

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 6.8.2018.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the resumed meeting:

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

Professor S.C. Wong Vice-Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Dr F.C. Chan

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

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic
Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Raymond W.M. Wong

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

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

Agenda Item 1 (continued)

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

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

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

3. The Vice-chairperson said that the meeting was to continue the hearing of representations and comments in respect of the draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/34 (the draft OZP).

4. The Secretary said that Members' declarations of interests were made at the morning session on 2.8.2018 (paragraph 2 of the Minutes of 2.8.2018). Members' declaration of interests had been made in the morning session of the hearing held on 2.8.2018 and was recorded in the minutes of the meeting accordingly. Members noted that Mr Raymond K.W. Lee and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr Ivan Fu, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Lawrence K.C. Li, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr Franklin Yu, Mr Daniel K.S. Lau, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng, who had declared interests on the item, had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting. Members agreed that as the interests of Professor S.C. Wong and Mr K.K. Cheung were indirect, they could stay in the meeting. Members also noted that Mr. Alex Lai had not yet arrived and he had no direct involvement in the subject public housing projects.

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

5. The Vice-chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to 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.

6. The following government representatives, 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) |
| Mr Kelvin K.C. Chan | - Town Planner/Tuen Mun (TP/TM) |

Housing Department (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) |

Civil Engineering and Development Department (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 (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
- Mr Alan B.L. Ho - Associate Director

Representers/Commenters and their Representatives

R3113 - 羅耀明

R3664 - 吳珮斯

R3709 - 羅邵梆

R3710 - 羅鈺熾

R3711 - 李志芳

R3837 - 廖志鵬

- Law Yiu Ming - Representer and Representers' Representative

R3439 - 許冠豐

R3757 - Liu Kwok Lai

R4133 - 廖惠儀

R4134 - Hui Sze Man

R4135 - 許治強

R4136 - Cheung Man Ching

- Liu Kwok Lai - Representer and Representers' Representative

R3472 - Lee Chi Ching

R3943 – Chan Wai Yu

R3944 – To Yin Nai

R3997 – 陳綺華

R4003 – 李灝鈿

R4064 – To Yat Tim

R4065 – To Chun Nei

R4067 – To On Nie Annie

C796 – 李金水

Lee Chi Ching - Representor and Representors' and
Commenter's Representative

R3665 – Wong Bun Hoi

R3765 – Wong Ching Nga

R3766 – Wong King Wah

R3767 – Choi Ching Bong James

R3768 – Wong Ching Yan

Choi Ching Bong James - Representor and Representors'
Representative

R3699 – 李孟邴

Lee Man Bong - Representor

R3700 – 徐慧珊

Tsui Wai Shan - Representor

R3702 – 李敏華

R3888 – Cheung Kam Har

Yip Man Pan - Representors' Representative

R3745 – 謝瑞玉

Tse Sai Yuk - Representor

R3758 – 梁靜儀

Sylvia Leung Ching Yi - Representor

R3798 – Hui Hoi Ming

Hui Hoi Ming - Representor

R3842 – 朱國棟

Cheung Kam Har - Representor's representative

R3866 – Wan Kwok Wai

R3867 – Lam Hoi Yee

Wan Kwok Wai - Representor and representor's representative

R4328 – 王繼明

Wong Kai Ming - Representor

R1146 – 屯門鄉事委員會

To Sheck Yuen - Representor's representative

R1148 – 古漢強

Ku Hon Keung - Representor

R1962 / C826 – Yuen Sing Lok

R1979 / C836 – Yuen Sing Wa

R2189 – Ella

C940 – Emi

C941 – Miss Kwok

C1008 – Yuen Sai Leung

Yuen Sing Wa - Representor, Commentor,
Representors' and Commentors'
representative

R1975 / C833 – 郭金滿

R2004 / C989 – 鄧潤泉

R2009 / C852 – Wong Lok Hang

R2089 / C857 – 何雪兒

C831 – Tang Nin Ying

C849 – Yeung Kam

C897 – Fung Yuk Ting

C914 – Ho Lam Kit Ching

C916 – Mr Ho

C1001 – Ho Ka Kin Ken

鄧潤泉] Representer, Commenter, Representers'
Tang Nin Ying] and Commenters' representative
Wong Lok Hang]

R2001 – Kwok Hau Wan

R2003 / C983 – Lau Mee Ling

R2013 / C858 – 鄧美英

R2104 – Yeung Ka Fai

鄧美英] Representer, Commenter, Representers'
Yeung Ka Fai] and Commenters' representative

R2002 / C1016 – Tang Pik Ki Doyle

C850 – Tang Yun Wing

C902 – Kate Ho

C905 – Siu Kai Yu

Tang Yun Wing] Representer, Commenter and
Siu Kai Yu] Commenters' representative
Tang Pik Ki Doyle]

R2005 – Ho Ken Wai Alex

R2090 / C856 – 何鈺藍

C817 – Li Heung Lan

C855 – Alex Ho

Ho Ken Wai Alex - Representer, Representers' and
Commenters' representative

R2007 – 張強

R2083 – Yeung Ka Ho

C851 – Chiu Yu Kit

C904 – Chan How

張強] Representer and Commenters'
Yeung Ka Ho] representative

R2010 – 曾佛良

Mr Tsang Kong Lung - Representer's representative

R2093 / C895 – 李維苑

Lee Wai Yuen - Representer and Commenter

R2108 – Chan Man Kit

Chan Man Kit - Representer

R2170 – 梁錦嫦

Leung Kam Seung - Representer

7. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. He 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 hearing, 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 on that day. After the Q&A session, the hearing of the day would be adjourned. After hearing of all the oral submissions from the representers, commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence, and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

8. The Vice-chairperson then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

9. With the aid of a visualizer, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLW, PlanD reported an amendment to Annex Va of TPB Paper No. 10449 (the Paper) that the representation made by representer R4373 should be related to Amendment Items A3, A5 and B. Then, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, he 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 to the representations and comments as detailed in the Paper.

[Dr C.H. Hau, Professor John C.Y. Ng and the Chairperson arrived to join this session of the meeting during DPO/TM&YLW, PlanD's presentation.]

10. The Chairperson took over the chairmanship at this point and invited the representers, commenters or their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

R3113-羅耀明

R3664-吳珮斯

R3709-羅邵梆

R3710-羅鈺煇

R3711-李志芳

R3837-廖志鵬

11. Mr Law Yiu Ming made the following main points:
- (a) some media reports saying that residents of Nerine Cove opposed the proposed public housing development at Site A4 because of their fear of losing the river view were not true. The reason for objecting to the public housing proposal was related to the size and shape of Site A4 and its close proximity to Nerine Cove;
 - (b) the site was too small for public housing development and was elongated in shape. The future development there would have a linear building arrangement, causing wall effect and adverse air ventilation impact;
 - (c) there would also be overlooking and privacy problem for the existing residents at Nerine Cove and the future public housing residents as the future development would be too close to Nerine Cove;
 - (d) alternative sites of larger size in the vicinity such as the Kowloon Motor Bus (KMB) Tuen Mun South Bus Depot or the playground near Goodview Garden should be considered for public housing development while Site A4 could be developed as open space;
 - (e) any development that would increase the population in the area should not be considered before the traffic and transport facilities were enhanced. A 'people-oriented' approach should be adopted by enhancing supporting facilities before drawing in new population; and
 - (f) many Light Rail Transit (LRT) stations were suffering from the problem of land subsidence due to construction works nearby. The proposed development at Site A4 might aggravate the subsidence problem.

R3439-許冠豐

R3757-Liu Kwok Lai

R4133-廖惠儀

R4134–Hui Sze Man

R4135–許治強

R4136–Cheung Man Ching

12. Mr Liu Kwok Lai made the following main points:

- (a) despite the relatively remote location of Tuen Mun, he moved there 20 years ago for better air quality and more community facilities. However, the population growth in Tuen Mun had outpaced the good living environment. Despite the government's claim for the provision and improvement of traffic and transport infrastructure including widening of Tuen Mun Road, traffic congestions often occurred near Tuen Mun Town Plaza, with traffic tailing back to Tuen Mun Road. Local residents could not understand the rationale of the Government's view that the traffic condition was acceptable;
- (b) the site of KMB Tuen Mun South Bus Depot could be used for public housing development upon the relocation of the bus depot to Lung Kwu Tan. It was a better alternative for public housing development than Site A4. There was no justification to develop Site A4, which was too close to Nerine Cove;
- (c) although the Government had stated that the proposed development would be set back from Nerine Cove to maximise the separation distance, it would then be fronting onto the LRT track and create problems for fire-fighting, and might even affect the safe operation of LRT as there could be falling objects from the development above. Besides, the land subsidence problem at LRT stations had not been solved;

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (d) it was not known how the existing volume of LRT passengers (i.e. at 70% to 80% of the carrying capacity of LRT) was derived. Despite

there might be spare capacity in terms of passenger head count, some passengers were carrying back packs, prams or using wheelchair, taking up a lot of space; and

- (e) infrastructure and supporting facilities should be planned and provided ahead of developments. The Government should not simply develop in-fill housing at various sites in an ad-hoc manner without a comprehensive planning for the associated supporting facilities.

R3472–Lee Chi Ching

R3943–Chan Wai Yu

R3944–To Yin Nai

R3997–陳綺華

R4003–李灝鈿

R4064–To Yat Tim

R4065–To Chun Nei

R4067–To On Nie Annie

C796–李金水

13. With the aid of a visualizer, Mr Lee Chi Ching made the following main points:

- (a) he would not object to public housing development if it was located in a site suitable for such purpose. However, Site A4 was not a suitable site as it was elongated in shape and the proposed development would create wall effect in front of Nerine Cove, adversely affecting air ventilation, natural light penetration and causing visual impact. Owing to site constraints, the wall effect could not be addressed at the detailed building design stage. Moreover, the future public housing development at that site was so close to Nerine Cove that it would be visually intrusive;
- (b) the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) for Tuen Mun was carried out by PlanD in 2014 before the private residential development by Sun Hung

Kai Property Limited (SHK) at the adjoining site south of Site A4 was committed. That development would block the prevailing wind and the sea wind from the south. The validity of that AVA was in doubt;

- (c) according to PlanD, there would not be any insurmountable technical problem in association with the proposed development. However, it was a matter of fact that local residents had to leave home earlier to commute to the urban area to work in the morning and come home late at night due to the worsening traffic probably caused by the increased population in Tuen Mun. This had adversely affected the family life of the residents;
- (d) there was land subsidence problem of the LRT Tuen Mun Swimming Pool Station due to construction works in the vicinity, affecting the operation safety of LRT. In fact, the subsidence problem had resulted in a level difference between the platform and LRT train, causing difficulties for disabled people on wheelchair in boarding the LRT train. The construction works for the proposed public housing development at Site A4 might worsen the subsidence problem;
- (e) there were alternative sites in Tuen Mun for public housing development, e.g. a vacant land near Goodview Garden and the KMB Tuen Mun South Bus Depot. Besides, public housing could be developed over the station of the planned Tuen Mun South Extension of the West Rail Line (WRL);
- (f) the Government claimed that with an increase in train cars and train frequency, there would be an increase in the carrying capacity of WRL by 60% after mid-2019. However, it was reported in a TV programme that the capacity of WRL would be taken up by the future Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area (HSK NDA);
- (g) according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41, the Board should consider the visual impact of key sensitive viewers. As Nerine

Cove was so close to Site A4, it should be taken as key sensitive viewers and the view from Nerine Cove should be assessed. Instead of considering the visual impact of hikers from MacLehose Trail towards Site A4, the visual impact on the adjacent development was more relevant; and

- (h) the purpose of the representation hearing was for the Board to listen to the views of local residents and understand how their livelihood would be affected, which could not be reflected in PlanD's assessments. As many of the local residents had been living in Tuen Mun for a long time, their views should carry more weight than the general conclusion made by PlanD that there would be no insurmountable technical problem and the impact would not be unacceptable.

R3665–Wong Bun Hoi

R3765–Wong Ching Nga

R3766–Wong King Wah

R3767–Choi Ching Bong James

R3768–Wong Ching Yan

14. Mr Choi Ching Bong James made the following main points:

- (a) LRT Tuen Mun Swimming Pool Station was subject to land subsidence. This phenomenon had been detected after the construction works at a site adjoining Site A4 commenced. Further development at Site A4 might aggravate the problem and cause structural damage to the nearby buildings;
- (b) the land subsidence problem would also cause safety hazard to the LRT operation. Site A4 was located to the north of the SHK site and abutted the LRT track on the western and northern sides. The proposed public housing development at Site A4 would pose similar subsidence problem for the LRT track and cause safety hazard for the LRT turning around the bend;

- (c) Site A4 was previously zoned “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”). The site was not suitable for residential development and should not be rezoned for such purpose. As Site A4 was too close to Nerine Cove, it would cause problems in terms of air ventilation and privacy. The residents in Nerine Cove, with their living rooms in glass curtain wall, could be viewed clearly from the future public housing development at Site A4. It was not fair for the residents in Nerine Cove, who had been living there for a long time, to be adversely affected by the proposed public housing development at Site A4;
- (d) despite that he would lose the river view towards Tuen Mun River Channel, he would not object to the future development at the KMB Tuen Mun South Bus Depot as that site was at a reasonable distance away from Nerine Cove and would not cause any privacy problem; and
- (e) there would be management problem and conflict if the pedestrian footbridge connecting Nerine Cove and Oceania Heights, which was provided and maintained by Nerine Cove, were to be used by the future residents at Site A4.

R3699—李孟邴

15. Mr Lee Man Bong made the following main points:

- (a) the reasons for his objection to the proposed public housing at Site A4 were similar to others, which were mainly related to traffic, air ventilation, visual and the provision of supporting facilities;
- (b) it was a good intention of the Government to provide public housing for the grass-root class. However, Site A4 was too small for such a purpose and the proposed development there would be more akin to in-fill development. There were alternative sites of larger size, e.g. the KMB Tuen Mun South Bus Depot and a temporary carpark or a piece of

vacant land in front of Castle Peak Bay Fire Station. Public housing development could be planned comprehensively with the provision of supporting facilities on these larger sites. It would not be a problem for the proposed public housing development to be provided immediately adjacent to the fire station as it was not necessary for the fire station to enjoy an open view; and

- (c) in-fill development at Site A4 was not ideal and represented a backward step in the planning standard. Given the small size and other site constraints, only limited number of flats could be provided at Site A4. Reclamation could be another alternative in providing land for housing development.

R3700—徐慧珊

16. Ms Tsui Wai Shan made the following main points:

- (a) there were concerns on housing supply by the general public but not many people raised concerns on the provision of facilities for the elderly, e.g. home for the elderly, elderly centre and community/health centre, where the aged could meet and interact with each other; and
- (b) Site A4 was too small for public housing development. However, it could be used for developing a community centre with facilities for the elderly. Public housing development could be implemented in other sites in Tuen Mun as an alternative to Site A4.

R3702—李敏華

R3888—Cheung Kam Har

17. With the aid of a visualizer, Mr Yip Man Pan made the following main points:

- (a) R3472 had previously showed a video clip about a disabled person having difficulties in boarding a LRT train due to the land subsidence of

LRT Tuen Mun Swimming Pool Station. This had happened since February 2018 when the foundation works at the SHK site was in full swing. Further housing development at Site A4, which was adjacent to the SHK site, would aggravate the problem;

- (b) the Chairman of the Owners' Committee (OC) of Oceania Heights (R4197) had also mentioned about the fire safety issue. As Site A4 was abutting the LRT track along Hoi Wong Road and the narrow footpath along the road (about 5.8m wide) was not wide enough to serve as an emergency access for fire engine, there would be difficulties in fighting fire along the Hoi Wong Road façade of the site;
- (c) Site A4 was elongated in shape and not suitable for public housing development. While there was a need to provide public housing for those who were living in substandard housing, the need of the existing residents should also be attended to. The public was misled by newspaper reports that the residents of Nerine Cove were being selfish for raising objection to public housing development as they would lose their view towards Tuen Mun River Channel. In fact, the objecting reason was related to the privacy problem caused by the proposed public housing development at Site A4. Alternative site should be considered for public housing development;
- (d) there was a report in the newspapers in February 2018 that the Task Force on Land Supply (the Task Force) had included Tuen Mun Swimming Pool in the list to be examined for possible topside development. The decision to develop Site A4 should be withheld pending the outcome of the Task Force's study;
- (e) there were other alternative sites in Tuen Mun for public housing development, e.g. the KMB Tuen Mun South Bus Depot, the Tuen Mun Swimming Pool, the Tuen Mun Public Riding School, the Tuen Mun Recreation and Sports Centre Archery cum Gateball Court, Tuen Mun Golf Centre, and Tuen Mun Adventure Park;

- (f) although funding had been approved by the Legislative Council to study the feasibility of developing the KMB Tuen Mun South Bus Depot site for a sports ground, it did not preclude the possibility of topside public housing development above the future sports ground. In connection with the proposed sports ground development, the use of two open-air car parks under short-term tenancy (STT) near the bus depot was being reviewed. With the car parks relocated, those sites could also be considered as alternatives sites for public housing development;
- (g) consideration should also be given to providing public housing development above the future station of the Tuen Mun South Extension of WRL. The number of public housing units that could be provided at that site would far exceed the 520 units planned for Site A4;
- (h) in the interest of increasing housing supply, those alternative sites mentioned above should be considered as they were much larger than Site A4 and had potential of providing more housing units. The utilisation rate of some of the existing recreation facilities on those sites was low, while others only served a small sector of the public. Subject to satisfactory relocation of those facilities and provision of associated transport infrastructure and supporting community facilities, redeveloping the respective sites for public housing was better than developing Site A4;
- (i) as public housing development in a small site such as Site A4 was not cost effective, developing Site A4 for community/recreational facilities to facilitate releasing other sites, such as the Tuen Mun Public Riding School or the Tuen Mun Swimming Pool, for development could be another alternative;
- (j) the Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) had been requesting a rail link to connect Tuen Mun to Tsuen Wan for over 30 years, but the proposal was turned down by the Government. Public housing developments in

Tuen Mun would be more acceptable by Tuen Mun residents if that rail link could go ahead;

- (k) HD had previously responded that the building blocks of the proposed public housing development at Site A4 would be sited as close to the LRT track as possible to maximise its separation distance from Nerine Cove. However, this arrangement might not be possible in view of the land subsidence problem. The separation distance of the proposed public housing development from Nerine Cove should be clarified;
- (l) in considering the proposed development at Site A4, the relevant department should be requested to clarify whether the building set back requirement of 25m from the LRT track to the edge of the building façade to mitigate rail noise, as stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), could be adhered to;
- (m) as vehicular ingress/egress for Site A4 was proposed at Hang Fu Street, the capacity of Hang Fu Street should be assessed as the ingress/egress for Nerine Cove and the SHK site were also along that street. The proposed road widening at Hoi Wong Road could not solve the external road connection problem as the traffic bottleneck was at the junction of Wong Chu Road/Tuen Mun Road; and
- (n) the privacy problem of Nerine Cove caused by the proposed public housing development at Site A4 should be solved now, rather than at the detailed design stage, which would be too late.

R3758—梁靜儀

18. Ms Sylvia Leung Ching Yi made the following main points:

- (a) Site A4 was elongated in shape and not suitable for residential use. In view of the site configuration and the original “G/IC” zoning, many residents of Nerine Cove believed that the site would be used for

Government, institution or community (GIC) development when they bought their properties in Nerine Cove. It was unfair to them that Site A4 would be used for an in-fill residential development, causing privacy problem;

- (b) Nerine Cove was responsible for constructing and maintaining a pedestrian footbridge (with lift service) to Oceania Heights and such a provision and the subsequent maintenance were costly. As the pedestrian footbridge was open to the public, the future residents in the public housing development at Site A4 would also use the footbridge and lift. In view of the increase in patronage, the maintenance of those facilities would need to be enhanced and the maintenance cost would be increased correspondingly;
- (c) despite that there was unanimous objection from TMDC on the proposed public housing development, the Government pressed ahead with the proposed development. The consultation process was not meaningful;
- (d) she was not sure whether the traffic data taken during the weekend was used in the traffic impact assessment (TIA) for the rezoning of Site A4 as she observed that some workers had been recording vehicular and pedestrian traffic during weekends at the pedestrian footbridge previously;
- (e) Nerine Cove and the surrounding developments were built on reclaimed land. Subsidence would happen in reclamation area due to loading. The construction works at the SHK site were still ongoing but they had already caused land subsidence at the LRT Tuen Mun Swimming Pool Station. The subsidence problem would be aggravated when the development at the SHK site was completed. Development at Site A4 would further aggravate the subsidence problem;
- (f) there was a 90-degree bend at the LRT track near Site A4. Any

subsidence of the LRT track near the bend would be hazardous. The safe operation of LRT would be threatened by objects falling from the proposed public housing development at the site; and

- (g) Site A4 was not located near any WRL station. It was unlikely that the future residents at the site would travel by WRL to the urban area as it would be twice as costly as taking a bus and the travelling time would also take longer. The increase in population in the area would result in a long waiting time for buses. It would not be fair to the existing Tuen Mun residents.

R3798–Hui Hoi Ming

19. Mr Hui Hoi Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he lived in Nerine Cove and objected to the proposed public housing development at Site A4;
- (b) the site was originally planned for GIC development to serve the community. This also implied that the site was not suitable for residential development. He could not understand how the current public housing development could suddenly become justified;
- (c) there were about 22 blocks of residential buildings in the vicinity, accommodating a large population. Those people living in the area included people of different ages who had different needs in terms of public facilities. Site A4 should be used to provide facilities such as an elderly centre as well as children's playground. The proposed public housing development at Site A4 not only failed to meet the needs of the local residents, but also creating new problems;
- (d) while there was an urgent need to provide housing for those in need, the Government should also look after the needs of the community as a whole. It was not justifiable to meet the housing need at the expense of

the interests of the others. Such an approach failed to balance the interests of different stakeholders, causing antagonism amongst the community; and

- (e) there were alternative sites available for public housing development. As the Government owned the land, it could take necessary steps to make those other sites available for public housing development. The Government should balance developments to meet the needs of the community instead of making local residents suffered from the impact of such development.

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

R3842 - 朱國棟

20. Ms Cheung Kam Har made the following main points:

- (a) she would like to express her views on the proposed public housing development at Site A4 from the perspective of a parent;
- (b) she spent her life-time's saving to purchase a flat in Nerine Cove in 2001. At that time, she was given to understand that the sites, including the SHK site and Site A4 known as TM145 and TM146 respectively, were planned for a park and GIC development with a building height restriction of not exceeding 5 storeys. She had been waiting for the Government to implement the park as planned. However, those two sites were now used for residential development;
- (c) the OC of Nerine Cove had contributed a lot in liaising with relevant government departments and the LRT company in providing zebra-crossing, improving the traffic management and managing crowds at the LRT station. Nerine Cove was responsible for providing and maintaining a pedestrian footbridge with passenger lifts for public use. It was unfair to the residents that the sites originally designated for park

and GIC developments be taken away for residential developments; and

- (d) she was always in support of the Government and contributed to the community by taking up voluntary works. However, she was speechless when the sites in front of Nerine Cove were rezoned for residential development. It was not fair to the residents of Nerine Cove by rezoning Site A4 for public housing development.

R3866–Wan Kwok Wai

R3867–Lam Hoi Yee

21. Mr Wan Kwok Wai made the following main points:

- (a) Site A4 in front of Nerine Cove was originally planned for GIC development for over a decade. That site was elongated in shape and not suitable for residential development. He wondered why the planned GIC facilities were not implemented and the site was rezoned for public housing development all of a sudden;
- (b) PlanD had consulted local residents previously on the proposed public housing development. PlanD provided its usual response saying that the proposed development was technically feasible and the impacts were acceptable. The opposing views of the residents were ignored and the actual sentiment was not reflected. In proposing the rezoning, only the supporting views were mentioned;
- (c) the site was long and narrow and the future public housing development would create wall effect, causing privacy, air ventilation and natural light penetration problems. Although PlanD had responded that the proposed housing blocks would be sited as near the LRT track as possible to maximise the separation distance from Nerine Cove, the buffer requirement from LRT had not been fully considered and the building blocks might still need to be situated close to Nerine Cove;

- (d) Site A4 was too close to Nerine Cove. The problems mentioned above should be resolved before the site was rezoned for public housing development. Leaving these problems to other departments at the detailed design stage was not appropriate; and
- (e) although there was a pressing need for more public housing supply, Site A4 was not a suitable site for such use. While he had no objection to public housing development in Tuen Mun, alternative sites such as those temporary car parks near the KMB Tuen Mun South Bus Depot or the site for the future station of Tuen Mun South Extension of WRL, which were larger in size, should be considered.

R4328-王繼明

22. Mr Wong Kai Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Oceania Heights. When he decided to buy his flat in Oceania Heights, Site A4 was planned for GIC development to meet the needs of the local residents. However, the long-awaited GIC facilities had not been implemented over the years and the site was rezoned for public housing development suddenly. ;
- (b) PlanD tried to demonstrate in a photomontage to show that the proposed public housing development at Site A4 would not have any adverse visual impact on the surrounding developments. That photomontage, taken from a distant viewpoint at the Tuen Mun Ferry Pier looking towards the inland, could not demonstrate the visual impact of the proposed public housing development on Nerine Cove and Oceania Heights;
- (c) he would also oppose any public housing development at the alternative sites such as the Tuen Mun Public Riding School and the Tuen Mun Recreation and Sports Centre Archery cum Gateball Court suggested by some representers in view that the severe road connection problem

between Tuen Mun and the urban area had not been resolved. These recreational facilities were actively in use. The archery practice was organised for students during weekdays and the riding school served users from as far as Hong Kong Island and Tseung Kwan O;

- (d) it was quite impossible to get on Bus No. 961 at the bus stop near Goodview Garden as it was so fully packed. Passengers had to take LRT to Tuen Mun Town Centre to get on the bus, otherwise no seat would be available even if they managed to board the bus at Goodview Garden. As the private residential development at the SHK site had not been completed, the actual traffic impact could not be fully ascertained yet. The proposed public housing development should be withheld;
- (e) Site A4 was also very close to the LRT track and there was a right-angled LRT turn at the north-western corner of the site. As there should be a minimum buffer distance between the LRT track and any residential development, the small site could not meet this requirement. The future public housing development would be subject to rail noise from the LRT;
- (f) TMDC had been consulted on the proposed public housing development at Site A4. Despite the strong objection from more than 20 TMDC members, the rezoning proposal was submitted to the Board. The views of the TMDC were not taken seriously and the public consultation was only taken as a process to meet the statutory requirement;
- (g) Oceania Heights was responsible for the construction and maintenance of a pedestrian footbridge with lifts and escalators leading to Tuen Mun Swimming Pool, which was also open to the public. The maintenance cost was expensive and it had been a financial burden to Oceania Heights. Further increasing the population in the area would increase the patronage of the footbridge and the maintenance cost, which was not fair to the residents;

- (h) Tuen Mun had accommodated facilities that were offensive in nature, e.g. sludge treatment, incinerator and landfill. Yet, the planned GIC facilities at Site A4 that were expected by residents for years were replaced by public housing development that was inappropriate for the site. GIC facilities such as library with study room or child care centre, which was in great demand in Tuen Mun, should be developed at Site A4 instead. The Government was going against the residents' wish for not giving them what they aspired, but proceeding with projects that they resisted; and
- (i) Tuen Mun residents were unfairly blamed for being selfish in opposing the proposed public housing development. Should the proposed Tuen Mun to Tsuen Wan rail link be provided, there would not be any objection to the proposal on traffic ground.

R1146-屯門鄉事委員會

23. Mr To Shek Yuen made the following main points:

- (a) he was the First Vice-chairman of the Tuen Mun Rural Committee and a member of TMDC;
- (b) he objected to Amendment Item A3 since Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen and villagers living there for over 20 years would be affected by the proposed development. Given Yau Chong Home could be retained at Site A5, Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen should also be retained and Amendment Item A3 involving the rezoning from "Green Belt" ("GB") to "Residential (Group A)" on the draft OZP should be shelved;
- (c) taking into account the landslides at Kotewall Road and 'Kai Liu' (i.e. the Kwun Tong Resettlement Estate) on 18 June 1972 resulted in deaths, he questioned why Site A3 located at the hillside should be developed; and

- (d) unless the rezoning proposal at Site A3 was shelved, objections to the proposed development at Site A3 affecting Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen together with the proposals of HSK NDA affecting Yick Yuen Tsuen would be escalated to Heung Yee Kuk and support would be sought from 26 Heungs against these proposals.

R1148 – 古漢強

24. Mr Ku Hon Keung made the following main points:

- (a) he had been a member of TMDC for over 30 years. To provide the historic background, he said that part of Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen was demolished and relocated about 30 years ago and a portion of the village was developed into private developments. The remaining portion of the village had been the homes of the villagers for at least two to three generations. Their living condition was improved from squatters to stone houses. However, these villagers had to face the predicament of their village being demolished again due to the proposed development at Site A3;
- (b) he wished that Members of the Board could pay a visit to Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen to assess the site's suitability for development. The site was located adjacent to 400kV overhead power lines and a water channel, which had a long history as a major source of water for Tai Lam Reservoir before the water supply from Dong Jiang. Besides, there were two landslides in the past ten years and the Water Supplies Department carried out repair works. He questioned the suitability of Site A3 for residential development and how many flats could be produced at the slope of Site A3;
- (c) it was the Government's own fault to sell the sites to the east of Tuen Mun and So Kwu Wat which were originally planned for public housing for private development;

- (d) he was the TMDC member of San Hui Constituency. His comment was based on the fact and his knowledge of the area where he had lived, studied and worked over the years. While he supported the Government policies, the Government should solve the conflicts resulted from the proposed development by compensating the affected villagers properly; and
- (e) there were many vacant government land and vacant schools in Tuen Mun. These sites should be used for housing developments.

[Ms Lilian S.K. Law arrived to join this session of meeting at this point.]

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

R1962 / C826–Yuen Sing Lok

R1979 / C836–Yuen Sing Wa

R2189–Ella

C940–Emi

C941–Miss Kwok

C1008–Yuen Sai Leung

25. Mr Yuen Sing Wa urged the Government to proceed with large scale reclamation to address the housing problem instead of resuming land of existing villages to create conflicts and instability in the community.

R2001–Kwok Hau Wan

R2003 / C983–Lau Mee Ling

R2013 / C858–鄧美英

R2104–Yeung Ka Fai

26. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yeung Ka Fai made the following main points:

- (a) his group, including the four representers/commeters' representatives who would speak after him, objected to Amendment Item A3. While the Government officials said in the previous meeting that the rezoning proposal at Site A3 was technically acceptable, they had disregarded the importance of the green belt in Site A3, the cost and safety issues, and the fact that there were alternative sites suitable for housing developments. It was unreasonable for the Government to resume land for producing only 2000 flats of public housing and a school at Site A3. His group would take turns to present their objection reasons on five aspects including (1) environment, (2) traffic, (3) cost effectiveness, (4) traditional culture, and (5) safety;
- (b) on environmental aspect, there were dense trees at Site A3. It was not sparsely vegetated as stated in the Technical Assessment Report of the Preliminary Development Review for Housing Sites at Tuen Mun Central – Feasibility Study (the Study). A total of 408 trees would be removed or replanted due to the proposed development and two trees preserved. He questioned how such a large quantity of trees could be replanted and enquired the details of the replanting;
- (c) there were many animals at Site A3 including protected species namely Chinese pangolin and barking deer and those active at night-time namely bats and frogs. The construction works of the proposed development would affect the animals in the Country Park and users of the hiking trail. The ecological surveys undertaken by the Government were questionable as the surveys were conducted three years ago only in daytime and did not cover all seasons. It was therefore inaccurate to conclude in the surveys that the ecological value at Site A3 was low;
- (d) according to the Summary of Representations and Government Departments' Responses appended to the Paper, while protected mammals like Short-nosed Fruit Bat and Pallas's Squirrel were found at Site A3, the Government responded that Site A3 was unlikely to be of particularly high ecological value since these mammals were common

and widely distributed in Hong Kong. He questioned whether these protected species would be sacrificed for housing development. Chinese White Dolphins which were once common and widely distributed in Hong Kong were no longer commonly seen in the sea near Lantau Island due to the reclamation and construction works of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HKZMB) and the expansion of the Hong Kong International Airport. He pointed out that it should not be taken for granted that those animals currently widely distributed in the area would be always widely distributed in the future. Those animals should be protected;

- (e) as stated in paragraph 3.10 of the Technical Assessment Report of the Study, buffer areas on both sides of the proposed road connecting Site A3 would be provided for mitigating the adverse impact arising from traffic emission and noise. The impacts of the proposed development on Villa Tiara such as noise and air pollution were not assessed by the Government. Also, given Site A3 was at the hillside, it would take at least five years to complete the site formation and construction works. The air and noise impacts of those works would affect the residents, users of hiking trails, secondary schools and elderly homes nearby. Also, sands and muds from those works would cause pollutions to water channels and drains, and result in flooding. There was no sewage treatment proposal in the Government's study; and
- (f) according to PlanD's website, "GB" zone referred to 'woodland and vegetated land at urban fringe areas and countryside to limit the sprawl of urban development' and the functions of greening included providing an 'urban lung to offer visual and psychological comfort and relief, which were vital to the health and well-being of people in a high-density and congested environment'. Given the importance of green belt, he questioned the rationale for rezoning of Site A3, which was a green belt in the town centre of Tuen Mun.

R2005–Ho Ken Wai Alex

R2090 / C856–何鈺藍

C817–Li Heung Lan

C855–Alex Ho

27. With the aid of PowerPoint Presentation, Mr Ho Ken Wai Alex made the following main points:

- (a) his presentation would cover the internal and external traffic impacts of the proposed development at Site A3. Internally, there would be various developments newly completed or to be completed near Site A3 including residential developments namely The Bloomsway and 2GETHER, two other residential developments and two hotels in San Hui and a government building near Chi Lok Fa Yuen. Traffic demand in Tuen Mun would be greatly increased. According to the responses of CEDD's representative in the previous meeting with the residents, the bus lay-bys near Site A3 would be extended to cater for the increasing traffic demand. With an increase in bus frequency due to the additional population but no road widening work near Site A3, it would not be effective to address the traffic problem simply by extending the bus lay-bys;
- (b) while the government representative also responded in the previous meeting that frequency of the WR would be increased to cater for additional demand, the feeder service connecting railway stations should be addressed first. There was no LRT station near Site A3 to allow for interchange with the WR. Passengers either had to walk half an hour or take MTR Bus to the nearest WR station. The frequency of MTR Bus was not sufficient to cater for the existing demand. The additional population of the proposed development at Site A3 would worsen the problem;
- (c) it was already overcrowded at the Bus-Bus Interchange on Tuen Mun Road during rush hours and buses had to queue up for over 10 minutes

before arriving at the stops. Besides, the daily passenger flow of the Shenzhen Bay Port was about 104,000 persons which were over the design capacity of about 60,000 persons per day. There were many Mainland visitors overcrowding Tuen Mun resulting in hundreds of passengers lining up for Bus No. B3X (between Shenzhen Bay Port and Tuen Mun Town Centre). Insufficient transport infrastructure had been a problem in Tuen Mun for 30 years and the situation would get worse with the proposed additional 10,000 population;

- (d) according to the Summary of Representations and Government Departments' Responses appended to the Paper, there would be a number of major transport infrastructure projects in Tuen Mun to be studied or designed for the longer term, which included the proposed Tuen Mun Western Bypass (TMWB) and Route 11. The traffic forecast in the TIA conducted for the subject rezoning was up to 2031 while that in the TIAs of other feasibility studies for projects of similar period was up to 2041. Given the investigation studies on the TMWB and Route 11 had just commenced, he questioned how these major transport infrastructure projects could be taken into consideration in the subject TIA and queried its accuracy and how to conclude that Tuen Mun Road would not be affected by the population intake of the proposed HSK NDA; and

- (e) the study area of the subject TIA only covered the surroundings of the amendment sites but the sections of Tuen Mun Road in Tai Lam, Siu Lam and Sham Tseng which were always congested were not included. Given the new developments along Castle Peak Road and the completion of HKZMB, traffic situation in Tuen Mun would get worse. In view of the above internal and external traffic problems, he objected to the proposed development at Site A3 and requested the provision of more effective mitigation measures.

R2002 / C1016 –Tang Pik Ki Doyle

C850–Tang Yun Wing

C902–Kate Ho

C905–Siu Kai Yu

28. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Ms Tang Pik Ki Doyle made the following main points:

- (a) she objected to Item A3. Although the Government concluded that there was no insurmountable technical problem for the proposed development at Site A3, it was not cost effective for a number of reasons. The construction cost at Site A3 would be high due to its location at the hillside requiring the provision of retaining walls and longer time for site formation, which was not cost effective to produce only about 2,000 flats;
- (b) about 400 trees at Site A3 would be affected which was the largest number of affected trees among the sites under the rezoning. The cost for tree re-planting and preservation would be high;
- (c) the existing sewers and drains at Site A3 could not support the proposed residential development and school. Cost would be involved for construction of new sewers and drains and associated road works;
- (d) according to the Technical Assessment Report of the Study, the supply of seawater for flushing could marginally meet the demand in the area. Fresh water would be used for flushing if the supply of seawater was insufficient to meet the new demand. Given Site A3 was located at the hillside, cost would be required for water pumping and storage system;
- (e) the construction cost per public housing flat would be over a million dollars mainly reference to similar developments involving the construction of retaining walls and other relevant structures adjacent to housing sites located at the hillside. Such cost information was not

included in the Summary of Representations and Government Departments' Responses;

- (f) according to the article of Hong Kong Federation of Education Workers in 2014, the demand for Primary One places in 2019-20 would decrease due to the enforcement of 'zero quota' policy for 'doubly non-permanent resident pregnant women' giving birth in Hong Kong. The demand for Primary One places in the proposed school at Site A3 would also be decreased. With reference to the Summary of Representations and Government Departments' Responses, the Education Bureau (EDB) would make suitable adjustments in reserving sites for construction of schools for districts with persistent surplus of school places. It would be a waste of money to carry out detailed design for the proposed school after the subject rezoning if there would be a possibility that the proposed school would no longer be required due to the declining demand of school places;
- (g) there were about 3,000 and 40,000 vacant public rental housing and private housing flats respectively up till October 2017. If the Government could increase the occupancy rate of these flats, it would be unnecessary to spend money for the proposed development at Site A3. Besides, there was vacant land in Tuen Mun instantly available for developments. Other than privately owned sites proposed by the representers or commenters as alternatives, there were four vacant school sites in Tuen Mun including Tai Lam Chung Public School, Lam Tei Gospel School and Tuen Mun School which were located adjacent to "GB" zone with potential for rezoning for housing developments; and
- (h) the Government should use the 13 rolled over sites in the Land Sale Programme, for examples, the eight sites in Kai Tak which could produce about 15,000 public housing flats to instantly meet the pressing housing demand.

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

R2007–張強

R2083–Yeung Ka Ho

C851–Chiu Yu Kit

C904–Chan How

29. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yeung Ka Ho made the following main points:

- (a) there were many elderly currently living at Site A3 and they would lose their homes due to the proposed development. It would be hard for them to adapt to the new living environment after relocation. Although the villagers of Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen did not have right to apply for small house grant, villagers who had been living there for 4 to 5 generations over a hundred year should be deemed indigenous villagers. The village with traditional culture should be protected by Article 40 of the Basic Law and that the lawful traditional rights and interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the New Territories should be protected by the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. The village should therefore not be redeveloped for other uses;
- (b) villagers, particularly, the elderly relied on farming to earn their living and be self-sufficient. The rezoning at Site A3 would affect their style of living;
- (c) besides, in the 1999 Policy Address, the Chief Executive set out the intention to build Hong Kong into a world-class city, and sustainable development was put on the Government's agenda for the first time and was brought to the public's attention. The concept of sustainable development, when applied in Hong Kong, was finding ways to increase prosperity and improve the quality of life while reducing overall pollution and waste; meeting our own needs and aspirations without doing damage to the prospects of future generations; and reducing the environmental burden we put on our neighbours and helping to preserve common resources. Given that such concept was widely adopted,

Hong Kong as an international city should pursue the principle of sustainability instead of unnecessarily developing such small piece of land at Site A3; and

- (d) the Board should take into account the objections raised by Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen and other residents in Tuen Mun. Without good town planning and sufficient transport infrastructure in the district, there should not be an addition of about 100,000 population in Tuen Mun.

R1975 / C833–郭金滿

R2004 / C989–鄧潤泉

R2009 / C852–Wong Lok Hang

R2089 / C857–何雪兒

C831–Tang Nin Ying

C849–Yeung Kam

C897–Fung Yuk Ting

C914–Ho Lam Kit Ching

C916–Mr Ho

C1001–Ho Ka Kin Ken

30. With the aid of PowerPoint Presentation, Ms Wong Lok Hang made the following main points:

- (a) her presentation focused on public health and safety perspective. Referring to the Summary of Representations and Government Departments' Responses, she queried the response to the ground of SA3(l) that the concern about wild animals might threaten the safety of future residents at Site A3 was not related to the OZP which was to show the broad land use proposal. However, Site A3 was located adjacent to the Country Park. Similar to the residents in Sui Wo Court, Shatin, wild animals such as wild boars and monkeys would cause nuisances to the residents of the proposed development and potential zoonotic diseases would affect the health of the residents;

- (b) the straight distance from the MacLehose Trail to the proposed development at Site A3 was only 57m. The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) of the Study revealed that the visual impact of the proposed development at Site A3 on the MacLehose Trail was significant. However, according to the Summary of Representations and Government Departments' Responses, the response was that the Chief Town Planner/ Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had been consulted and had no adverse comment. From the photomontages, the proposed development would block the views from Section 10 of the MacLehose Trail which was the most accessible by the users. Give that the MacLehose Trail was one of the world's top 20 hiking trails announced by National Geographic Channel in 2016, she questioned whether it was worthy to affect the users of this trail by only producing 2,000 flats;
- (c) Site A3 was originally zoned "GB" serving as a buffer for the town centre of Tuen Mun. The proposed development would impose adverse impact on the air quality in Tuen Mun and subsequently pose health impact on residents particularly the elderly since 408 trees would be removed and there would be air pollution during the construction. As reported by Ming Pao on 1.1.2018, the data collected by the air quality monitoring stations reflected that the air quality in Tuen Mun was the worst;
- (d) according to the Summary of Representations and Government Departments' Responses, preliminary geotechnical appraisal had been carried out to identify the man-made slopes and retaining walls which could affect or be affected by the proposed development at A3 Site. The preliminary geotechnical appraisal also examined the potential natural terrain hazards for the proposed development. Further geotechnical assessment would be carried out at the detailed design stage to define the scope of necessary slope works and natural terrain hazard mitigation measures to be carried out under the project. However, the findings of the preliminary geotechnical appraisal were not included in the Study nor in the Paper. It was not acceptable to

rezone the site before examining the natural terrain hazard. For the 6m high protective barrier proposed for the proposed residential development at Yin Ping Road, Shek Kip Mei, it was criticised that the barrier could only protect the proposed development from rocks of about 2m in diameter. Since Site A3 was a huge rocky hill slope and extreme weather conditions including heavy rain would occur more frequently, the probability of the natural terrain hazard would increase. She questioned whether such hazard could be largely mitigated or significant cost for slope works would be involved;

- (e) according to the Summary of Representations and Government Departments' Responses, the 132kV Overhead Lines and pylons had been taken into account in the Study. However, the proposed housing blocks were just located 36m outside the working corridor as required. She doubted why the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) had no adverse comment on the proposed development;
- (f) the current function of Site A3 as a rural settlement to mitigate the heat island effect would be gone after the construction of the proposed high-rise public housing development. Despite the Government responded that various design measures such as building separation would be adopted, the proposed development should not be pursued at Site A3 due to its current function;
- (g) to conclude, it was unjust and unwise if the Board would agree to the rezoning proposal at Site A3 despite the fact that the proposed development was not justified in terms of the five aspects as her group had presented; and
- (h) she reminded the Board that 'it was not a house, it was our home' by playing a trailer of an Australian movie called 'The Castle' produced in 1997. The movie was about a family with an aid of a solicitor to fight against the authority who tried to vacate their home for development and the family won at the end.

31. As the presentation from government representatives, 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 the Chairperson 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.

Site A4

Zoning History

32. In response to a Member's question on the zoning history of Site A4, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLW, PlanD said that the site was formerly zoned "G/IC" without a designated GIC use.

Traffic and Transport

33. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) according to the TIA, what traffic impact of the proposed development at Site A4 would be;
- (b) whether the pedestrian footbridge adjacent to Site A4 was under the management of Nerine Cove; and
- (c) what measures would be implemented to cater for the public transport demand and the traffic congestion at the Bus-Bus Interchange on Tuen Mun Road.

34. In response, Mr Tony K.L. Cheung, CE/W3, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) Hang Fu Street was a single two-lane carriageway with a two-way design traffic flow capacity of 2,400 passenger car units (pcu) per hour. According to the TIA, the peak hour two-way traffic flow at Hang Fu Street was about 320 pcu at peak hours. There would be sufficient reserve traffic capacity. A vehicular access and a zebra crossing at Hang Fu Street would be provided for the proposed development and the junction of Hang Fu Street and Hang Kwai Street would be converted into a signalised junction with pedestrian crossing. All developments in the district including the proposed development by SHK had been taken into consideration in the TIA. With the implementation of the proposed traffic arrangement and junction improvement works, there would be no traffic problem arising from the proposed development;
- (b) for pedestrian connectivity, future residents could walk southward to the LRT Tuen Mun Swimming Pool Station and use the pedestrian footbridge (with lift service) between Nerine Cove and Oceania Heights, which should be managed and maintained by the owners of Nerine Cove and opened 24 hours for public use in accordance with the relevant lease conditions for access to the bus terminus outside Goodview Garden. The footbridge of about 3m wide could cater for the demand from the proposed development. There was another footbridge between Oceania Heights and Tuen Mun Swimming Pool which was managed and maintained by the owners of Oceania Heights. The footbridge should also be opened 24 hours for public use; and
- (c) currently, there was a designated bus-only lane running from 7:30am to 9:00am giving priority to bus service to travel along Tuen Mun Road to the urban area. While it took a bit of time for pick-up and drop-off at the Bus-Bus Interchange during the peak hours, it was generally observed that traffic in the bus-only lane was smooth.

35. In response to Members' question regarding the existing arrangement for wheelchair users to get on LRT trains, Mr Tony K.L. Cheung, CE/W3, CEDD said that, the video clip provided by a representer had shown a disabled person having difficulties in boarding a LRT train, it was because of the level difference between the platform and train compartment. From engineering point of view, the problem could be addressed by adjusting the platform level. As far as he was aware, the LRT operator would also provide assistance on site as required.

Surrounding Development

36. In response to a Member's question about the planning of the KMB Tuen Mun South Bus Depot and its adjoining areas opposite Site A4 and whether there would be a railway station, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLW, PlanD said that to the north and northeast of Site A4, there were GIC uses including a sports centre and an elderly home, playgrounds and residential developments namely Goodview Garden, Tsui Ning Garden and Siu Lun Court. The public cargo handling area and some industrial uses were located to the south of Site A4. For Tuen Mun Swimming Pool which was located in the northern portion of the "G/IC" zone opposite Site A4, the planning of this area could be further reviewed holistically taking into account a possible WR station and for better site utilisation. For the southern portion of the "G/IC" zone, the LCSD was planning to construct a sports ground of international standard with a 11-a-side soccer pitch and a stadium with capacity of 5,000 seats for major events such as the Asian Football Confederation Cup.

LRT Operation and Potential Subsidence

37. Some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) whether Site A4 would be subject to LRT noise; and
- (b) whether there were safety issues in relation to land subsidence of LRT station.

38. In response, Mr Tony K.L. Cheung, CE/W3, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) according to HKPSG, the horizontal separation between the LRT track and residential development should be 25m or above for the purpose of noise protection. 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; and
- (b) regarding the concern on land subsidence, under proper monitoring, site formation works with the use of cast-in-place bored piling technique would not cause adverse impact on stability of the nearby buildings. The indicative scheme of the proposed development had been shown to the Corporation (MTRC) who did not raise any objection. The Government would maintain a close liaison with MTRC to ensure that proper monitoring would be conducted and safe operation of LRT would not be affected. The details of monitoring programme would be formulated when the detailed design of buildings at Site A4 was made available by HD in the detailed design stage.

39. In response to a Member's question on whether the LRT track to the immediate west of Site A4 could be covered for housing development, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLW, PlanD said that the government had no intention to cover the LRT track for topside development which would likely affect the operation of LRT.

Fire Fighting

40. A Member asked whether there was difficulty in fire fighting at Site A4 in particular the façade facing the LRT. In response, Mr Patrick P.C. Tse, SA25, HD said that fire engines would access Site A4 via Hang Fu Street. According to the Code of Practice for Fire Safety, the minimum width of a carriageway allowing fire engines to

access for rescue was 7.3m, whilst the width of Hang Fu Street was about 10m. He pointed out that the layout of emergency vehicular access was required to be submitted to the Fire Services Department for approval during the detailed design stage before commencement of construction works of the proposed development.

Impacts on Nerine Cove

41. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) whether the building design for Site A4 could address the privacy issue raised by the residents of Nerine Cove;
- (b) whether there was any standard for building separation and whether residents of Nerine Cove and the proposed development would directly overlook each other; and
- (c) whether there would be a possibility that the disposition of the proposed building blocks at Site A4 had to move towards Nerine Cove to increase the clearance distance from LRT to address the land subsidence issue.

42. In response, Mr Patrick P.C. Tse, SA25, HD made the following main points:

- (a) the horizontal distance between the site boundary at the east side of Site A4 and the façade of Nerine Cove was about 26m based on the conceptual block layout. Taking into account the concerns from the residents of Nerine Cove, the proposed building blocks at Site A4 would be set back from Nerine Cove as far as practicable to maximise the window to window distance. Based on the conceptual block layout of the proposed development at Site A4 which was subject to detailed design, the window to window distance between the public housing block and the buildings in Nerine Cove would range from about 43m to 56m. There would be no window on the

eastern façade along Hang Fu Street of the southern block;

- (b) the measure of set-back from Nerine Cove had been adopted as far as practicable as shown on the conceptual block layout for Site A4. While such measure would continue to be adopted, there could be adjustment in the arrangement of building disposition at the detailed design stage. As a distance of about 2.5m to 3m from the site boundary would be required for construction purpose, the proposed building blocks would not be built immediately along the site boundary; and
- (c) currently, there was no building separation requirement in the Environmental Review or other guidelines for assessment on privacy issues associated with a development. From the aerial photo, it was noted that the windows of Nerine Cove were not facing Site A4 squarely but at an angle of about 45 degree.

Site A3

Greening and Landscaping

43. Some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) whether tree survey at Site A3 had been conducted;
- (b) what the tree preservation and replanting proposal at Site A3 would be; and
- (c) what the green coverage at the proposed development sites would be.

44. In response, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLLW, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) broad assessment on impact on existing trees had been carried out but detailed tree survey at Site A3 would be conducted at detailed design stage; and
- (b) it was estimated that a total of about 1,072 trees would be potentially affected by the public housing developments and their associated infrastructure at the 5 housing sites. Details of the proposed number of trees to be felled, retained or transplanted would be subject to detailed design of the proposed housing developments. Compensatory planting at 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 would be recommended. The submission and implementation of tree preservation and removal proposal would be carried out for the public housing sites in accordance with relevant government Technical Circular.

Ecological Survey

45. A Member asked whether the ecological surveys for Site A3 had covered the night-time and winter periods. In response, Mr Ivan T.L. Wan, AECOM said that ecological surveys were actually conducted in daytime and night time, and in wet and dry seasons, as advocated by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department. There was no survey conducted in winter. Short-nosed Fruit Bat and Otus Lettia were recorded in Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen and Tai Lam Country Park respectively in the night-time survey.

46. In response to a Member's question on when the photo of the Chinese pangolin shown in the PowerPoint presentation was taken, Ms Wong Lok Hang (R2009 / C852) said that the photo of the Chinese pangolin was obtained from the Internet for reference since they were not able to take photos of the wild animals at the night-time due to technical constraints.

Visual Impact

47. In response to a Member's question regarding the visual impact from the proposed development at Site A3 on the MacLehose Trail, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLW, PlanD said that the distance between Site A3 and the MacLehose Trail was about 57m. With reference to the photomontages from the viewpoints at the bus stop outside Tuen Mun Eye Centre (VP2), Tuen Mun East Fresh Water Service Reservoir (VP3), MacLehose Trail in Tai Lam Country Park (VP4) and Tuen Mun Cultural Square (VP8) in the VIA of the Study, it was concluded that the proposed development at Site A3 would inevitably impose significant visual changes to the townscape due to blockage of open distance views from some of the viewpoints, loss of visual openness and some degree of visual obstruction. Nonetheless, the visual composition of the proposed development was not incompatible with the existing and planned urban context of Tuen Mun Central, which was predominately medium-to high-rise residential developments mixed with GIC uses.

Safety

48. A Member asked whether there were safety issues in relation to construction on slopes and the proximity of the overhead power lines. In response, Mr Tony K.L. Cheung, CE/W3, CEDD made the following main points with the aid of visualizer:

- (a) the overhead power cable at Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen was 132kV not 400kV. According to Chapter 7 of the HKPSG on 'Utility Services', the preferred working corridor of 132kv overhead transmission lines was approximately 36m (18m on each side of the cable) for the operational need for the CLP Power Hong Kong Limited and the minimum vertical ground clearance was 6m. The minimum distance of the southern boundary of Site A3 from the cable was about 30m, which complied with the standard. For safety concern, according to paragraph 2.3.11 of Chapter 7 of the HKPSG, there were also standards on the continuous public exposure limits for power frequency electric and magnetic fields recommended to the power companies by EMSD when the erection of permanent

overhead transmission lines was planned. The overhead power cable complied with the relevant standards; and

- (b) for safety concern in relation to construction on slopes, retaining walls and rock fences would be constructed for the proposed development at Site A3 in accordance with the geotechnical assessment and the requirements by the Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD. There would be no insurmountable geotechnical problem for the proposed development. The estimated construction cost would be around \$300,000 per unit. It was not uncommon for Hong Kong to construct buildings on slopes.

Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen

49. In response to a Member's question on whether Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen was an indigenous village and the land ownership of Site A3, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLW, PlanD said that Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen was not an indigenous village and the whole site was government land.

50. In response to another Member's question regarding the affected villagers in Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen and the compensation arrangement, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLW, PlanD said that according to the preliminary assessment in the Study, 89 structures would be potentially affected by the proposed development while the exact number of affected households would be subject to detailed survey. Given their location, avoiding such structures or acceding to the request of 'no removal and no clearance' would substantially affect the public housing production. 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.

51. In response to the Chairperson's question about the number of affected households according to her knowledge, Ms Wong Lok Hang (R2009 / C852) said that such information was not available.

52. In response to a Member's question on what traditional village culture should be preserved at Site A3, Ms Wong Lok Hang (R2009 / C852) said that it was difficult to specify the village culture worthy for preservation since it involved memories which were emotionally attached to villagers of Tseng Tau Sheung Tsuen. There were Poon Choi banquets and firecracker blasting for celebrating Lunar New Years. She doubted whether it was worthwhile to remove the village which was built by her ancestors for producing only about 2,000 flats.

GIC Facilities

53. Some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) taking into account all the proposed developments under this rezoning exercise, what GIC facilities were planned in the area;
- (b) what the provision of GIC facilities in Tuen Mun would be against that in the territory;
- (c) what the spatial distribution of the libraries, elderly facilities and child care centres in Tuen Mun was; and
- (d) whether the proposed primary school at Site A3 could be provided at the vacant school sites in Tuen Mun and how the location of the proposed school was determined.

54. In response, Mr David Y.M. Ng, DPO/TM&YLW, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) the planned population of the area covered by the draft Tuen Mun OZP would be increased to 570,000 after this round of rezoning exercise. The provision of GIC facilities had been assessed and the planned GIC facilities provision were generally sufficient in Tuen Mun OZP area except clinic/ health centre and there was also a slight

deficit in sports centre provision. 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. PlanD would also liaise with relevant bureaux/departments to 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 GIC facilities;

- (b) 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 Tuen Mun and Yuen Long Districts. In service planning, HA had taken into account a number of factors, including the increase of 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 parameters 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 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 HSK NDA for the construction of a new hospital to meet the growing health care demand of the population in NTW;
- (c) according to the 2016 Census, the existing population of Tuen Mun

was about 490,000 including 70,000 aged over 65. For the population in 2026, it was estimated that there would be about 570,000 persons including about 130,000 persons aged over 65. According to the Social Welfare Department's statistics comparing the provision of elderly facilities in the territories and Tuen Mun, there were 210 existing Subvented Elderly Centres in Hong Kong including 10 in Tuen Mun. These comprised 41 District Elderly Community Centres (DECs) and 169 Neighbourhood Elderly Centres (NECs) in Hong Kong including 2 DECs and 8 NECs in Tuen Mun. In addition, there would be 2 planned NECs in Tuen Mun. Besides, there were 75 existing Subvented Day Care Centres/Units for the Elderly (DEs/DCUs) in Hong Kong including 3 in Tuen Mun (i.e. 3,114 and 110 service places respectively). The planned DEs/DCUs in Hong Kong and Tuen Mun would be 27 (880 service places) and 3 (158 service places) respectively. For the planned Contract Residential Care Home for Elderly (RCHE) spaces, there would be 2,405 in Hong Kong and about 300 spaces in Tuen Mun. For Special Scheme on Privately Owned Sites for Welfare uses, there would be 9,000 Day Care Services for the Elderly Spaces and RCHE spaces in Hong Kong including 1,430 spaces in Tuen Mun. Some of the elderly facilities were provided in private developments, for example, there would be contract RCHE spaces provided in a private development at Tseng Choi Street;

- (d) there were three libraries in Tuen Mun namely Tai Hing Public Library, Tuen Mun Public Library and Butterfly Estate Public Library and mobile libraries serving the district;
- (e) for primary schools, there were two school nets in Tuen Mun located in both sides of Tuen Mun River Channel. The Education Bureau (EDB) made projections on the supply and demand of school places in each school net having regard to the forecast growth and movement of population, etc. Taking into account the time involved in the planning and implementation of a school which was 6

years in general, EDB considered that a primary school was required at Site A3. EDB would monitor the situation and make suitable adjustments in reserving the proposed school site taking into account trends of persistent shortfall or surplus of school places; and

- (f) taking into account the annual and summer prevailing wind directions at Site A3 which were easterly, northeasterly and southerly and to allow wind penetration from the hilltop to Villa Tiara and Tuen Mun town centre, the proposed school, which would be a low-rise building, was prepared to be located at the northern portion of Site A3.

Tuen Mun Air Quality

55. A Member asked whether the overall air quality of the Tuen Mun district would be adversely affected by the proposed new public housing developments. In response, Mr Tony K.L. Cheung, CE/W3, CEDD said that due to the geographic location of Tuen Mun, the district was sometimes subject to the air pollutants carried by the northwesterly wind from the Mainland. Nevertheless, according to the Preliminary Environmental Review submitted to the Environmental Protection Department, air quality impacts affecting the proposed public housing developments were considered acceptable.

Allocation of Public Housing Units within the Same District

56. A Member asked whether there was information about how many public housing applicants out of total could be allocated with public housing units within the same districts of their existing residences, such as Tuen Mun. Noting that such information was not available in hand, the Chairperson requested HD's representatives to provide the information, if readily available, at coming hearing session.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

57. 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.

58. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 2:50p.m.