018)

Miss Anissa W.Y. Lai (7.8.2018)

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 2.8.2018:

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West)
Transport Department
Mr Patrick K.H. Ho

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

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Assistant Director (Regional 1)
Lands Department
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Tuen Mun & Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/34
(TPB Paper No. 10449)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

2. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments mainly involved, inter alia, rezoning of five pieces of government land for public housing developments by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), and rezoning of a site to take forward the decision of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) on a section 12A application (No. Y/TM/16) submitted by Fill Year Limited (R4361), a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Property Limited (SHK). The following Members had declared interests on the item for being associated/having business dealings with HKHA, AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM)(i.e. consultant of the ‘Preliminary Development Review for Housing Sites at Tuen Mun Central – Feasibility Study’ (the Study) supporting the proposed public housing developments conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)), SHK, CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (R1149), a subsidiary of CLP Holdings Limited (CLP), Hong Kong and China Gas Co Ltd (HKCG) (R4373), a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. (HLD), Senworld Investment Limited (R4360), a subsidiary of Kerry Properties Limited (Kerry), Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R4374), Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB)(R1141) and/or Ms Mary Mulvihill (R124/C2860):

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning
(*as Director of Planning*) Committee (SPC) and Building
Committee of HKHA

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - being a representative of the Director of
(*as Chief Engineer (Works)*, Home Affairs who was a member of SPC

Home Affairs Department)

and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA

Professor S.C. Wong
(Vice-chairperson)

- having current business dealings with AECOM, being the traffic consultant /engineering consultant of AECOM; being the Chair Professor of Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) which had obtained sponsorship from SHK on some activities of the Department before; being employee of HKU which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD before; and being a member of the Advisory Committee for Accredited Programme of MTR Academy

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

- having current business dealings with AECOM, SHK, HLD and MTRCL, and past business dealings with HKHA

Dr C.H. Hau

- having current business dealings with AECOM; the institute he served having current business dealings with HKHA; and being an employee of HKU which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD before

Mr K.K. Cheung

-] their firm having current business
-] dealings with HKHA, SHK, Kerry, CLP, HKCG and MTRCL, and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA, SHK and MTRCL, and past business dealings with AECOM

- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work, and was an ex-employee of Kerry

- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HKHA, SHK, CLP and MTRCL

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA, AECOM, SHK, HLD and MTRCL, and his spouse was an employee of SHK

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being employee and Director (Development and Marketing) of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with HD on housing development issues

- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a Director of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which had obtained sponsorship from SHK and HLD before

- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - being a Director of the Kowloon Motor Bus Co. (1933) Ltd. and SHK was one of the shareholders

- Dr Jeanne C.Y. NG - being the Director of Group Sustainability of CLP

- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a Member of the Board of Governors of the Arts Centre, which had collaborated with MTRCL on a number of arts projects, and had received a donation from an Executive Director of HLD before
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - being the Treasurer of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before; and his relative being a member of DAB

3. Members noted that Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Professor S.C. Wong, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Franklin Yu, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had tendered apologies for being unable to attend this session of the meeting. As the interest of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan on the item was direct, he should be invited to leave the meeting. Members noted that Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Dr C.H. Hau and Mr Daniel K.S. Lai had no direct involvement in the subject public housing projects, and the interests of Messrs Wilson Y.W. Fung, Stephen L.H. Liu and Peter K.T. Yuen were indirect, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left this session of meeting at this point.]

4. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr David Y.M. Ng - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun & Yuen Long West (DPO/TM&YLW)

Miss Jessica Y.C. Ho - Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun (STP/TM)

Miss Maggie H.K. Wu - Town Planner/Tuen Mun (TP/TM)

HD

Mr Barry T.K. Lam - Senior Planning Officer 4 (SPO4)

Mr Leslie K.C. Yuen - Senior Architect 36 (SA36)

Mr Patrick P.C. Tse - SA25

Mr S.C. Lo - Senior Landscape Architect 2 (SLA2)

CEDD

Mr Tony K.L. Cheung - Chief Engineer, West Division(3) (CE/W3)

Mr T.F. Lau - Senior Engineer/1, West Division (SE/1(W))

AECOM

Mr Ivan T.L. Wan - Environmental Consultant

Mr Stanley S.Y. To - Senior Landscape Designer

- Mr Samuel Y.H. Hung - Associate
- Mr Damon D.B. Wong - Senior Engineer
- Mr S.T. Lee - Technical Director

Representers/commenters and their Representatives

R122 – Tuen Mun District Council

- Mr Lee Hung Sham - Representer's representative

R124 / C2860 - Mary Mulvihill

- Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

R133 - Wong Sau Kuen

R1155 / C794 – Yip Man Pan

R3118 - 郭燕儀

R3504 - 簡穎媛

R3505 - 江敏慈

R3533 - Chiu Ming Yin

R3904 - 藍連明

R3936 - Chan Yin Chun, Mabel

R3939- 張惠文

R4021 - Ng Wai Keung

- Mr Yip Man Pan - Representer, Commenter and
Representers' representative

R177 - 鄭家盛

R424 - 陳凱姿

R440 - 張祝媚

R649 - Lam Kit Yi

R1204 - 謝少英

R1206 - 李樹棠

R1252 - 梁潤雄

R4353 - Cathy

C23 - 黃康傑

C25 - Chan Ka Lai

C27 - Elaine Yeung

C29 - Ho Yuen Ting

C32 - 胡逸祥

C37 - Wong Ka Yan

C50 - Lau Yee Ching

C61 - Lau Pui Ki

C64 - Shum Yu Bun

C73 - Ada Ng

C78 - 冼志傑

C88 - Jade Lam

C93 - Lo Wing Fei

C94 - Ruby Leung

C97 - Law Chun Hin

C111 - Pau Kai Yin, Thomas

C117 - Tang Kowk Chiu

C125 - 劉翠瑤

C140 - 俞菲萍

C467 - Chau Yin Kan

C496 - 阮金正

C578 - Pang Yuen Yi

C602 - 徐俊彥

C651 - Rachel Lam

C680 - 蕭佩儀

C729 - Wan Wai Lam

C739 - 吳佩輝

屯門發展關注組

Ms Chan Hoi Chi

- Representers, and Representers' and
Commenters' representative

Mr Leung Po Lung

] Representers' and Commenters'

Miss Wong Lok Yi

] representative

R195 - Wong Kwok Fai, Mike

R258 - Chik Hui Nam

R262 - Chun Chan

R263 - Okada Ken

R314 - Zoe Yuen

R902 - 高峻威

R2095 - Hui Lai Fan

R3395 - 李金水

R3399 - Au Chi Piu

R3418 - 陳政維

R3419 - 梁雅詩

R3472 - Lee Chi Ching

R3485 - 張月媚

R3492 - Shing Mei Miu

R3494 - Tam Wing Kai

R3497 - Chan Yuk Lin

R3498 - 陳劍龍

R3499 - Chan Yuk Wu

R3507 - 高光鎮

R3510 - Leung Pui Kwan

R3522 - Liang Hui Ling

R3525 - Cheung Kwok Yau

R3532 - Chan Kin Kwan

R3543 - 陳渠生

R3544 - 陳嘉裕

R3538 - 吳宇鴻

R3539 - Lam Kit Ling

R3540 - Lam Mee Ling

R3542 - 陳偉就

R3550 - 劉鎮江

R3551 - 劉佩玲

R3552 - 阮耀屏

R3554 - 張浩維
R3565 - Yeung Miu Yan, Michel
R3566 - 劉家樂
R3574 - 岡田敏行
R3578 - 張鳳珍
R3582 - 周有勝
R3583 - 黎玉芳
R3592 - 林盼
R3607 - 植曉蕙
R3609 - Ho Ka Wai
R3613 - 陳麗
R3615 - 梁麗芳
R3616 - 陳鏡光
R3623 - 劉松蘭
R3628 - 李杏容
R3629 - 蕭啟賢
R3630 - 植智根
R3631 - 陳縉
R3637 - 倫惠如
R3638 - 黃思敏
R3648 - 程子恩
R3663 - 鄭寶媚
R3671 - 梁君翔
R3672 - 梁君豪
R3675 - Chris Tse
R3685 - Law Hung Shing
R3688 - 貝玉英
R3689 - 張家豪
R3690 - 徐慧恩
R3691 - 李潔華
R3694 - 張玉美

R3695 - 廖文英
R3696 - Lee Tsz Yeung
R3698 - 李耀輝
R3703 - Palmes Phoebe Labaro
R3704 - Tsui Yuk Hei, Ricky
R3705 - 鄭耀榮
R3723 - 區卓儀
R3724 - 區發文
R3725 - 陳燕蘭
R3726 - Lam Chi Ming
R3736 - Tang Sin Fat
R3739 - 鍾力文
R3740 - 洪燕玲
R3742 - 李卓華
R3754 - Fong Ching Hei
R3769 - 陳樂平
R3776 - 張治
R3785 - To Lisa
R3788 - 廖騰萬
R3792 - Lee King Yan
R3793 - Fung Polyanne
R3797 - 梁詠欣
R3803 - 吳繼平
R3804 - 何秋洪
R3813 - 崔浩橋
R3814 - 崔詠儀
R3816 - 盧金枝
R3825 - Ng Yuet King
R3839 - 江展成
R3852 - Yung Wing Ping, Winnly
R3853 - 孔玉婷
R3854 - 徐歧敏

R3862 - 麥敏亭
R3863 - 譚子權
R3871 - Li King Sang
R3876 - 譚堯娣
R3878 - 冼德星
R3879 - 黃俊絡
R3880 - 楊景文
R3881 - Lau Chun Ip
R3883 - 麥慧媚
R3884 - Hung Fan Yan
R3886 - 黃國輝
R3892 - Wong Chi Hang
R3893 - 黃麗娟
R3895 - 冼麗鈺
R3902 - 潘銀嬋
R3906 - 楊素君
R3913 - Ng Suet Ying, Maria
R3926 - 吳立里
R3928 - 夏常年
R3935 - Yu Sin Man, Chris
R3937 - Wong Sze Nga
R3938 - Wong Ming Yan
R3942 - Ng Ka Fai
R3956 - 林俊杰
R3966 - 章如成
R3967 - 魏國喜
R3968 - 吳汝芳
R3969 - Chui Kai Wai
R3970 - Chui Hoi Ying
R3971 - Chui Hoi Kam
R3972 - Chan Kwok Wing
R3996 - Hui Nga Wan

R4011 - Ip Wai Ki
R4023 - Cheng Sze Nga
R4024 - 鄭錦河
R4025 - 張秀珠
R4036 - 蕭尚容
R4038 - 葉泳珊
R4039 - 葉炳基
R4048 - Fong Sik Sang
R4049 - Man Shun King
R4052 - 勞國良
R4069 - Chow Wai Ha
R4072 - Wong Lai Sun
R4084 - 蔡偉健
R4085 - 阮慧詩
R4092 - 蔣宗希
R4101 - 劉珮珊
R4107 - Wong Hiu Ting
R4108 - Tam Tsz Yeung
R4128 - Chan Chi Man
R4130 - Li Sui Nam
R4153 / C691 - 林宇希
R4175 - Leung Kam Lun
R4343 - 黃松齡
C754 - MK
C755 - Cheng Ming Kit
C797 - 南浪之聲
C795 - 南浪海灣業主立案法團

南浪海灣業主立案法團

Mr Lau Chun Kong]	Representers, and Representers' and
Mr Lee Chi Ching]	Commenters' representatives
Ms Lau Chung Lan]	
Ms Wong Lai Kuen]	

Ms Yip So Wan

- Representers' and Commenters'
representative

R206 / C636 - Tse Wai Yue

R393 - 毛宇軒

R443 - Moon Tang

R1212 - Shum Yim Wan

R1285 - 馮海源

R2284 - 莊錦生

C153 - 李識玲

C163 - Kan Sum Yin

C169 - Ho Ting

C199 - Lung Ka Fai

C257 - Tam Lok Sze

C265 - 葉潔茹

C307 - Ngai Wing Han

C364 - 阮伯寧

C369 - 周小姐

C376 - Cheung Wing Yan

C398 - Jason Lam

C413 - Chan Yin Fan

C423 - Chan Yuen Ki

C433 - Leung Ying Chi, Debby

C435 - Sueky

C444 - Tsang Yin Yi

C492 - Thomas Lau

C529 - Mak Wan Ming

C615 - 溫偉芳

C646 - MS Kwok

C649 - Chui Wan Sum

C668 - Chan Ka Man

C714 - 曾美芝

C716 - 文素微

C777 - Kito

C2725 - Queenie Li

屯門發展關注組

- Mr Tse Wai Yue - Representor, Commenter and Representers' and Commenters' representative
- Mr Yan Pui Lam - Representers' and Commenters' representative

R260 - 禰偉柏

R261 - 禰永堂

R3980 - 陳燕玉

- Mr Huen Wing Tong - Representor and Representers' representative

R265 / C788 - Chu Hoi Dick

- Mr Chu Hoi Dick - Representor and Commenter

R375 / C1562 - 葉美容

- Ms Yip Mee Yung - Representor and Commenter

R464 - 區國權

- Mr Au Kwok Kuen - Representor

R647 - 梁少娟

R1543 / C735 - Wong Chun Hung

R1584 - 王笑萍

R1592 - Lam Chi Yin

R1621 - 吳鳳儀

R1648 - 梁瑞枝

R1667 - 李錦蓮

R1668 - 盧桂榮

R1684 - Wong Shoon Kay

R1685 - Wong Yin Gwan

R1686 - Wong Chi Sing

R1698 - Lee Ying Pang

R1749 - 黃寶珍

R1774 - 梁麗清

R1813 - 龍素玉

R1839 - Wong Siu Lan

R1840 - Chan Lin Ho

R1842 - Lau Yu Choi

R1852 - Lai Po Chu Rila

R1875 - 陳雪梅

R1876 - 陳毅梅

R1901 - 候蓮娥

R1143 – Kam Man Fung

Mr Kam Man Fung - Representer, and Representers' and
Commenter's representative

R939 - Chan Ping Wing

R1230 - Ng Tsz Yau

R1231 - Leung Kwai Fong, Victoria

R1232 - Mancera Analiza Alob

R1233 - Ng Tsz Yuet

R1234 - Tam Wing Ki, Gary

R1235 – Kin Chan

R1236 - Ng Sin Mun, Mandy

R1237 - Ng Kwok Wah

Mr Ng Kwok Wah - Representer and Representers'
representative

R1138 - Yeung Chi Hang

R1878 – Lee King Ku, Simon

Mr Yeung Chi Hang - Representer and Representers'
representative

R1156 - Oceania Heights Owners' Committee

R1239 - Lam Chun Hung

R3098 - 張路瑟

R3134 - Kan Chun Yin

R3138 - Leung Chi Hang

R3146 - 胡元釗、霍穗軍

R3160 - 湯潔楠

R3164 - Lau Wai Sheung

R3172 - Chan Yuk Sim, Idy

R3177 - Yip Ho Wing

R3183 - Ho Hon Ting, Johnson

R3190 - 方瑞意

R3191 - 陳子樂

R3193 - 李俊耀

R3207 - Ho Lai Man

R3222 - 簡俊然

R3227 - 梁志豪

R3238 - 李志達

R3246 - 姚安鍵

R3247 - 施志強

R3249 - Law Kit Chi

R3255 - Leung Sun Ming

R3271 - Wu Chiu Yin

R3285 - 張嘉雯

R3326 - Leung Yuet To

R3330 - 黃志權

R3333 - Simon Tsang

R3354 - 鍾偉強、鄧家賢

R3355 - Chui Wan Sum

R3359 - Chan Nga Wai

R3366 - Poon Kai Cheong

R3479 - Lau Oi Ying

R3657 - 霍穗軍

R3761 - Lee Chi Tat

R3829 - 胡元釗

R4149 - Leung Hoi Kit

R4189 - Lo Wing Fat

R4217 - 胡筠儀

R4218 - 何月杏

R4223 - Chung Pui Fan

R4231 - 胡保儀

R4279 - 黃嘉偉

R4301 - Leung Lai Ping

R4315 - 黃駿傑

R4321 - Lung Wai Man

R4338 - 胡志穎

C360 - Thomas Kwok

Oceania Heights Owners' Committee

Mr Wu Chiu Yin]	Representers, and Representers' and
Mr Lo Wing Fat]	Commenters' representatives

R3104 - Wong Kai Cheung

Ms Chow Kit Ping - Representers' representative

R3117 - Fung Kam Wing

R3693 - Yung Man Lui

Mr Fung Kam Wing - Representer and Representer's representative

R3121 - Lee Chun Ho, Christopher

Mr Lee Chun Ho, Christopher - Representer

R3491 / C2857 - 葉俊遠

Mr Ip Chun Yuen - Representer and Commenter

R3495 - 劉甄月女

Mrs Lau Yan Yuet Nui - Representer

R3502 - 梁頌謙

R4117 - 梁程照

Mr Leung Chung Him - Representer and Representer's representative

R3503 - 趙衛心

Mr Chiu Wai Sum - Representer

R3515 - Lau Wing Yee

Ms Lau Wing Yee - Representer

R3519 - Tsang Ling Keung

Mr Tsang Ling Keung - Representer

R3531 - 王施麗

R3535 - 陳益榮

Mr Chan Yick Wing - Representer and Representer's representative

R3545 - 林貴雄

Mr Lam Kwai Hung - Representer

R3559 - 劉玉湘

Ms Lau Yuk Sheung - Representer

R3914 - 李成林

R3951 - Lam Mei See

Mr Lee Shing Lam - Representer and Representer's representative

R4072 - Wong Lai Sun

Ms Wong Lai Sun - Representer

R4314 - Wong Hau Ling, Michelle

Mr Pang Yu Him - Representer's representative

6. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers, commenters or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn according to their representation and comment number. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer, commenter or their representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. After the Q&A session, the meeting would be adjourned. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on all the representations and comments in a closed meeting after hearing all the oral submissions and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

7. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLW, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's responses on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10449 (the Paper).

9. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representative to elaborate on their representations and comments.

R122 – Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC)

10. Mr Lee Hung Sham made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Vice-chairman of TMDC;
- (b) the proposed amendments to the Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) were discussed at the TMDC meeting on 5.9.2017. While TMDC supported the Government's effort in increasing land supply for public housing development, it should be a prerequisite for any proposed development that the local residents would not be adversely affected. The TMDC considered the proposed rezoning of the six sites for housing developments and passed two motions, one objecting to three of the housing sites, i.e. Items A1, A2 and A4; and the other one objecting to all of the six housing sites. The minutes of meeting were submitted to the Board on 11.10.2017;
- (c) the major concerns raised by TMDC members were: (a) the existing transport infrastructures/facilities and community facilities were insufficient to support additional housing developments, in particular, West Rail Line (WRL) passenger carrying capacity and Tuen Mun Road congestion should be improved first before any additional housing developments; (b) insufficient medical and health facilities to support additional housing developments; and (c) the Government back tracked from implementing the planned government, institution and community (GIC) and open space at Sites A1, A2 and A4, and housing developments were proposed instead without sufficient consultation;
- (d) TMDC was further consulted on the amendments to the Tuen Mun OZP on 7.11.2017. TMDC maintained their opposing views on the rezoning of the six housing sites on grounds of insufficient transport infrastructure/facilities and provision of GIC facilities. Besides, TMDC was dissatisfied that its views expressed in the meeting on 5.9.2017 were not taken on board in the OZP amendments; and

- (e) while TMDC clearly indicated its objection to the OZP amendments, PlanD had not provided any response on the matter. The Board was requested to note and lend support to the views of the TMDC.

[Mr Elvis W.K. Au arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

R124 / C2860 - Mary Mulvihill

11. With the aid of the visualizer, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) the OZP amendments were typical of planning exercises in recent years seeking to rezone individual “Green Belt” (“GB”), “Open Space” (“O”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites for housing developments. The cumulative impacts of rezoning the sites had not been comprehensively assessed;
- (b) she complained against the voluminous documentation of the Paper which made it difficult to download and print out, especially the big colour plan showing all the rezoning sites. That plan should be withdrawn from the Paper;
- (c) given the large number of sites and the complicated issues involved in the rezoning exercise, she wondered if all Members could go through the representations and comments, digest all the information in the Paper and understand the impacts of the proposals on the society. As the sites were scattered around Tuen Mun New Town, the interests of the affected local people and stakeholders were diverse and hence a focused discussion on the relevant issues would not be possible;
- (d) the subject “O” and “G/IC” sites were planned some years ago to cope with the needs of the growing community in Tuen Mun while the “GB” sites were zoned to provide green space and visual relief for local people. With the increased population, it was unreasonable that those

sites would become no longer essential and were now proposed to be rezoned for housing developments;

- (e) there were trees on each of these sites and the total number of trees to be affected amounted to over 2,000. The trees were to be replaced with concrete buildings without any compensatory planting proposal; and
- (f) while there were other options to increase housing land supply including the development of brownfield sites, village areas and developers' land bank, the Government had resorted to rezoning the "O", "G/IC" and "GB" sites which would lower the standard of living of the local community. Such approach was not in line with the recommendations of the Hong Kong 2030+ which advocated for a higher standard in the provision of open space and GIC facilities.

R177 - 鄭家盛

R424 - 陳凱姿

R440 - 張祝媚

R649 - Lam Kit Yi

R1204 - 謝少英

R1206 - 李樹棠

R1252 - 梁潤雄

R4353 - Cathy

C23 - 黃康傑

C25 - Chan Ka Lai

C27 - Elaine Yeung

C29 - Ho Yuen Ting

C32 - 胡逸祥

C37 - Wong Ka Yan

C50 - Lau Yee Ching

C61 - Lau Pui Ki

C64 - Shum Yu Bun

C73 - Ada Ng

C78 - 冼志傑

C88 - Jade Lam

C93 - Lo Wing Fei

C94 - Ruby Leung

C97 - Law Chun Hin

C111 - Pau Kai Yin, Thomas

C117 - Tang Kowk Chiu

C125 - 劉翠瑤

C140 - 俞菲萍

C467 - Chau Yin Kan

C496 - 阮金正

C578 - Pang Yuen Yi

C602 - 徐俊彥

C651 - Rachel Lam

C680 - 蕭佩儀

C729 - Wan Wai Lam

C739 - 吳佩輝

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Chan Hoi Chi made the following main points:

- (a) the Concern Group on Development of Tuen Mun (Concern Group) (屯門發展關注組) objected to all amendment items except Item C;
- (b) she read out two stories about the relationship between human and nature, namely ‘愛心樹’ and ‘學校裡的愛心樹’, which brought out the message that the natural environment should be treasured;
- (c) the green areas and countryside of Tuen Mun were important assets of the local community which should not be sacrificed for human interests and developments. As the OZP amendments involved rezoning of several “GB” sites for housing developments, there was grave concern over the potential adverse impacts on the flora and fauna;

- (d) the concept of co-existence with nature should be applied at the planning stage of development. Without conducting comprehensive assessments to appraise the potential adverse impacts, the displacement of trees, animals and local people for the proposed housing developments would appear unreasonable and unjustified;

Site A5

- (e) the proposed high-rise buildings on Site A5 would have adverse impacts on the structure of the adjacent Dragon Kiln. A heritage impact assessment should be conducted before the rezoning to ascertain the feasibility of such proposal;
- (f) the soil in the Castle Peak area was particularly suitable for production of ceramics. While there were previously nine ceramic factories in the area, Dragon Kiln was the only one left and was designated as a Grade 3 historic building. Dragon Kiln and its associated structures and facilities were still operational. While Dragon Kiln would be preserved, consideration should also be given to comprehensively planning the kiln and Site A5 for a living museum providing exhibits, workshops and education programmes to showcase the history of ceramic production in Tuen Mun. Such proposal had once been raised by the then Governor Sir Edward Youde in the 1980s. Following Sir Edward's death, the proposal had been shelved. Site A5 should therefore be retained for "G/IC" for low-rise development which was more compatible with the adjoining Dragon Kiln;

Site A3

- (g) Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen, which fell within Site A3, was a local village set within the natural environment. The proposed developments at Site A3 would displace the existing village settlements in the southern part of Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen. The affected residents had lived in the village for decades and the proposed developments would completely change

the way of living and destroy their collective memories which could not be compensated in monetary terms. A freezing survey should first be conducted for the village before amending the OZP so that the number of affected residents and the scale of impact could be ascertained;

- (h) it was common for villagers to keep dogs for security purpose or due to their affection for dogs. However, there was no rehousing arrangement for pet animals under the prevailing squatter policy. The abandonment of pet animals would become a serious problem arising from developing the rural areas;
- (i) Site A3 was located between the Tuen Mun New Town proper and Tai Lam Country Park and was serving as a green buffer between the two. The proposed developments with a maximum building height (BH) of 145 mPD would be significantly taller than the adjoining Villa Tiara and totally out-of-context with the country park;
- (j) the proposed primary school site in Site A3 might not be necessary as some schools in Tuen Mun were subject to under-subscription and closure;
- (k) in addition to Site A3, a large area to its east was proposed for slope protection and stabilization works to support the development on the site. The need and cost-effectiveness of such large extent of works were questionable. Insufficient information had been provided to justify the proposed developments;
- (l) as demonstrated in the “4 per 1000” initiative in which many other countries had already participated, agricultural soil could play a crucial role in securing food production and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. In support of the initiative, the Concern Group moved to plant melons and potatoes in Site A3 as a gesture for promoting succession of agricultural activities and for making known to public the agricultural history of Tuen Mun;

Site A4

- (m) land subsidence had recently been found at the Light Rail Transit (LRT) Tuen Mun Swimming Pool (TMSP) Station. It was suspected that the subsidence was caused by the construction works at an adjoining site for private residential development. Similar problem should be avoided in the future;

[Mr Daniel K.S. Lau left this session of the meeting at this point.]

Site A1

- (n) Site A1 was currently zoned “GB” and occupied by Wu Shan Recreation Playground which provided various recreational facilities and green space for the local people. While Site A1 would be rezoned for residential use, the rezoning of the adjoining planted area (Site E1) zoned “GB” to “O” was only a gesture to make up for the loss of open space in numerical terms. It was also uncertain whether the tress on Site E1 would be adversely affected by the proposed open space development;
- (o) any additional development in the area around the Tuen Mun Ferry Terminal would worsen the local traffic condition in particular along Wong Chu Road;

Demand for Housing

- (p) given the aging population in Hong Kong, it was estimated that the increase in number of households would decrease significantly from about 40,700 in 1996 to 14,000 in 2043. Speculative demand aside, the genuine demand for new flats should decrease in the long run;
- (q) according to the information provided by the Task Force on Land Supply, there was only a shortfall of some 230 hectares of land for residential use

to meet the housing demand up to 2046. Given the Fanling Golf Course alone could provide some 170 hectares of land for development, any proposed measures to increase housing land supply in the long term should be revisited so as to avoid rezoning unsuitable land for housing development and to minimise the potential adverse impacts on the local residents;

- (r) the assumed plot ratio (PR) of 3.5 for estimation of the land required was on the low side. If a higher PR was assumed, the actual amount of land required for residential use would be further reduced;

Uneven Distribution of New Housing Developments

- (s) new housing developments were not evenly distributed over the Territory, many of them were concentrated in the Tuen Mun area. Apart from the proposed developments under the OZP amendments, there had been/would be eight new private housing developments completed in the Castel Peak Road area during the past five years and in the near future. While the huge supply of private housing developments could not help lower the flat prices, it would aggravate the traffic conditions along Castle Peak Road. Individual developments might also turn the adjoining public beaches into private use. The supply of private housing land should be reduced or converted for public housing developments. The Government's past decision to redevelop San Fat Estate for private housing development was irrational and should not be repeated; and
- (t) there were several new development areas in New Territories West including Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long South, Kam Tin South and Tuen Mun Area 54 and Wang Chau, and the additional population amounted to some 500,000. On the other hand, Tuen Mun Hospital was fully utilised and there was a shortage of some 1,200 hospital beds to serve the existing and planned population in Tuen Mun. Besides, the patronage of WRL had already exceeded its planned capacity and Tuen

Mun Road had long been subject to congestion problem. However, no comprehensive assessment had been conducted and no practical solution had been proposed to address the problems. Unless local job places were created in the New Territories West area, the traffic problems were resolved and supporting facilities were put in place, additional developments in Tuen Mun should not be considered or otherwise social conflicts between the existing and new residents would be created. The assumed 150,000 number of job places to be created in Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area (NDA) appeared unrealistic. Moreover, more land in the Kai Tak Development and the urban renewal projects should be reserved for public housing development.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui left this session of the meeting at this point.]

13. Mr Leung Po Lung made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in Tuen Mun since 1980s;
- (b) his daughter grew up in Tuen Mun and was fortunate to have gone to the school and now worked in the same district. However, it was unlikely that the next generations would be able to relish similar fortune. As revealed in his daughter's personal case, she had encountered bad experience when giving birth and raising her two children owing to inadequate hospital facilities, medical staff, nursery facilities and primary school places in Tuen Mun. Moreover, Tuen Mun often suffered from a lack of local job opportunities and traffic congestion along Tuen Mun Road. It was envisaged that the situation would worsen in the light of the growing population in Tuen Mun resulting from the OZP amendments; and
- (c) inadequacies in GIC and transport facilities had been long-standing problems in Tuen Mun. The Government should seek to resolve the problems or otherwise, social conflicts would be created affecting the harmony of the community.

14. Ms Wong Lok Yi made the following main points:
- (a) she was a life-long resident of Tuen Mun;
 - (b) the Board meeting should be held in Tuen Mun, Tin Shui Wai or Yuen Long to facilitate participation of the representers/commenters;
 - (c) WRL was very congested during the morning peak hours. For trains departing Tuen Mun Station for the urban area, they were already fully packed at Tin Shui Wai Station, thus passengers at Long Ping Station and beyond would not be able to get on the trains. It was doubtful if the WRL could absorb the further increase in population as proposed under the OZP amendments. The traffic problem should be resolved before new housing developments were to be built in Tuen Mun;
 - (d) there was a severe shortage of medical staff in Tuen Mun Hospital and the waiting time for the Accident & Emergency services was unduly long. The proposed increase in population would generate additional demand for the already strained resources of Tuen Mun Hospital; and
 - (e) the Government should take on board the views and comments of the local residents and not to propose further development in Tuen Mun.

R133 - Wong Sau Kuen

R1155 / C794 – Yip Man Pan

R3118 - 郭燕儀

R3504 - 簡穎媛

R3505 - 江敏慈

R3533 - Chiu Ming Yin

R3904 - 藍連明

R3936 - Chan Yin Chun, Mabel

R3939- 張惠文

R4021 - Ng Wai Keung

15. Mr Yip Man Pan made the following main points:
- (a) he was representing the residents of Nerine Cove and Oceania Heights who strongly objected to the rezoning of Site A4;
 - (b) while the increase in public housing provision was supported, such proposals should be implemented in the right place and at the right time. As the proposed developments would entail adverse impacts on the existing residents particularly in traffic terms, it would be unreasonable to sacrifice the welfare of a significant number of the existing residents for the benefit of a relatively small group of people;
 - (c) Wong Chu Road was the principal access road connecting Tuen Mun South to Tuen Mun Road and a bottleneck in traffic terms. While improvement works to Tuen Mun Road had been carried out throughout the years, no improvement works for Wong Chu Road had been implemented. Without resolving the traffic issues, the proposed developments at Sites A1, A2 and A4 would not be sustainable in terms of traffic;
 - (d) the traffic condition of Wong Chu Road had been aggravating in recent years and the situation would worsen in the future with the increase in population under the OZP amendments and the completion of Tuen Mun - Chek Lap Kok Link and the HKZMB Hong Kong Link Road. Although the Government claimed that the traffic impact of the proposed residential developments could be addressed by the implementation of proposed Tuen Mun Western Bypass (TMWB), its alignment had not yet been confirmed;
 - (e) the assessments on capacity of public transport service were conducted based on outdated assumptions in that it had not taken into account the latest spatial requirement of passengers. As a result, there appeared to be spare capacity hence no improvement to bus services frequency would be made. As revealed in the case of Yan Tin Estate in Area 54, no improvement to the bus services had yet been made even after its population intake recently;

- (f) congestion problems were also experienced in the railway services including the LRT and WRL. While the MTRCL had proposed to revamp the LRT system and 40 new trains would be procured, 20 of them were for replacement of the dated trains. While only 20 new trains were additional to the current system, it was not known which line they would be serving and also uncertain to what extent they could improve the LRT service;
- (g) although the provision of transport facilities in Tuen Mun had improved over the past decades, their capacities had already been exceeded by the corresponding increase in population;

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

- (h) he had previously objected to the rezoning of the site to the south of Site A4 for residential use on the draft Tuen Min OZP No. S/TM/32. However, his views were not taken on board by the Government and the Board. The site had subsequently been sold to SHK and was currently under construction for private residential development. The Government should not proceed with the current OZP amendments;
- (i) Site A4 was not suitable for residential development for the following reasons:
 - (i) since the rezoning of the SHK site, no improvement to the transport facilities and bus services in the area had been made;
 - (ii) land subsidence was recently found at the LRT TMSP Station, possibly due to the on-going construction works at the adjoining SHK site. As Site A4 was also located adjacent to the LRT station, the proposed development at the site might also cause the same problem. While the Government had previously admitted that land subsidence had been detected at 64 railway stations and 8 LRT stations, the location and details of the concerned stations had not been disclosed.

It could not be guaranteed that other WR/LRT stations close to the amendment sites would not be subject to the same problem; and

- (iii) Site A4 was located in a reclaimed area where land subsidence issue had been experienced in the nearby residential developments including Nerine Cove, Oceania Heights and The Sea Crest. It was unfair to the future tenants of the proposed public housing development to suffer from the same problem due to the current bad planning;
- (j) it was unacceptable for PlanD to state that there was no insurmountable technical problem for the proposed developments on Site A4 and to recommend to the Board not to uphold the representations. In passing, he would like to express dissatisfaction about the submission requirements of representations in terms of the design of the submission form and the timing of submission;
- (k) the rezoning of Site A4 was unfair and unacceptable to the residents of Nerine Cove as the site was zoned "G/IC" when they purchased their flats in 2002/03. In particular, the proposed developments would be located as close as 24m to Nerine Cove which would severely affect the privacy of the existing residents and tranquillity of the area; and
- (l) in view of the above, the rezoning of Site A4 should be shelved and the zoning of the site should be reverted to "G/IC" for provision of GIC facilities such as library, sports and market facilities to benefit the local community. The Board should not rubber-stamp the proposals of the Government.

16. At this juncture, a few representers/commenters and their representatives indicated that they were not available for attending the afternoon session of the meeting and requested to make their oral presentations before lunch break. As there was no objection from other attendees, Members agreed that those representers/commenters and their representatives could speak after the presentation of the representatives of the

Owners' Incorporation of Nerine Cove.

R195 - Wong Kwok Fai, Mike

R258 - Chik Hui Nam

R262 - Chun Chan

R263 - Okada Ken

R314 - Zoe Yuen

R902 - 高峻威

R2095 - Hui Lai Fan

R3395 - 李金水

R3399 - Au Chi Piu

R3418 - 陳政維

R3419 - 梁雅詩

R3472 - Lee Chi Ching

R3485 - 張月媚

R3492 - Shing Mei Miu

R3494 - Tam Wing Kai

R3497 - Chan Yuk Lin

R3498 - 陳劍龍

R3499 - Chan Yuk Wu

R3507 - 高光鎮

R3510 - Leung Pui Kwan

R3522 - Liang Hui Ling

R3525 - Cheung Kwok Yau

R3532 - Chan Kin Kwan

R3543 - 陳渠生

R3544 - 陳嘉裕

R3538 - 吳宇鴻

R3539 - Lam Kit Ling

R3540 - Lam Mee Ling

R3542 - 陳偉就

R3550 - 劉鎮江

R3551- 劉佩玲

R3552 - 阮耀屏

R3554 - 張浩維

R3565 - Yeung Miu Yan, Michel

R3566 - 劉家樂

R3574 - 岡田敏行

R3578 - 張鳳珍

R3582 - 周有勝

R3583 - 黎玉芳

R3592 - 林盼

R3607 - 植曉蕙

R3609 - Ho Ka Wai

R3613 - 陳麗

R3615 - 梁麗芳

R3616 - 陳鏡光

R3623 - 劉松蘭

R3628 - 李杏容

R3629 - 蕭啟賢

R3630 - 植智根

R3631 - 陳縉

R3637 - 倫惠如

R3638 - 黃思敏

R3648 - 程子恩

R3663 - 鄭寶媚

R3671 - 梁君翔

R3672 - 梁君豪

R3675 - Chris Tse

R3685 - Law Hung Shing

R3688 - 貝玉英

R3689 - 張家豪

R3690 - 徐慧恩

R3691 - 李潔華

R3694 - 張玉美

R3695 - 廖文英

R3696 - Lee Tsz Yeung

R3698 - 李耀輝

R3703 - Palmes Phoebe Labaro

R3704 - Tsui Yuk Hei, Ricky

R3705 - 鄺耀榮

R3723 - 區卓儀

R3724 - 區發文

R3725 - 陳燕蘭

R3726 - Lam Chi Ming

R3736 - Tang Sin Fat

R3739 - 鍾力文

R3740 - 洪燕玲

R3742 - 李卓華

R3754 - Fong Ching Hei

R3769 - 陳樂平

R3776 - 張治

R3785 - To Lisa

R3788 - 廖騰萬

R3792 - Lee King Yan

R3793 - Fung Polyanne

R3797 - 梁詠欣

R3803 - 吳繼平

R3804 - 何秋洪

R3813 - 崔浩橋

R3814 - 崔詠儀

R3816 - 盧金枝

R3825 - Ng Yuet King

R3839 - 江展成

R3852 - Yung Wing Ping, Winnly

R3853 - 孔玉婷

R3854 - 徐歧敏

R3862 - 麥敏亭

R3863 - 譚子權

R3871 - Li King Sang

R3876 - 譚堯娣

R3878 - 冼德星

R3879 - 黃俊絡

R3880 - 楊景文

R3881 - Lau Chun Ip

R3883 - 麥慧媚

R3884 - Hung Fan Yan

R3886 - 黃國輝

R3892 - Wong Chi Hang

R3893 - 黃麗娟

R3895 - 冼麗鈺

R3902 - 潘銀嬋

R3906 - 楊素君

R3913 - Ng Suet Ying, Maria

R3926 - 吳立里

R3928 - 夏常年

R3935 - Yu Sin Man, Chris

R3937 - Wong Sze Nga

R3938 - Wong Ming Yan

R3942 - Ng Ka Fai

R3956 - 林俊杰

R3966 - 章如成

R3967 - 魏國喜

R3968 - 吳汝芳

R3969 - Chui Kai Wai

R3970 - Chui Hoi Ying

R3971 - Chui Hoi Kam

R3972 - Chan Kwok Wing

R3996 - Hui Nga Wan

R4011 - Ip Wai Ki

R4023 - Cheng Sze Nga

R4024 - 鄭錦河

R4025 - 張秀珠

R4036 - 蕭尚容

R4038 - 葉泳珊

R4039 - 葉炳基

R4048 - Fong Sik Sang

R4049 - Man Shun King

R4052 - 勞國良

R4069 - Chow Wai Ha

R4072 - Wong Lai Sun

R4084 - 蔡偉健

R4085 - 阮慧詩

R4092 - 蔣宗希

R4101 - 劉珮珊

R4107 - Wong Hiu Ting

R4108 - Tam Tsz Yeung

R4128 - Chan Chi Man

R4130 - Li Sui Nam

R4153 / C691 - 林宇希

R4175 - Leung Kam Lun

R4343 - 黃松齡

C754 - MK

C755 - Cheng Ming Kit

C797 - 南浪之聲

C795 - 南浪海灣業主立案法團

17. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Lau Chun Hung made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in Nerine Cove for 17 years, and his family liked the estate, the neighbourhood and the surrounding environment very much;
- (b) Site A4 was zoned “G/IC” when he purchased the flat at Nerine Cove but two 27-storey blocks of public housing development were now proposed there. Coupled with the development being constructed at the SHK site, the new developments would create significant adverse impacts on Nerine Cove in terms of visual, air ventilation, natural lighting, privacy and traffic aspects;

Visual impact

- (c) visual impact assessment should be conducted to assess the potential adverse impact of any proposed development on the living environment of the local residents. The feelings of the residents should not be neglected;
- (d) Site A4 was in an elongated shape of about 150m long and only 30m wide, and the distance between Site A4 and Nerine Cove was merely 24m. Together with the residential development being constructed at the SHK site, they would form a wall of buildings of about 270m long to the west of Nerine Cove. Given the separation distance between Nerine Cove and Site A4 was only 24m, the proposed developments would have severe visual impact on the neighbouring estates and local communities. The ‘wall effect’ would also cause air ventilation and heat island problems which might be harmful to the health of the nearby residents;
- (e) according to Chapter 11 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), it had been generally supported by the community that ridgelines were valuable assets and their preservation should be given special consideration in the process of development. However, when viewed from the important public vantage points including the proposed sport grounds in Area 16 and from the waterfront promenade along Tuen Mun River towards the east, Nerine Cove and the ridgelines in the backdrop would be completely blocked by the proposed development at

Site A4;

- (f) while according to Chapter 9 of the HKPSG, a separation of 25m should be kept between LRT tracks and any development, the distance between the LRT along Hoi Wong Road and the proposed development at Site A4 would only be about 7m. The LRT passengers would be facing a long wall when passing by Site A4;
- (g) the podium garden and clubhouse of Nerine Cove were providing leisure and recreational facilities and serving as an important access and gathering places for the estate residents. The existing views of Castle Peak as viewed from the podium and clubhouse of Nerine Cove would be entirely blocked by the proposed development at Site A4;

Natural lighting

- (h) the flats in Nerine Cove facing Castle Peak were now receiving at least 6 hours of natural lighting in a day from 12 p.m. to 6 p.m. However, with two 27-storey buildings erected on Site A4, most of the sunlight would be screened off. For those flats in the middle and lower floors, the daylighting period would be substantially reduced to less than an hour in the winter;
- (i) the right to enjoy sunlight should be duly respected. The United Nations and some western countries had enacted legislation to protect the “right to sunlight” as a basic human right. According to the World Health Organization, individuals should enjoy at least 3 hours of sunshine per day in their homes;

Privacy

- (j) flats of Nerine Cove were equipped with large glass windows of ceiling height. As the distance between Nerine Cove and the proposed development at Site A4 would be merely 24m across Hang Fu Street, the

problem of privacy would arise. There was no practical means to address the privacy problem effectively;

Noise

- (k) after the population intake of the proposed development at Site A4 and in the neighbourhood, the traffic volume along Hang Fu Street would increase substantially. Given the narrow width of Hang Fu Street, the noise of pedestrians and vehicles travelling along the road would be clearly transmitted into the flats on both sides. The problem would be particularly serious during night-time;

Traffic

- (l) Tuen Mun Road had been subject to serious traffic congestions especially during the morning and evening peak hours. The trips to and from the main urban areas for work, coupled with the traffic to/from Shenzhen Bay Port, had increased the loading of Tuen Mun Road. With the completion and occupation of several new housing developments in the near future (including a population of 13,600 in Yan Tin Estate), he believed that the traffic congestion problem along Tuen Mun Road and Wong Chu Road would get worse;

Other Planning Issues

- (m) the purpose of HKPSG was to provide guidance on environmental planning, conservation of natural landscapes and habitats and preservation of cultural heritage and views. It would not be the right approach for PlanD to disregard the adverse impacts on the local people and neglect the professionalism in the process of identifying land for housing developments. As government official and planning professional, PlanD officers should proactively explain the government's policies to the general public and listen to their views;

- (n) the proposed development at Site A4 had contravened the HKPSG in several aspects. In addition to those mentioned in paragraphs (e) and (f) above, the proposed development was also not in line with the HKPSG in that it would lower the quality of living for the existing residents, and entail adverse environmental and air ventilation impacts and give rise to privacy issue;
- (o) while PlanD had previously objected to a planning application for rezoning a site in Sha Tin from “O” to residential use on grounds related to visual, traffic and air ventilation aspects, and setting of an undesirable precedent, it now proposed to rezone several “O”, “G/IC” and “GB” sites in Tuen Mun for housing developments despite the adverse visual and traffic impacts. It appeared that PlanD had applied a double standard and was “moving the goal post” towards development proposals under similar circumstances;

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left this session of meeting at this point.]

- (p) according to the Task Force on Land Supply, small sites, vacant sites between buildings and slope areas were not suitable for public and private housing developments and public housing sites should have a minimum area of 120,000 square feet. Based on the above, Site A4, with an area of about 37,000 square feet, could not meet the land requirement for public housing development;
- (q) while PlanD claimed that the proposed developments on the amendment sites would not cause insurmountable impacts, the validity of such claim was questionable. It was irresponsible for PlanD to turn a blind eye on the views of the local residents and submit the OZP amendments to the Board for consideration;

Population data of Tuen Mun

- (r) in the Rural and New Town Planning Committee meeting held on 13.10.2017, government officials mentioned that the existing population of

Tuen Mun was 454,000, based on which the future population growth, the demand for GIC facilities and the traffic impact of the proposed developments were calculated and assessed. However, according to the 2016 By-Census, the population of Tuen Mun was about 489,000, which was about 35,000 more than PlanD's figure. In light of the discrepancy, there might be differences between PlanD's assessment and the actual situation in terms of demand for GIC facilities and traffic impact. The application of inaccurate data could have irreversible consequences;

Conclusion

- (s) the residents of Nerine Cove purchased their flats in 2000 for the spacious and tranquil environment as well as the high level of privacy and quality of living. While the residents were not against increasing land supply for public or private housing developments, the adverse impacts of such proposals on privacy, visual experience, noise, air quality and traffic should be adequately considered before the proposed developments could be taken forward; and
- (t) Members of the Board were urged to perform their duties diligently to provide guidance and control on developments, thus creating a better living and working environment for the people.

18. Mr Lee Chi Ching made the following main points:

- (a) the Board should exercise its professional judgment and independent thinking in considering the views of the local residents;
- (b) the information provided in the Paper were not entirely correct and could not adequately address the following issues;
- (c) the AVA was conducted in 2014 when the layout of buildings in the SHK site was not yet available. As two building blocks were being constructed at the SHK site and arranged in a T-shape, it was likely that the prevailing wind for Nerine Cove would be blocked by the buildings. The validity of

the findings of the AVA, which might be carried out based on outdated information, was questionable;

- (d) as the proposed buildings on Site A4 would be long and narrow and were located close to Nerine Cove, their windows would effectively become reflective planes during noon-time reflecting strong sunlight into the flats of Nerine Cove. However, after 2 p.m. the sunlight would be completely blocked by the proposed buildings at Site A4 and hence the flats would suddenly become very dark. There were medical reports suggesting that people subject to long exposure in dark environment were prone to emotional disorder;
- (e) it was unfair to allege that the residents of Nerine Cove were stifling housing development for their own benefits of protecting private views. The fact was, while the residents of Nerine Cove were willing to accept some loss in visual openness, the proposed development at Site A4 would completely block all the views of Nerine Cove and thus considered unacceptable by most people. Thus, the residents' objection on visual ground should not be labelled as selfish. The Government should adopt objective and quantitative standards in assessing visual impacts;
- (f) it was unjustified to say that the adverse impacts of the proposed development on Nerine Cove was inevitable. There were many other sites in Tuen Mun which were more suitable for residential development than Site A4. Although the Government often claimed that those sites had been planned for other uses, they were in fact lying idle or being blighted for such uses as recycling workshops and carparking. As evident in the previous San Fat Estate case, planned land uses could be changed if there was a right reason;
- (g) as a new WR station was earmarked to be provided near TMSP, the subject area should be considered for comprehensive planning and development. Given that both the existing residents of the surrounding and the future residents of the proposed development at Site A4 would suffer from

adverse impacts in terms of air ventilation, traffic and natural lighting, the suitability of the site for residential use should be reviewed; and

- (h) the decision of the Board would have life-long implications on the local residents. The views of the local residents were reflecting the true and full picture of the issues at stake and should be duly considered by the Board.

R206 / C636–Tse Wai Yue

R393 - 毛宇軒

R443 - Moon Tang

R1212 - Shum Yim Wan

R1285 - 馮海源

R2284 - 莊錦生

C153 - 李識玲

C163 - Kan Sum Yin

C169 - Ho Ting

C199 - Lung Ka Fai

C257 - Tam Lok Sze

C265 - 葉潔茹

C307 - Ngai Wing Han

C364 - 阮伯寧

C369 - 周小姐

C376 - Cheung Wing Yan

C398 - Jason Lam

C413 - Chan Yin Fan

C423 - Chan Yuen Ki

C433 - Leung Ying Chi, Debby

C435 - Sueky

C444 - Tsang Yin Yi

C492 - Thomas Lau

C529 - Mak Wan Ming

C615 - 溫偉芳

C646 - MS Kwok

C649 - Chui Wan Sum

C668 - Chan Ka Man

C714 - 曾美芝

C716 - 文素微

C777 - Kito

C2725 - Queenie Li

19. Mr Yan Pui Lam made the following main points:
- (a) while the proposed housing sites were located close to the existing developments in Tuen Mun, many local residents were not aware of the OZP amendments. The residents of Tuen Mun should be properly consulted on any proposed population increase;
 - (b) as most of the Tuen Mun residents had to travel to the urban area for work, the traffic on Tuen Mun Road was often congested and the Tuen Mun Road bus interchange had been fully utilised during the morning and evening peak hours. Moreover, the WR trains departing Tuen Mun Station for Kowloon were already fully packed at Siu Hong Station and beyond;
 - (c) Tuen Mun had been subject to the development of such polluting uses as landfill, power station and columbarium. With the implementation of the proposed infill housing developments under the OZP amendments, the traffic condition would be further aggravated;
 - (d) there were plenty of land available for development in Hong Kong including brownfield sites, the Fanling Golf Course and vacant industrial premises;
 - (e) in the past, there were industrial areas in Tuen Mun providing job opportunities for local people. With the transformation of the economy in recent years, the function of Tuen Mun town centre had been changed to become a retail and service centre serving mainly the mainlanders but not

the people of Tuen Mun; and

- (f) the Board should plan for the benefits of Tuen Mun people or otherwise the harmony of the society would be harmed.

R939 - Chan Ping Wing

R1230 - Ng Tsz Yau

R1231 - Leung Kwai Fong, Victoria

R1232 - Mancera Analiza Alob

R1233 - Ng Tsz Yuet

R1234 - Tam Wing Ki, Gary

R1235 - Kin Chan

R1236 - Ng Sin Mun, Mandy

R1237 - Ng Kwok Wah

20. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Ng Kwok Wah made the following main points:

- (a) the local residents were not consulted on the OZP amendments. While the 2-month exhibition period of the OZP was regarded as a public consultation process, the Government had not come forward to explain the development proposals to the local residents. The consultation arrangement was different from other development proposals such as those of Area 54 and San Hing Tsuen. Hence, the residents did not have sufficient time to prepare representations;
- (b) there were already many new developments in Tuen Mun in recent years including Yan Tin Estate, and those in Area 54 and along Castle Peak Road. In support of the proposed developments under the OZP amendments, traffic impact assessments had been carried out. However, the proposed traffic improvement measures such as junction improvements, modification of slip roads and extension of bus stop lanes were localised in nature and could merely solve the traffic problems in Tuen Mun in particular the congestion along Tuen Mun Road and Tuen Hing Road;

- (c) while the Paper stated that all potentially affected trees were of common species in Hong Kong, the relevant study report mentioned that some incense trees in Sites A1 and A3 would be affected. It should be noted that incense trees might include species of conservation interest such as *aquilaria sinensis* (土沉香);
- (d) although the Paper stated that the trains of the WRL had been progressively changing from 7-car to 8-car, no data or figures had been provided in assessing the adequacy of the capacity of WRL. It was doubtful whether the proposed increase in WRL passenger capacity would be sufficient to support all the planned additional developments in New Territories West;
- (e) according to the Study, mammals which were protected under Wild Animals Protection Ordinance (Cap.170) such as Short-nosed Fruit Bat and Pallas's Squirrel were found at Site A3. Their habitats should by no means be disturbed;
- (f) it was unclear from the Paper how government departments were consulted on the OZP amendments and what their views were;
- (g) given that there was a general shortage of hospital beds in Hong Kong, it would not be meaningful to address the deficit in hospital beds in Tuen Mun by increasing provision in other districts such as Siu Lam;
- (h) the maximum building height of 145mPD for Site A3 was excessive as it was more than twice of that of the adjacent "R(B)10" zone (i.e. 70mPD). The proposed developments at Site A3 would be incompatible with the adjoining developments and country park, and generate adverse visual impacts. It was unreasonable to assess the visual impact of the proposed developments at Site A3 in the context of Tuen Mun Central which was located more than 1 km away. Rezoning the site to "R(A)" with a higher development intensity and a different mix of permitted uses would also change the existing tranquil character of the area and was unjustified;

- (i) while the site areas required for the proposed public housing development and primary school in Site A3 were only about 1.62 ha and 0.62 ha respectively, it was irrational that the Study had proposed an area of about 3.6 ha for development and that an even larger area was proposed by PlanD to be rezoned to “R(A)26”. The need for a primary school site at Site A3 was also doubtful given that some of the existing schools in Tuen Mun were subject to under-subscription and closure. The unnecessary increase in areas for rezoning might lead to further increase in housing development and population and the associated slope stabilisation works would increase the number of trees to be felled;
- (j) there had been many rezoning proposals in Tuen Mun in recent years resulting in a significant increase in number of flats. A comprehensive environmental assessment should be conducted to assess the impacts of those proposals. In particular, the environmental impact of the proposed developments at Site A3 should be properly assessed as they were located close to country park and MacLehose Trail;
- (k) while the Study concluded that several of the proposed developments would be subject to adverse visual impacts, the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures such as visual connection, building height variations and additional planting was questionable;
- (l) the AVA conducted in 2014 was irrelevant to the current OZP amendments, and it was obvious that the proposed developments, which were tall and bulky, would result in adverse air ventilation impact on the surrounding;
and
- (m) the land of Hong Kong should be planned for the benefits of its people. However, the mistakes of rezoning the “GB”, “O” and “G/IC” sites were to be paid by the citizens. It was highly doubtful whether the traffic problem and shortage of GIC facilities could be adequately addressed in the future.

R265 / C788 - Chu Hoi Dick

21. Mr Chu Hoi Dick made the following main points:

- (a) there had been a discrimination against the residents of the New Territories. According to the population projection and distribution in Hong Kong from 2018-2026, there would be an increase of about 440,000 people in the New Territories West but a decrease by some 90,000 people on Hong Kong Island . While major developments had already been planned in the new development areas in the New Territories West such as Kam Tin South, Hung Shui Kiu and Yuen Long South, further infill housing developments were also proposed in Tuen Mun;
- (b) there was a lack of employment opportunities in Tuen Mun. While the proposed public housing developments would result in more low-income population in Tuen Mun, there was no corresponding measure to provide new job places in the rezoned sites. Thus, the existing planning and traffic problems would bound to further aggravate. With the planned Tuen Mun - Chek Lap Kok Link, opportunity should also be taken to extending the development concept of 'bridge economy' from Tung Chung to Tuen Mun;
- (c) while there was a deficit of some 1,200 hospital beds in New Territories West, no effective remedial measure had been proposed to address the problem. According to the latest statistics, New Territories West would have the lowest ratio of 2.4 hospital beds per 1,000 persons in 2024, in contrast, the ratio for Hong Kong West was 5.5 hospital beds per 1,000 persons; and
- (d) planning was meant to address problems. It should not blindly follow the policy to rezone "GB" sites which would not only aggravate the existing problems but also create new problems. The decision on the OZP amendments would also involve displacement of the existing residents on Site A3. Items A and B should be vetoed.

R3914 - 李成林

R3951 - Lam Mei See

22. Mr Lee Shing Lam made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Nerine Cove and objected to the proposed developments on Site A4;
- (b) since Site A4 was small in size, narrow and of elongated shape, it had been left idle for over 20 years and would not be suitable for residential use;
- (c) there appeared to be discrepancies in site boundary of Site A4 as shown in the Paper, with the adjoining section of LRT tracks included in the site on Plans H-2d and H-3d but being excluded from the site on Plans H-5d and H-9d. If the proposed developments were to be built over the LRT tracks, the recent land subsidence problem at the LRT TMSP Station would surely worsen. The potential land subsidence problem at Site A4 would affect the structural safety of the adjoining buildings given its close proximity to Nerine Cove;
- (d) given the development constraints of Site A4, the future residents of the proposed development would also suffer from adverse impacts in terms of air ventilation, traffic and natural lighting;
- (e) members of the Board should visit Tuen Mun and personally experience the problems currently encountered by the residents; and
- (f) while he did not object to public housing developments, those vacant or under-utilised sites should be considered for development first before resorting to the infill sites.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:30 p.m.]

23. The meeting was resumed at 2:30 p.m. on 2.8.2018.
24. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Stephen L.H Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

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

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, Transport Department
Mr Patrick K.H. Ho

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

25. The following government representatives and consultants, representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

PlanD

Mr David Y.M. Ng - DPO/TM&YLW

Miss Jessica Y.C. Ho - STP/TM

Miss Maggie H.K. Wu - TP/TM

HD

Mr Barry T.K. Lam - SPO4

Mr Leslie K.C. Yuen - SA36

Mr Patrick P.C. Tse - SA25

Mr S.C. Lo - SLA2

CEDD

Mr Tony K.L. Cheung - CE/W3

Mr T.F. Lau - SE/1(W)

AECOM (CEDD's consultant)

Mr Ivan T.L. Wan - Environmental Consultant

Mr Stanley S.Y. To - Senior Landscape Designer

Mr Samuel Y.H. Hung - Associate

Mr Damon D.B. Wong - Senior Engineer

Mr S.T. Lee - Technical Director

Representers, Commenters and their representatives

R206/C636 - Tse Wai Yue

R393 - 毛宇軒

R443 - Moon Tang

R1212 - Shum Yim Wan

R1285 - 馮海源

R2284 - 莊錦生

C153 - 李識玲

C163 - Kan Sum Yin

C169 - Ho Ting

C199 - Lung Ka Fai

C257 - Tam Lok Sze

C265 - 葉潔茹

C307 - Ngai Wing Han

C364 - 阮伯寧

C369 - 周小姐

C376 - Cheung Wing Yan

C398 - Jason Lam

C413 - Chan Yin Fan

C423 - Chan Yuen Ki

C433 - Leung Ying Chi Debby

C435 - Sueky

C444 - Tsang Yin Yi

C492 - Thomas Lau

C529 - Mak Wan Ming

C615 - 溫偉芳

C646 - MS Kwok

C649 - Chui Wan Sum

C668 - Chan Ka Man

C714 - 曾美芝

C716 - 文素微

C777 - Kito

C2725 - Queenie

Mr Ng Cheuk Hang]	Representer and Commenter and
Mr Tse Wai Yue]	Representers' and Commenters'
Mr Ho Chun Yin]	representatives
Mr Ng Wing Chi]	

R260 - 禰偉柏

R261 - Huen Wing Tong

R3980 - 陳燕玉

Mr Huen Wing Tong	-	Representer and Representers' representatives
-------------------	---	--

R280 - Ng Wai Ming

Mr Ng Wai Ming	-	Representer
----------------	---	-------------

R375/C1562 - Yip Mee Yung

Ms Yip Mee Yung	-	Representer and Commenter
-----------------	---	---------------------------

R647 - 梁少娟

R1543/C735 - Wong Chun Hung

R1584 - 王笑萍

R1592 - Lam Chi Yin

R1621 - 吳鳳儀

R1648 - 梁瑞枝

R1667 - 李錦蓮

R1668 - 盧桂榮

R1684 - Wong Shoon Kay

R1685 - Wong Yin Gwan

R1686 - Wong Chi Sing

R1698 - Lee Ying Pang

R1749 - 黃寶珍

R1774 - 梁麗清

R1813 - 龍素玉

R1839 - Wong Siu Lan

R1840 - Chan Lin Ho

R1842 - Lau Yu Choi

R1852 - Lai Po Chu Rila

R1875 - 陳雪梅

R1876 - 陳毅梅

R1901 - 候蓮娥

R1143 - Kam Man Fung

Mr Kam Man Fung - Representer and Representers'
Representative

R1138 - Lee King Ku Simon

R1878 - Yeung Chi Hang

Mr Yeung Chi Hang - Representer and Representer's
Representative

R3515 - Lau Wing Yee

R3519 - Tsang Ling Keung

Ms Lau Wing Yee] Representers

Mr Tsang Ling Keung]

R1156 - Oceania Heights Owners'

Committee

R1239 - Lam Chun Hung

R3098 - 張路瑟

R3134 - Kan Chun Yin

R3138 - 梁先生

R3146 - 胡元釗、霍穗軍

R3160 - 湯潔楠

R3164 - Lau Wai Sheung

R3172 - Chan Yuk Sim Idy

R3177 - Yip Ho Wing

R3183 - Ho Hon Ting Johnson

R3190 - 方瑞意

R3191 - 陳子樂

R3193 - 李俊耀

R3207 - Ho Lai Man

R3222 - 簡俊然

R3227 - 梁志豪

R3238 - 李志達

R3246 - 姚安鍵

R3247 - 施志強

R3249 - Law Kit Chi

R3255 - Leung Sun Ming

R3271 - Wu Chiu Yin

R3285 - 張嘉雯

R3326 - Leung Yuet To

R3330 - 黃志權

R3333 - Simon Tsang

R3354 - 鍾偉強、鄧家賢

R3355 - Chui Wan Sum

R3359 - Chan Nga Wai

R3366 - Poon Kai Cheong

R3479 - Lau Oi Ying

R3657 - 霍穗軍

R3761 - Lee Chi Tat

R3829 - 胡元釗

R4149 - Leung Hoi Kit

R4189 - Lo Wing Fat

R4217 - 胡筠儀

R4218 - 何月杏

R4223 - Chung Pui Fan

R4231 - 胡保儀

R4279 - 黃嘉偉

R4301 - Leung Lai Ping

R4315 - 黃駿傑

R4321 - Lung Wai Man

R4338 - 胡志穎

C360 - Thomas Kwok

Mr Lo Wing Fat]	Representers and Representer's
Mr Wu Chiu Yin]	Representatives

R3121 - Lee Chun Ho Christopher

Mr Lee Chun Ho Christopher	-	Representer
----------------------------	---	-------------

R3491/C2857 - Ip Chun Yuen

Mr Yip Chun Yuen	-	Representer and Commenter
------------------	---	---------------------------

R3495 - Lau Yan Yuet Nui

Ms Lau Yan Yuet Nui	-	Representer
---------------------	---	-------------

R3502 - Leung Chung Him

R4117 - Leung Ching Chiu

Mr Leung Chung Him	-	Representer and Representer's Representative
--------------------	---	---

R3503 - Chiu Wai Sum

Ms Chiu Wai Sum	-	Representer
-----------------	---	-------------

R3545 - Lam Kwai Hung

Mr Lam Kwai Hung	-	Representer
------------------	---	-------------

R3559 - Lau Yuk Sheung

Ms Lau Yuk Sheung	-	Representer
-------------------	---	-------------

26. The Secretary reported that a letter was received from a representer, who jointly submitted representation R1141. As the information was submitted after the

statutory publication period, it was submitted out-of-time and should be treated as not having been made under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). Notwithstanding that, Members noted that the main points in the letter submitted were generally similar to the written submission made in R1141, and another representor who jointly submitted R1141 would make oral submission in the hearing session in the afternoon.

27. The Chairperson extended a welcome to the government representatives and the consultants, representers, commenters and their representatives. She then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to give their oral submissions.

R393 - 毛宇軒

R443 - Moon Tang

R1212 - Shum Yim Wan

R1285 - 馮海源

R2284 - 莊錦生

C153 - 李識玲

C163 - Kan Sum Yin

C169 - Ho Ting

C199 - Lung Ka Fai

C257 - Tam Lok Sze

C265 - 葉潔茹

C307 - Ngai Wing Han

C364 - 阮伯寧

C369 - 周小姐

C376 - Cheung Wing Yan

C398 - Jason Lam

C413 - Chan Yin Fan

C423 - Chan Yuen Ki

C433 - Leung Ying Chi Debby

C435 - Sueky

C444 - Tsang Yin Yi

C492 - Thomas Lau

C529 - Mak Wan Ming

C615 - 溫偉芳

C646 - MS Kwok

C649 - Chui Wan Sum

C668 - Chan Ka Man

C714 - 曾美芝

C716 - 文素微

C777 - Kito

C2725 - Queenie

R206/C636 - Tse Wai Yue

28. Mr Ng Cheuk Hang made the following main points:

- (a) Site A3 was originally zoned “GB”, which was intended to contain urban sprawl and to be excluded from future development. There was an expectation from the public on protection of “GB” zones as they served as important buffers between urbanised and environmentally sensitive areas and ‘green lungs’ of the city. Members might recall that some members of the public had voiced out against the development of “GB” zones at Tai Wo Ping and Pok Fu Lam Village. Furthermore, Site A3 was located near the fringe of a country park. In recent years, there had been many debates on whether development should be allowed at the fringe of country parks;
- (b) many of the domestic structures within Site A3 were permitted by the Government in 1950-60s by way of Crown Land Licence which allowed occupation of government land for agricultural and domestic uses. Similar type of licences could be found in Nim Wan. There was a policy to encourage farming activity in relatively undeveloped areas including Tuen Mun and hence the nature of these domestic structures was different from those of illegal squatters;
- (c) the affected villagers had great grievances as their way of living would be severely affected by the proposed development, however, they were not eligible for rehousing. In comparison, indigenous villagers affected by the

developments were eligible for better compensation packages. Furthermore, even with the enhancements to the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for Government's development clearance exercises as announced in May 2018, the aspiration of the affected villagers for preserving their way of living were not properly addressed. The villagers, who had been living in the area for many generations and decades, had a legitimate expectation to continue using the land they occupied. It was unjust to force them to move out and give up their preferred way of living due to development. In particular, many of the affected elderly would have great difficulties in adapting to new living environments such as new modern housing estates. The current rezoning exercise was a deviation from the 'people-oriented' planning principle;

- (d) the Government had been trying to develop housing at all available sites without regards to their location and suitability. For example, extensive site formation works was required for development of Site A3 which was located on a slope near the fringe of a country park and far away from transport facilities. Also, many new public housing estates, including Shui Chuen O Estate and On Tat Estate, were located in inconvenient areas and lacked supporting facilities to meet the daily needs of the residents. Sufficient supporting facilities should be provided in new towns or New Development Area (NDA) to meet the educational and employment needs of the residents. Urban agricultural activities should also be encouraged;
- (e) while the need to use land for development was recognised, proper planning was required. Some agricultural uses should be retained and community farming should be promoted. There should be scope to promote better integration between urban and rural areas. Many residential sites in the Land Sales Programme could be converted for public housing development. The current issue on housing shortage was not caused by limited supply, but rather imbalanced distribution of land resources;
- (f) the transport network and services in Tuen Mun area were already congested and could not cope with the additional population. Currently

many housing estates in Tuen Mun relied on shuttle bus services as the public transport service was inadequate. Also, sites closest to railway station would be developed for private residential developments whereas housing for the grassroots would be located further away from the station. There was a need to review this planning model as most of the grassroots would need to rely on railway for commuting; and

- (g) despite the district council was consulted on the amendments, many of the documents provided by the Government were technical in nature and most of the general public could not understand them.

29. Mr Tse Wai Yue made the following main points:

- (a) many of the local residents were unaware of the rezoning proposals. Many of them were also not familiarised with the jargons in the consultation documents and technical assessments. The consultation arrangement should be improved to facilitate the public to better understand the rezoning proposals;
- (b) more than 50% of the working population in Tuen Mun had to travel to other districts to work. Most of these commuters relied on Tuen Mun Road, the main connector from Tuen Mun to Tsuen Wan and other urban areas, and as a result, even minor accidents or congestion on Tuen Mun Road would significantly affect the commuters. The long daily commuting had deprived them from spending more time with their families or for leisure. Most of the Tuen Mun residents were concerned about the traffic impact associated with the proposed residential developments under amendments;
- (c) if local employment opportunities could be provided, the need for cross-district commuting would be reduced. The Government should take an active role to increase job opportunities and varieties in Tuen Mun. Proper planning of land uses would have a profound positive impact on the daily lives of the residents;

- (d) most of the existing structures in Site A3 i.e. Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen south (TTST) would likely be removed due to the proposed public housing development. Licences were granted by the Government to permit domestic uses on these land. Many of the residents in TTST had been living there for decades. It was their choice to live in an environment that was close to nature;
- (e) based on his understanding, there was a plan to rezone TTST as second phase of a residential development named Villa Tiara, however the plan was subsequently abandoned. From the experience of Wang Chau, the high cost for site formation would significantly drive up the overall construction cost for public housing units. Noting that Site A3 was a sloping site, the construction cost would likely be very high. He doubted the cost-effectiveness of developing public housing at the site; and
- (f) the existing 132KV overhead power lines should be located as far away from residential development as possible. There was no information on whether the power lines would have impact on the proposed residential development.

30. Mr Ho Chun Yin made the following main points:

- (a) the consultation conducted for the rezoning exercise had very limited effect in terms of reaching out to the community and collecting the views of the local residents. The Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) did not support the development and already indicated in 2017 that suitable facilities and infrastructure upgrading were required to support the proposed housing developments. Until now, many of the questions raised by the TMDC remained unanswered by government departments. There appeared to be inconsistent approaches for different projects in terms of the timing and sequence that rezoning proposals were presented to the district council and considered by the Board;

- (b) the proposed developments would add an additional population of 70,000 to the existing population of 480,000 in Tuen Mun. Other developments at River Trade Terminal and Castle Peak Bay etc. were also being explored. There would be a burden on the supporting community facilities. As the locals did not support the proposed developments, even if the proposals were eventually realized, it would likely result in conflicts between the existing communities and the new residents;
- (c) even with the enhancement measures on train capacity and frequency, the WRL would not be able to cope with the future demand. Despite the claim that the capacity of WRL could be increased by 60% upon implementation of various enhancement measures, the proposed hourly frequency of 28 trains at each direction was impractical;
- (d) for Site A3, boars and pangolins had been spotted in the surrounding area. The site was surrounded by natural environment and some hiking trails were in close proximity to the proposed residential development within 10 minutes walking distance. The Government should pay more attention to the interface between urban development and the natural environment; and
- (e) the arrangement to conduct hearing on weekdays was inconvenient to the local residents. Besides, many of the local residents might not be able to access the TPB Paper and relevant information on the Board's website.

31. Mr Ng Wing Chi made the following main points:

- (a) the effort to increase housing supply was supported. However, it should be noted that the housing issue faced by Hong Kong had wider implications. Besides housing land, many important supporting GIC facilities were also in shortage. Such concerns had been mentioned by many local residents;
- (b) planning should take into account the culture, tradition and the way of living of local residents. The failure in Beijing in the 1950s to adopt the Soviet city planning model, an attempt without regards to local culture and

needs, was a lesson to be observed;

- (c) there was an imbalanced distribution of housing and employment opportunities in Hong Kong. Many of the residential areas were in the New Territories whereas employments were concentrated on Hong Kong Island and in Kowloon. Development of new employment hubs in the New Territories should be considered; and
- (d) the affected residents of TTST, if relocated to public housing estates, would face great hardship in adapting to their new living environment. In order to retain the social fabric and minimize the impact on the affected residents, the Government should consider relocating them to the same locality so that the residents could remain close to each other.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui left the meeting at this point.]

R260 - 禰偉柏

R261 - Huen Wing Tong

R3980 - 陳燕玉

32. Mr Huen Wing Tong made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Nerine Cove. He was concerned that safety of LRT might be affected by the proposed development at Site A4, despite it was stated in the Paper that there would be no insurmountable problem on safety aspect. He had raised questions on LRT safety on various occasions including at a residents' forum conducted in 2017, however, no satisfactory answer had been provided;
- (b) according to the Buildings Ordinance, land within 30m along a railway was designated as railway protection area. A majority of Site A4 fell within such area. Suitable risk assessment should be undertaken before the development could proceed;

- (c) based on a Works Bureau Technical Circular promulgated in 2002, site formation works to be carried out in close proximity (e.g. within 3m to 10m) to railway structures or installations would require submission of method statement. Many other assessments would also need to be carried out and would involve substantial cost. It was not cost-effective to develop Site A4 as only 520 units could be provided;
- (d) in order to minimise the impact on LRT, future development in Site A4 would have to be located away from the LRT track and closer to Nerine Cove. It would cause additional problems, such as overlooking, for residents of Nerine Cove; and
- (e) there was also concern on safety during construction stage. If there was any accident on the LRT, the casualty could be severe.

R280 – Ng Wai Ming

33. Mr Ng Wai Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he lived in Tuen Mun and commuted daily to Kowloon. After development of the Harrows International School, the traffic in its surrounding area had become very congested. Despite he had complained to various government departments, TMDC and bus operator, the issue remained unresolved. Given this background, he was shocked to learn that an additional 10,000 flats would be provided at sites along Castle Peak Road;
- (b) the Government had not properly addressed the need for additional community services in new public housing estates. For example, there was no social workers available in the integrated family services centre in Hung Fuk Estate; and
- (c) the effort to increase housing supply was an ineffective means to counter the sky-rocketing property prices. From a wider perspective, in order to

tackle the housing problem, a holistic housing policy was needed. A more comprehensive planning, rather than piecemeal rezoning of individual sites, was also required. Other than residential uses, there was a strong demand for suitable supporting facilities and community services in Tuen Mun.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting at this point.]

R375/C1562 – Yip Mee Yung

34. Ms Yip Mee Yung made the following main points:

- (a) the Dragon Kiln was built in 1940s and had rich historical value. There used to be other kilns in Tuen Mun but the Dragon Kiln at Hin Fat Lane was the only one remained. There was concern from conservation perspective as the kiln would likely be affected by site formation works for the proposed development at Site A5. The kiln should be properly conserved to provide unique, valuable educational opportunities for the future generations; and
- (b) she also shared the concerns of villagers in TTST affected by the rezoning and future public housing development. Even if there was rehousing arrangement, whether these villagers could afford the high rent was uncertain.

[Mr Elvis W.K. Au left the meeting at this point.]

R647 - 梁少娟

R1543/C735 - Wong Chun Hung

R1584 - 王笑萍

R1592 - Lam Chi Yin

R1621 - 吳鳳儀

R1648 - 梁瑞枝

R1667 - 李錦蓮

R1668 - 盧桂榮

R1684 - Wong Shoon Kay

R1685 - Wong Yin Gwan

R1686 - Wong Chi Sing

R1698 - Lee Ying Pang

R1749 - 黃寶珍

R1774 - 梁麗清

R1813 - 龍素玉

R1839 - Wong Siu Lan

R1840 - Chan Lin Ho

R1842 - Lau Yu Choi

R1852 - Lai Po Chu Rila

R1875 - 陳雪梅

R1876 - 陳毅梅

R1901 - 候蓮娥

R1143 - Kam Man Fung

35. Mr Kam Man Fung made the following main points:

- (a) he was the TMDC member of Fu Sun district. The TMDC was informed in 2015 about the potential housing sites in the district. The relevant paper was only provided by the Government one week before the TMDC meeting. However, many details on transportation and supporting community services were not available. More information should be provided to TMDC before it was requested to endorse the rezoning proposals;
- (b) many of the long-term transportation infrastructures for Tuen Mun, including Route 11, TMWB and the proposed Tuen Mun South extension of the WRL, were only in various planning stages. Given the first population intake of the proposed public housing developments was in 2024, it was not feasible that these planned transport infrastructures would be ready by then to alleviate the traffic congestion. Moreover, the extension of WRL to Tuen Mun South would unlikely be able to alleviate the crowdedness inside WRL trains as the fundamental issue was the limited carrying capacity of the WRL trains. It was also expected that the traffic congestion in Tuen Mun would worsen upon commissioning of the HZMB;

- (c) for Site A1, there was a lack of proper tree compensation plan from the Government. Wu Shan Recreation Playground, being surrounded by residential developments, was used by a large number of local residents as their recreational outlet on a daily basis. Even though the tree survey concluded that no trees with significant conservation value was found within the site, the benefit of the greenery to the residents should not be overlooked;
- (d) there was no private hospital serving the area and residents had no alternative but to use public medical service. However, the public medical service in Tuen Mun was also severely under-provisioned and the situation was the worst among all districts in Hong Kong. The new clinic at Yan Tin Estate was unable to serve the residents of Tuen Mun south; and
- (e) the lack of coordination between government departments had resulted in deficiency of the development plan. The community generally acknowledged that there was urgency to increase housing supply. However, without committed provision of additional transportation and community services in time, it was hard for them to accept proposals for new developments that would result in drastic increase in population. Government departments should work in a more coordinated manner to come up with a more comprehensive plan for development.

R1138 - Lee King Ku Simon

R1878 - Yeung Chi Hang

36. Mr Yeung Chi Hang made the following main points:

- (a) the current housing issue mainly evolved around the Government's deficiency in immigration and population policies and its inability to offer assistance to those in need to boost home ownership. The birth rate in Hong Kong was on a downward trend in the past 20 years. The main contributor to population growth was the 50,000 immigrants arriving Hong Kong annually. Without restricting purchase of residential properties by

non-residents, the market was skewed by the influx of capital brought in by overseas speculators. Without dealing with the fundamental problems, the effort to increase housing supply would become meaningless;

- (b) upon commissioning of the HZMB, the traffic in Tuen Mun was expected to worsen. While the Transport Department (TD) considered that the road network would have sufficient capacity to handle the additional traffic, TD's calculation was based on an average number of vehicles spreading throughout the day. In reality, the traffic condition during peak hours was very congested and unacceptable;
- (c) the development of Tuen Mun South extension of the WRL would likely be delayed since at this stage the alignment and location of the station had yet to be decided. TMWB and Route 11 were still only under the planning stage. There was no firm programme on when these transport infrastructures would be available. Taking the example of Tseung Kwan O (TKO), despite the TIA indicated that the road network had sufficient capacity, there was traffic jam at bottlenecks such as TKO Tunnel every day. For Yuen Long, despite the TIA for the major residential developments indicated that there would be no traffic issue, there was frequent severe traffic congestion at Castle Peak Road - Yuen Long Section (commonly known as Yuen Long Main Road). He was concerned that similar situation would repeat in Tuen Mun;
- (d) there was a general lack of GIC facilities in Tuen Mun. Many of the existing facilities, in particular medical services, were under-provisioned. There was also an acute shortage in parking space particularly during holidays;
- (e) the rezoning proposals were not supported by TMDC mainly because the Government had made use of every single small sites for development without fully considering the impacts. Site A1 was part of a popular open space regularly used by many locals for various types of exercises. The rights of the residents to utilise the open space should not be deprived of.

The proposed wall-like residential development at Site A4 directly facing Nerine Cove was also unacceptable; and

- (f) Tuen Mun was suffering from severe air pollution and air ventilation problem, and the situation had been deteriorating over the years with the increasing number of tall buildings being constructed. The rezoning sites were very close to the existing developments and would bring about adverse visual, air ventilation and natural lighting impacts.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 10 minutes.]

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Professor T.S. Liu left the meeting at this point.]

R3515 - Lau Wing Yee

R3519 - Tsang Ling Keung

37. Ms Lau Wing Yee made the following main points:

- (a) her unit in Nerine Cove would face the proposed residential development at Site A4 directly and she had grave concern on issue of overlooking and privacy;
- (b) Tuen Mun was suffering from air pollution originated from the Pearl River Estuary area. The air ventilation assessment (AVA) conducted had not included the private residential development to the south of Site A4, hence could not reflect the actual impact of the proposed development at Site A4. The narrow gap between Nerine Cove and future development at Site A4 would create a channelling effect, accelerating strong winds during typhoon. A more comprehensive assessment should be carried out; and
- (c) currently the bus services in the area were already saturated and the situation would worsen with the additional population from the proposed developments.

38. Mr Tsang Ling Keung made the following main points:

- (a) his existing living environment would be severely deteriorated by the residential development at Site A4; and
- (b) Site A4 would be used for public rental housing or subsidized flats and adversely affecting the price of surrounding properties. He anticipated that the price for his unit in Nerine Cove would drop by more than one million which was substantial. He was very disappointed by the response set out in the Paper that the concern on property price was not a material planning consideration in the rezoning process.

R1156 - Oceania Heights Owners' Committee

R1239 - Lam Chun Hung

R3098 - 張路瑟

R3134 - Kan Chun Yin

R3138 - 梁先生

R3146 - 胡元釗、霍穗軍

R3160 - 湯潔楠

R3164 - Lau Wai Sheung

R3172 - Chan Yuk Sim Idy

R3177 - Yip Ho Wing

R3183 - Ho Hon Ting Johnson

R3190 - 方瑞意

R3191 - 陳子樂

R3193 - 李俊耀

R3207 - Ho Lai Man

R3222 - 簡俊然

R3227 - 梁志豪

R3238 - 李志達

R3246 - 姚安鍵

R3247 - 施志強

R3249 - Law Kit Chi

R3255 - Leung Sun Ming

R3271 - Wu Chiu Yin

R3285 - 張嘉雯

R3326 - Leung Yuet To

R3330 - 黃志權

R3333 - Simon Tsang

R3354 - 鍾偉強、鄧家賢

R3355 - Chui Wan Sum

R3359 - Chan Nga Wai

R3366 - Poon Kai Cheong

R3479 - Lau Oi Ying

R3657 - 霍穗軍

R3761 - Lee Chi Tat

R3829 - 胡元釗

R4149 - Leung Hoi Kit

R4189 - Lo Wing Fat

R4217 - 胡筠儀

R4218 - 何月杏

R4223 - Chung Pui Fan

R4231 - 胡保儀

R4279 - 黃嘉偉

R4301 - Leung Lai Ping

R4315 - 黃駿傑

R4321 - Lung Wai Man

R4338 - 胡志穎

C360 - Thomas Kwok

39. With the aid of the visualizer, Mr Lo Wing Fat and Mr Wu Chiu Yin made the following main points:

- (a) land subsidence was discovered at LRT TMSP Station and railway tracks in the vicinity. The safe operation of LRT had been severely

compromised. The construction and piling works for the future development at Site A4 would worsen the situation and affect the safety of LRT. If operation of LRT was affected, the traffic in the area would be paralysed;

- (b) based on the observation from a previous fire accident in Oceania Heights, the fire engines needed a large area for manoeuvring and operation. The narrow road to the immediate west of Site A4 would not be able to serve as an emergency vehicular access (EVA). In case of fire, there might be insufficient space for fire engines with ladder to operate;
- (c) without any confirmed programme for development of Tuen Mun South extension of WRL, the traffic in the area would remain very congested;
- (d) despite it was mentioned in paragraph 6.1.4 of the Paper that Site A4 which was previously zoned "G/IC" had no designated use, he recalled that in around 2003/2004, the site was once planned for development of a roller-skating rink by the Government; and
- (e) the development at Site A4 was not cost-effective and the Board was requested to reject the rezoning.

R3121 - Lee Chun Ho Christopher

40. Mr Lee Chun Ho Christopher made the following main points:

- (a) PlanD emphasised in the responses that the proposed developments would not have insurmountable technical issues. However, the technical assessments had simply ignored the changes brought about by new developments in the surrounding areas;
- (b) the LRT track near Site A4 involved a 90-degree turn. He suspected that noise generated from deceleration, turning and acceleration of LRT trains would be particularly severe. The Board should adopt the same standard

in assessing development proposal for various sites and request a 25m-buffer to be provided between LRT tracks and sensitive uses in accordance with the HKPSG;

- (c) Site A4 was located immediately adjacent to the LRT track and was not in compliance with HKPSG in that it could not achieve the minimum buffer distance requirement. In order to mitigate the noise impact of LRT operation, future buildings at Site A4 would have to adopt suitable mitigation measures including single-aspect building design. As a result, most of the rooms would face the east and directly overlook Nerine Cove, causing concerns from privacy perspective;
- (d) there was no explanation provided on why Site A4 was not rezoned together with the private housing site to its immediate south in one go. When rezoning of the private housing site was considered, Site A4, which was then zoned “G/IC”, was retained to provide an air passage for the area. In the current round of rezoning, Site A4 was proposed for high-density public housing development and the Government had failed to keep its promise;
- (e) frequent access of construction vehicles for development in Site A4 would cause traffic safety issues at Hang Fu Street; and
- (f) he queried why government land was allocated to be used for car parking by way of Short Term Tenancy while there was a call for land supply for residential development.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left the meeting at this point.]

R3491/C2857 - Ip Chun Yuen

41. With the aid of the visualizer, Mr Ip Chun Yuen made the following main points:

Site A4

- (a) as stated in paragraph 6.3.45 of the Paper, HD would work out the detailed building layout and design of the housing development of Site A4 at detailed design stage. However, given the elongated layout of Site A4, the scope of adopting mitigation measures through building design was indeed limited. It was unlikely that the concern on air ventilation and overlooking could be properly mitigated by design means. There was also much concern from fire safety perspective as the narrow road to the west of Site A4 was unable to serve as an EVA;
- (b) the area surrounding Site A4 mainly consisted of private residential developments. The Government should review whether it was suitable for developing public housing at Site A4;

Traffic Related Issues

- (c) residents around Site A4 already had difficulties in boarding the LRT trains. Very little improvement to the LRT system had been carried out since it commenced operation in 1988. The existing LRT facilities and services would not be able to cope with the additional population brought by the public housing development at Site A4. The nearby road network was congested and there was limited scope to increase frequency of bus service. Many of the traffic improvement measures stated by the Government including the TMWB and Route 11 were large scale, long-term projects subject to significant delays;
- (d) his office had received a number of complaints from Oceania Heights regarding LRT operation noise. His office could provide information on the number of complaints received if required;
- (e) there were concerns on traffic safety as there were many ingress/egress points of the nearby residential developments along Hang Fu Street;

Other Issues

- (f) according to its lease conditions, Oceania Heights had to provide an escalator with footbridge for use by the public. Currently many residents, including those of Nerine Cove, utilised the escalator and footbridge of Oceania Heights to get to Hoi Chu Road. It was expected that many of the future residents in the public housing development at Site A4 would utilise the same connection. There was concern from residents of Oceania Heights on increased maintenance cost;
- (g) issues on inadequate transport services and community facilities concerning the wider Tuen Mun district were yet to be satisfactorily addressed by the Government;
- (h) based on the views he collected from local residents, they preferred to use Site A4 for development of community facilities such as clinic, or for community event such as celebration of Tin Hau Festival; and

Hearing Arrangement

- (i) the arrangement for the hearing session should be improved. Noting that many representers had indicated to attend the meeting, they could be invited to attend the morning or afternoon sessions separately, instead of getting all representors at the meeting room early in the morning and wait for their turn to make oral presentation.

R3495 - Lau Yan Yuet Nui

42. Ms Lau Yan Yuet Nui said that she was a resident of Nerine Cove and the proposed public housing development at Site A4 would cause overlooking and privacy concern.

R3502 - Leung Chung Him

R4117 - Leung Ching Chiu

43. Mr Leung Chun Him said that there was inadequate medical service in Tuen Mun. Being a wheelchair user, he often faced great difficulties when he needed to get around as the LRT was congested and the design of many stations was not suitable for wheelchair users. For example, there was a big level difference at the platform of LRT Goodview Garden Station. With the land subsidence, the situation would worsen and he might face even greater difficulties when using the LRT.

R3503 – Chiu Wai Sum

44. Ms Chiu Wai Sum made the following main points:

- (a) there was a severe shortage of hospital service, in particular intensive care unit beds, in Tuen Mun. There had been little improvement over the years. There was often a long queue at the hospital and patients had to wait four to six hours before a doctor was available to conduct an initial check. There was also long waiting time, often in terms of years, if special medical care service was required;
- (b) wheelchair users required extra space and their needs were often neglected by public transport service providers. The space dedicated for wheelchair users on the LRT was limited and often occupied. She and her son who was in wheelchair often had to wait for a few trains for boarding; and
- (c) the development at Site A4 would completely block the view of Nerine Cove, affecting their living environment.

R3545 - Lam Kwai Hung

45. Mr Lam Kwai Hung made the following main points:

- (a) the public transport service for Tuen Mun was very congested and would not be able to cope with the additional population. The LRT was not effective in alleviating traffic congestion;

- (b) with the additional population in the district, the demand for recreational facilities would also increase;
- (c) he paid a premium to purchase his apartment at Nerine Cove with an open view. Now that the view would be completely blocked by the development at Site A4 and the residents felt they were cheated; and
- (d) the Board was set up to prepare statutory plans in a systematic manner to improve the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community. Judging from the current situation in Tuen Mun, these objectives had not been achieved.

[Mr F.C. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

R3559 - Lau Yuk Sheung

46. Ms Lau Yuk Sheung made the following main points:

- (a) rezoning Site A4 from “G/IC” to “R(A)26” was a break of the Government’s promise to provide GIC facility at the site;
- (b) the cumulative impact of development at Site A4 and the site to its immediate south currently under development by Sun Hung Kai had not been considered by the Government;
- (c) there was concern on issue of overlooking and privacy as Site A4 was only about 24m away from Nerine Cove. Based on the photomontage at Plan H-10d of the Paper, the development at Site A4 would make Nerine Cove completely surrounded by buildings; and
- (d) it was unreasonable to develop Site A4, which could only provide 520 units, at the cost of causing great disturbance to the residents of Nerine Cove and Oceania Heights.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang left the meeting at this point.]

Question & Answer (Q&A) session

47. As the presentations from the representers/commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and would invite the representers/commenters, their representatives and/or the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

48. The Chairperson and some Members raised questions on the following aspects:

Site A4

Traffic and Transport

- (a) whether there was sufficient traffic capacity and transport facilities to cope with the additional demand brought by the proposed developments;
- (b) there appeared to be a discrepancy between the Government's assessment on the traffic and transport issues and the actual experience of the residents, and how the Government would respond to the phenomenon;
- (c) noting many representers expressed concerns on congestion at Wong Chu Road, what the current situation was and how the situation would change in 2026 ;
- (d) noting that Site A4 was located not far from Tuen Mun Ferry Pier, whether there was plan to reprovide ferry services from Tuen Mun to Central;

LRT Operation and Potential Subsidence

- (e) whether the proximity of LRT track to the north and west of Site A4 had any impact on the design of future residential buildings in Site A4;
- (f) whether information on land subsidence of LRT station and tracks was available and what the proposed measures were to ensure the future development at Site A4 would not affect the operation of LRT;

Impacts on Nerine Cove

- (g) what the distance between Site A4 and Nerine Cove was;
- (h) noting that some flats in Nerine Cove would face the future buildings in Site A4 at a 45 degree angle, and taking into account the setback of the buildings from site boundaries, what the distance between the façade of Nerine Cove to that of the future buildings in Site A4 would be;
- (i) in assessing the potential impact of development at Site A4, whether there was any requirement under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO) for addressing the concern on privacy;
- (j) whether potential issues arising from the proposed development at Site A4 on air ventilation, natural lighting and over-shadowing had been considered by HD;

Other Issues

- (k) more information on the access arrangement for fire engines in the event of fire, noting that the road to the immediate west of Site A4 was quite narrow;
- (l) what type of public housing would be developed at Site A4;

Site A1 and Site A2

- (m) the number of trees at Site A1 and Site A2 to be affected by the proposed developments;
- (n) for trees required to be felled, what the compensation mechanism was, and noting some of the sites were small in size, whether off-site compensation was required. Whether there was information on a comparison between the area within the sites currently covered by trees and the proposed greening ratio to illustrate the change and magnitude of landscape impact of the proposed developments;

Site A3

- (o) the approximate number of villagers to be affected within TTST and the compensation and rehousing arrangement was available to the affectees;
- (p) noting that some representers raised that some primary schools in Tuen Mun were under the risk of ceasing operation due to under-enrolment, whether the proposed primary school at Site A3 was really required;

Dragon Kiln near Site A5

- (q) whether developments at Site A5 would have any adverse impact on the kiln; and

GIC Facilities

- (r) noting that many representers had pointed out that there was inadequate community facilities in Tuen Mun, in particular medical services, whether the Government had any plans to address these problems.

49. In response, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLW, Mr Tony K.L. Cheung, CE/W3, Mr Barry T.K. Lam, SPO/4, and Mr Patrick P.C. Tse, SA/25, made the following main points:

Site A4

Traffic and Transport

- (a) the area near Site A4 was currently served by WRL, LRT and buses. For LRT service, the routes at TMSP Station and Goodview Garden Station were operating at about 70% and 80% of their respective capacity at peak hours and still had sufficient spare capacity. With the addition of about 520 units in Site A4, equivalent to a population of about 1,500, the demand would not be substantial and the LRT capacity at these two stations should not be a constraint;
- (b) according to the TIA conducted by CEDD's consultant, the public transport services in Tuen Mun had enough capacity to support the increase in population. Tuen Mun Station was the first stop of WRL, hence the residents should have no difficulty in boarding the train. Starting from 2016, trains of WRL had been progressively changing from 7-car to 8-car, representing an increase in at least 14% capacity comparing with the capacity in 2015. After the completion of Shatin to Central Link, the fleet size of WRL could be further increased by operating with 8-car trains with an hourly frequency of 28 at each direction. On this basis, the ultimate carrying capacity of WRL could increase by 60% comparing with the capacity in 2015. The current situation on WRL was slightly congested at peak hours and it would remain at about same level upon completion of the proposed developments with the above-mentioned enhanced services. In the long run, the Highways Department would commission a study to examine the feasibility of heavy rail connection to the urban area;
- (c) for bus services, there was scope to enhance the services by optimising the bus routes and increasing frequency. There was regular dialogue between

TD and TMDC on provision of bus services. It was observed that on some occasions, the buses might appear to be full, but in fact they were not, only that the passengers were unwilling to move into the inner part of the bus;

- (d) upon commissioning of the Tuen Mun – Chek Lap Kok Link, some of the vehicular traffic would be diverted to the new link which would alleviate the pressure on Tuen Mun Road. While in the long run there was a need to improve the transport infrastructure in order to support future developments in northwest New Territories, the proposed public housing developments at the five sites in Tuen Mun, with the earliest estimated population intake in around 2023-24, would not result in adverse traffic impact even without the TMWB in place by 2026;
- (e) the vehicle/capacity (v/c) ratio of Wong Chu Road was currently slightly above 1. According to the TIA conducted, it was anticipated that the v/c ratio for east bound traffic during morning peak hours would increase to about 1.19 in 2026. Notwithstanding that, the proposed housing developments were planned to be completed in the relatively short term and the existing transport infrastructure in Tuen Mun should still be able to cope with the population generated from these developments. For long term development, the Government had been conducting the feasibility study for implementation of the TMWB, which would divert north-south bound traffic from the local road networks. It was expected that upon commissioning of TMWB, v/c ratio of Wong Chu Road would be reduced to near 1;
- (f) currently there was no plan to provide ferry service from Tuen Mun to Central;

LRT Operation and Potential Subsidence

- (g) according to HKPSG, the horizontal separation between the LRT track and residential development was recommended to be 25m or more for the

purpose of noise protection requirements. The buffer distance of 25m could be reduced if there were other suitable mitigation measures, for example, by placing the habitable rooms away from the noise source. From technical perspective, there was no insurmountable issue for LRT to be in proximity to a residential development. For instance, there was a private residential site to the south of Site A4, with the LRT running along its western periphery. For Site A4, the concern on LRT noise could be addressed through suitable building design. The future buildings at Site A4 could adopt a single-aspect design which could effectively mitigate the potential noise impact of LRT operation;

- (h) regarding the concern on land subsidence, there was no relevant data in hand. However, from engineering perspective, building works with the use of cast-in-place bore piling technique would have minimal/no adverse impact on stability of nearby buildings. The LRT was also not envisaged to be adversely affected. There were many examples of construction works which were carried out within the protection zone of railway tracks. The Government would maintain a close liaison with MTR Corporation to ensure proper monitoring and safe operation of LRT. The details of monitoring programme would be formulated when the detailed design of the buildings at Site A4 was made available by HD in the detailed design stage. Construction companies and engineering consultants in Hong Kong had extensive experience of carrying out construction works near railway tracks. Generally speaking, monitoring system could be installed to monitor the levels of vibration and subsidence and there should be no insurmountable problem from technical perspective. If subsidence was detected, investigation would be conducted to ascertain the cause and suitable mitigation measures would be implemented. In extreme scenario, if required, the construction work could be suspended until the issue associated with subsidence was resolved;

Impacts on Nerine Cove

- (i) the closest distance between the existing buildings at Nerine Cove and the eastern boundary of Site A4 was 26m;
- (j) regarding the distance between the windows of the buildings at Nerine Cove and those of future buildings in Site A4, based on the conceptual layout and taking the building on the northern portion with an L-shape layout as an example, it was roughly estimated that the distance ranged from approximately 40m to 60m. The details on distance would have to be further worked out and could be provided to the Board in the coming sessions of hearing if required;
- (k) regarding the concern on overlooking and privacy, currently there was no requirement in the Environmental Review or other guidelines for assessment on privacy issues associated with development;
- (l) an AVA-expert evaluation had been conducted by the consultant of CEDD in relation to Site A4 and a quantitative AVA-Initial Study would be further carried out in the detailed design stage. Tuen Mun River Channel was one of the major wind corridors in Tuen Mun. The prevailing wind came from north-east in winter and east in summer. To facilitate air movement, two 15-m wide non-building areas (NBA) had been reserved within Site A4. Furthermore, an AVA had been conducted for the private residential site immediately to the south of Site A4 and an NBA had already been reserved within the site;
- (m) the building layout and deposition of the future development in Site A4 would comply with the requirements of the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) under the Buildings Ordinance, and would not adversely affect the natural lighting and ventilation of adjacent existing buildings erected in accordance with the B(P)R;

Other Issues

- (n) for the issue on fire-fighting, emergency vehicles would access Site A4 via Hang Fu Street and in the detailed design stage, the arrangement for EVA would be submitted to the Fire Services Department for approval;
- (o) Site A4 was planned for public housing which could be public rental housing, home ownership scheme (HOS) or other form of subsidised housing;

Site A1 and Site A2

- (p) based on initial assessment, about 372 trees in Site A1 and 143 trees in Site A2 might be affected by the proposed developments. Most of the land within Site A2 had been formed and many of the existing trees were located on slopes along periphery of the site, and hence would be outside the building footprints and remain unaffected. The existing recreational facilities within Wu Shan Recreation Playground would not be affected by the proposed development at Site A1;
- (q) a total of about 1,072 trees would be potentially affected by the public housing developments and their associated infrastructure. There were no Old and Valuable Trees identified within the proposed public housing sites and all potentially affected trees were of common species in Hong Kong with no specific conservation interests. While details of the proposed number of trees to be felled, retained or transplanted were subject to detailed design of the proposed housing developments, mitigation measures such as transplanting trees of high amenity value, compensatory planting in a ratio of not less than 1:1 in terms of quantity as far as possible in accordance with Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 7/2015 – Tree Preservation, and provision of 20% to 30% green coverage within the development sites were recommended;

Site A3

- (r) TTST was not a recognized village and based on an initial assessment there were about 89 structures within Site A3 that might be affected. Given their locations, avoiding such structures or acceding to the request of 'no removal and no clearance' would substantially affect the proposed public housing development. For clearance of existing structures, the Government would offer ex-gratia allowances and/or rehousing arrangements to the eligible affected parties in accordance with the enhanced packages announced by the Government in May 2018;

- (s) Site A3 was located within the Tuen Mun East school net. Taking into account the catchment area of primary school, the lead time for school development of about 6 years, the estimated increase in population brought by the proposed public housing developments and the current provision of primary school classrooms in the area, a site had been reserved for development of a primary school at the request of the Education Bureau;

Dragon Kiln near Site A5

- (t) the ceramic kiln at Hin Fat Lane was a brick structure located on a gentle slope to the east of Site A5. The distance between the kiln and the boundary of site A5 was about 30m. The future building in Site A5 would be located as far away from the kiln as possible. When the detailed layout of the buildings became available, HD would carry out further assessment to ensure the developments would not affect the kiln. The Antiquities and Monuments Office would also be further consulted on the requirements for conducting a Heritage Impact Assessment. From technical perspective, with a separation distance of not less than 30m, the construction works, using modern techniques such as cast-in-place bore pilling, would not cause adverse impact on the kiln during building construction;

GIC Facilities

- (u) the provision of GIC facilities had been assessed and the planned GIC facilities were generally sufficient in the Tuen Mun OZP area except clinic/ health centre and there was a slight deficit in provision of sports centre. For clinic, there was a planned clinic and a planned community health centre in Area 3 and Area 29 respectively while redevelopment of the Kau Hui Clinic was also being considered. For sports centre, there were a total of eight existing and planned Indoor Recreation Centres in Tuen Mun. PlanD was liaising with relevant bureaux/departments to reserve a site for sports centre development in Tuen Mun, and would also review the GIC facilities and open space provision in the area from time to time and take follow-up action if relevant bureaux/ departments requested sites for provision of relevant GIC facilities; and

- (v) with regard to the concerns about hospital services, the Hospital Authority (HA) planned its services on a cluster basis and the New Territories West (NTW) cluster covered the service requirement from residents in the Tuen Mun and Yuen Long Districts. In terms of service planning, HA had taken into account a number of factors, including the increase in service demand as a result of population growth and demographic changes, advancement of medical technology, manpower availability as well as organisation of services of the clusters and hospitals. Population was only one of the factors for consideration. HA would also monitor the service utilisation and update the service demand projection regularly according to the latest population projection and development plan of the Government. As stated in the Clinical Services Plan for NTW Cluster published in 2017, Tin Shui Wai Hospital (TSWH) had commenced operation in the first quarter of 2017 by phases and it would provide 300 hospital beds upon full operation. In the long run, HA would consider making use of the adjoining site of TSWH for future expansion of the hospital to further increase its service capacity. The construction of an extension to the Operating Theatre Block of Tuen Mun Hospital, which was the major acute hospital in the cluster, was also underway. The Government had also

reserved a site at Hung Shui Kiu NDA for the construction of a new hospital to meet the growing health care demand of the population in NTW.

50. The Chairperson supplemented that the Government had announced earlier in May 2018 the proposed enhancements to the general ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for eligible domestic occupants in squatters and business undertakings affected by Government's development clearance exercises. The enhancements included offering non-means tested rehousing for affected eligible households residing in licenced/Year 1982 surveyed structures seven years preceding the pre-clearance survey to the dedicated rehousing estates to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Society, retaining the current means-tested rehousing option to rental flats by the Hong Kong Housing Authority for eligible households residing in licenced/Year 1982 surveyed domestic structures for two years preceding the survey; and relaxing the eligibility criteria and increasing the amount of cash ex-gratia allowances.

51. In response to two Members' questions on building disposition of Nerine Cove and viewing angle from the flats, some representers remarked that at the moment residents of Nerine Cove would not normally be able to see the inside of a flat in the adjacent tower from their own units. In contrast, despite some units in Nerine Cove were not directly facing the west, they would have a direct line of sight at the future development at Site A4 and vice versa, and they considered their concern on overlooking was valid.

52. The Chairperson noted that Site A4 was originally zoned "G/IC" and some representers said the site was once planned and committed for the development of a roller-skating rink and the local residents had a legitimate expectation that the site would be used for such purpose. She asked whether there was any information from the Government or the representers supporting the above claim. In response, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLW, said that the site was previously zoned "G/IC" rather than "Open Space" and there had been no plan for providing recreational facility or a roller-skating rink on the site. Mr Lau Chun Kong (R3550) who was the Chairman of the Owners' Committee (OC) of Nerine Cove, clarified that between 2003 and 2005, the Government had consulted the OC on potential use of Site A4. The OC therefore issued a questionnaire to the residents and more than 80% of the return favoured the development of a roller-skating rink and open space at the site. Subsequently this suggestion had not

been taken forward by the Government. From his personal perspective, if a GIC facility was to be developed at Site A4, it should be low-rise to avoid blocking the views of Nerine Cove.

[Mr K.K. Cheung left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

53. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing session on the day was completed. The Board would deliberate on the presentations and comments in closed meeting after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives, and the Government representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

54. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.