

**Minutes of 1270th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 16.5.2022, 17.5.2022 and 23.5.2022**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr C.H. Hau

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West
Transport Department
Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung

Chief Engineer (Works)
Home Affairs Department
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang (16.5.2022, 17.5.2022 a.m. and 23.5.2022)

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Regional Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Victor W.T. Yeung (17.5.2022 p.m.)

Director of Lands
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Franklin Yu

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board
Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo (16.5.2022 a.m., 17.5.2022 p.m. and 23.5.2022 p.m.)
Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng (16.5.2022 p.m., 17.5.2022 a.m. and 23.5.2022 a.m.)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board
Mr W.C. Lui (16.5.2022 a.m. and 23.5.2022 p.m.)
Mr L.K. Wong (16.5.2022 p.m.)
Ms Kitty S.T. Lam (17.5.2022 a.m.)
Mr Kelvin K.H. Chan (17.5.2022 p.m.)
Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu (23.5.2022 a.m.)

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 16.5.2022:

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

Chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West
Transport Department
Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung

Chief Engineer (Works)
Home Affairs Department
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Director of Lands
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Opening Remarks

2. The Chairperson said that the meeting would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TY/31

(TPB Paper No. 10827)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

3. The Secretary reported that Amendment Item A of the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY/31 (the draft OZP) involved a public housing development in Tsing Yi area to be implemented by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and the Housing Department (HD) was the executive arm of HKHA. An Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) for the aforesaid amendment item was conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). Representations and comment had been submitted by the Conservancy Association (CA) (R89/C2) and the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R90). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai (as Director of Lands)	- being a member of HKHA;
--	---------------------------

Mr Paul Y.K. Au (as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department)	- being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA;
--	---

Dr C.H. Hau	- conducting contract research projects with CEDD, being a member of HKBWS and a life member of CA and his spouse being the Vice-Chairman of the Board of Directors of CA;
-------------	--

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| Mr Franklin Yu | - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr L.T. Kwok | - his serving organization operating a social service team which was supported by HKHA and had openly bid funding from HKHA; |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - being a member of the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which had discussed with HD on housing development issues; |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | - being a member of HKHS which had discussed with HD on housing development issues; |
| Mr K.W. Leung | - being a member of the executive board of HKBWS and the chairman of the Crested Bulbul Club Committee of HKBWS; |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong | - having current business dealings with HKHA; |
| Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung | - owing properties in Tsing Yi; |
| Mr Timothy K.W. Ma | - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS which had discussed with HD on housing development issues; and |
| Mr K.L. Wong | - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS which had discussed with HD on housing development issues. |

[Messrs Andrew C.W. Lai and Paul Y.K. Au left the meeting at this point.]

4. Members noted that as the interests of Mr Franklin Yu and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong were direct, they had not been invited to join the meeting. Members also noted that Messrs Andrew C.W. Lai and Paul Y.K. Au had already left the meeting. Members agreed that as the interest of Mr L.T. Kwok was indirect, Dr C.H. Hau and Mr K.W. Leung had no involvement in the proposed public housing development and/or the submission of the representers/commenters, Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau, K.L. Wong and Timonthy K.W. Ma and Ms Lilian S.K. Law had no involvement in the proposed public housing development, and the properties owned by Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung did not have direct view of the site covered by the amendment item, they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Chairperson said that notification 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.

6. The following government representatives, representers, commenters and representers'/commenters' representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Derek P.K. Tse	- District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)
Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan	- Senior Town Planner/Kwai Tsing

CEDD

Mr C.F. Leung	- Chief Engineer/Special Duties (Works) (CE/SD(W))
Mr K.W. Lee	- Senior Engineer/5

HD

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr Dickson K.C. Mok | - Senior Planning Officer/Development and Construction (SPO/DC) |
| Ms Joanne M.Y. Chan | - Senior Architect/3 (SA/3) |
| Mr S.W. Lo | - Planning Officer |
| Mr Y.T. Tso | - Civil Engineer |

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| Mr Eric Y.H. Wong | - Senior Nature Conservation Officer (Central) (SNCO(C)) |
|-------------------|--|

WSP (Asia) Ltd.

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| Mr Calvin C.W. Li |] |
| Ms Jessica K.Y. Fung |] |
| |] |

Ecocystems Ltd.

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------|
| Mr Klinsmann Cheung |] Consultants |
| |] |

Meinhardt Infrastructure

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <i>and Environment Ltd.</i> |] |
| Mr David C.M. Lee |] |

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R65 – Seto Pik Kuen

- | | |
|------------------|---------------|
| Ms Seto Pik Kuen | - Representer |
|------------------|---------------|

R89/C2 – The Conservancy Association (CA)

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| Mr Ng Hei Man | - Representer's and Commenter's Representative |
|---------------|--|

R90 – Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS)

- | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ms Wong Suet Mei | - Representer's Representative |
|------------------|--------------------------------|

R91 – Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation (KFBGC)

R4788 – Lau Sin Pang

Mr Nip Hin Ming - Representers' Representative

R94/C1 – Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHKL)

R351 – John Robertson Budge

R3708 – Yeung Cheuk Yin

Mr Samuel Wong - Representers' and Commenter's
Representative

R96 – Tsui Hiu Kit, Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) Member

Mr Tsui Hiu Kit - Representer

R97 – Lo Yuen Ting, K&TDC Member

Ms Lo Yuen Ting - Representer

R100 – Poon Chi Shing

R2929/C1286 – Chan Shiu Ying

R4097/C801 – Cheung Lai Fong

Mr Poon Chi Shing - Representer and Representers' and
Commenters' Representative

R101/C3 – Mount Haven Owners' Committee (MHOC)

R1885 – Shing Kam May

R4278/C190 – Mount Haven Concern Group Committee

Mr Leung Chee Kin Roger - Representers' and Commenters'
Representative

R104/C836 – Dao Wing Yi

R1992 – Dao Ching Yi Tina

R1993/C838 – Dao Che Chong

R1994/C839 – Chow Yuk Wah

R1995/C837 – Lin Di

R1996/C841 – Dao Chun Ming

Ms Dao Wing Yi

- Representer/Commenter and Representers' and Commenters' Representative

R126/C449 – Chan Chi Wing

R893 – Chan Leong Sing Leslie

Mr Chan Chi Wing

- Representer/Commenter and Representer's Representative

R132/C1429 – Tsang Perry Kin

R1778/C1427 – Tsang Kong Po

R2418/C1480 – Tsang Elroy Yu Zit

Mr Tsang Perry Kin

- Representer/Commenter and Representers' and Commenters' Representative

7. 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 at this session of the meeting held on 16.5.2022. For better time management and smooth running of the meeting, no further briefing would be given by PlanD at the subsequent sessions. Instead, the PowerPoint and the presentation given by PlanD's representative would be uploaded to the Board's website for viewing by the representers and commenters. After PlanD's presentation, 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 in each of the hearing session after all attending representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, representers, commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government

representatives, the representers, commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would deliberate on 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.

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

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendment, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10827 (the Paper).

10. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

R132/C1429 – Tsang Perry Kin

R1778/C1427 – Tsang Kong Po

R2418/C1480 – Tsang Elroy Yu Zit

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tsang Perry Kin made the following main points:

- (a) about 98% of the representations/comments objected to the amendment while only 2% expressed support;
- (b) the 10-year construction period (from Q1 2024 to Q3 2034) was too long for a site of 2.73 ha with provision of only 3,800 units, as compared with other major infrastructures in Hong Kong, such as railway developments and the three-runway system for airport expansion which were or would be completed in less than 10 years. The long construction period would likely be due to the fact that the representation site (the Site) was situated in a

valley with dense vegetation, and substantial site formation works with land filling of about 21m in height (approximately 7 storeys high) would be required for the proposed public housing development. Such design would induce higher construction cost and longer time, and cause more serious environmental impacts on the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone covering the Site. The Government should review the proposed development at the Site in a holistic manner and consider other more cost-effective alternative sites. Developments in Lantau Tomorrow Vision (LTV) and Northern Metropolis would be better options to increase housing supply;

- (c) the traffic capacity of Ching Hong Road (CHR) was already saturated especially during the peak hours. The construction of the proposed 1.9km long sewerage pipes underneath CHR would further exacerbate the local traffic during the construction stage. Also, the construction cost of such sewerage facility was expensive and disproportionate to the production of merely 3,800 units. The proposed development should not be supported at the planning stage;
- (d) the adverse impacts of the proposed development on the “GB” zone and its surroundings were irreversible. More than 1,260 trees would be felled and the actual number might be more as the tree survey did not cover some young trees with tree trunk diameter less than 95mm at breast height. The feasibility of the transplanting proposal and the compensatory planting proposal was questionable as there was insufficient information provided, such as the location of the transplanted trees and the off-site planting of some 300 compensatory trees, and all arrangements would only be explored later in the detailed design stage. The removal of large number of trees would require additional retaining works for slope stabilization, thus increasing more construction cost and time;
- (e) he had been living in Tsing Yi for many years. The government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in Tsing Yi had long been in deficit, particularly for hospital services, community care services (CCS) facilities, residential care home for the elderly (RCHE), and child care centre (CCC)

etc. There was no hospital in Tsing Yi and the nearest ones were Princess Margaret Hospital in Lai Chi Kok and Yan Chai Hospital in Tsuen Wan. Additional population brought by the proposed development would intensify the demand of these services. While some GIC facilities would be proposed within the Site, there were no details on the types of GIC facilities to be provided and how they would be implemented; and

- (f) he disagreed with the proposed ecological mitigation measures as various native species would be significantly affected. There was no detail on the proposed mitigation measure of “capture-and-translocation” of aquatic fauna such as *Cryptopotamon anacoluthon* (鰓刺溪蟹) and *Nanhaipotamon hongkongense* (香港南海溪蟹), and it was doubtful whether such measure would be effective in mitigating the impacts due to watercourse diversion.

[Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng joined this session of the meeting during Mr Tsang’s presentation.]

R65 – Seto Pik Kuen

12. Ms Seto Pik Kuen made the following main points:

- (a) being a resident in Tsing Yi, she considered that health care and hospital services were not sufficient in the area;
- (b) the capacity of local road and public transport in Tsing Yi was already saturated; and
- (c) the public housing allocation method and the arrangement of sales of public housing units should be reviewed with a view to ensuring that more housing units would be available for applicants who had been in the waiting list for a long time.

R90 – HKBWS

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wong Suet Mei made the following main points:

- (a) members of HKBWS had all along been keeping records of birds in Hong Kong, and the Site and its surroundings were amongst the regular reporting locations. According to their records, there were various bird species of passage migrants found in the areas around Tsing Yi Nature Trails (the Nature Trails), Liu To, Tsing Yi Road West (TYRW) Park etc. where the habitat was similar to the country park or mature secondary woodland. Some of them were woodland-dependent birds (e.g. Grey-headed Canary-flycatcher (方尾鵯), Blue-and-white Flycatcher (白腹姬鵯), Black-naped Monarch (黑枕王鵯) and Asian Brown Flycatcher (北灰鵯), Indochinese Yuhina (栗耳鳳鶯), Scarlet Minivet (赤紅山椒鳥), Black-winged Cuckooshrike (暗灰鶇鶇)) and some were stream/river dependent (e.g. Little Egret (小白鷺), Black-crowned Night Heron (夜鷺) and White-throated Kingfisher (白胸翡翠)). Some of these species were uncommon, rare and scarce in Hong Kong. Other species included Crested Goshawk (鳳頭鷹), as observed at the Site in a recent site visit, and Besra (松雀鷹) which were Class II Protection Status in China. It was also anticipated through their observations that young birds of Crested Goshawk might be potentially nurtured in the said areas of Tsing Yi;
- (b) other species were also observed in the surrounding areas of the Site, including snakes (e.g. Indo-Chinese Rat Snake (過樹榕)) and dragonflies (e.g. Common Shadow-emerald (颶中偽蜻)), which had reflected that the quality of natural habitat in these areas was good. Endemic crab species could easily be found in the streams in the western part of the Site (e.g. *Cryptopotamon anacoluton* and *Nanhaipotamon hongkongense*) which would be directly impacted by the proposed development. Capture-and-translocation was recommended as a mitigation measure in the ecological assessment, but no information on the implementation details and successful previous cases were provided;

- (c) some orchards were found at the Site, but they had been abandoned for many years. The woodland thereat had been transforming into a piece of mature woodland which had attracted different kinds of birds to frequent the areas;
- (d) it was disappointing that the baseline ecological survey did not include information such as surveying period, surveying time, and if there was any night survey. A full list of species recorded in the survey should be provided to reflect the conditions of the habitat for birds of passage migrants; and
- (e) HKBWS considered it appropriate to retain the previous “GB” zoning of the Site which was intended to define the outer limits of urbanised districts with existing natural features appropriate as such features could be easily found within the Site. According to Chapter 10 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), “GB” zone was to promote conservation or protection of the environment. Under the “GB” review, only “GB” zone which was devegetated, deserted or formed, or had insignificant buffering function and relatively low conservation value, even if it was vegetated, would be considered for residential development. However, the Site contained woodland of “low to moderate” ecological value and the watercourse of “moderate” ecological value which should be treated as an integral part of the whole “GB” zone. The rezoning of the Site was inconsistent with the criteria under the “GB” review, undermined the planning intention of the “GB” zone, and set an undesirable precedent for similar “GB” rezoning for development in Hong Kong. The rezoning would also affect the existing Nature Trails which was a popular hiking trail in Hong Kong.

[Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung joined this session of the meeting during Ms Wong’s presentation.]

R89/C2 – CA

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Hei Man made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was well-wooded. Although there were once orchards within the Site, it was currently a piece of mature woodland with a variety of plant species;
- (b) due to the topography of the Site, large-scale site formation would be required for development and the Site would ultimately be surrounded by retaining walls. Substantial adverse impacts of the proposed development on the natural habitat of the surrounding areas was anticipated, such as felling a large number of trees within the Site. The piecemeal tree compensation arrangement as recommended in the ecological assessment would not be able to re-create a habitat with integrity and ecological value comparable to the existing condition;
- (c) there would be significant visual changes due to the loss of woodland. According to the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), the visual impacts on 10 viewpoints were considered to be “significantly adverse” to “moderately adverse” even with the proposed mitigation measures in place. In other words, the visual impacts could not be mitigated and CA could not agree that the proposed development was technically feasible;
- (d) the Site was situated in a valley and the development of which would be difficult and not cost-effective, as more than 10 years of construction time was anticipated even if the government departments could closely work together to strive for achieving a shorter construction period and less construction cost. The development of the Site should not be identified as one of the short to medium-term measures to increase housing land supply and hence, it was not in line with the intention of the “GB” review;
- (e) there would be potential impact on the ecology in the lower watercourse due to the increase in sediment, and potential of accelerating risk on flash flood in the diverted stream;
- (f) the Site and the surrounding areas were still performing a good buffer function as a “GB” zone with close linkages with adjacent habitats. The proposed rezoning of the Site would set an undesirable precedent for similar “GB”

rezoning proposals in future and affect the integrity of habitats in different districts of Hong Kong; and

- (g) whilst provision of adequate housing and environmental conservation were not contradictory to each other, the Site was considered not suitable for residential development and better land supply alternatives, such as the use of brownfield and idle Government sites, should be considered.

R91 – KFBGC

R4788 – Lau Sin Pang

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Nip Hin Ming made the following main points:

- (a) the Site, located in the valley, was covered with vegetation of native species. Although some man-made features such as orchards and stone walls were identified within the Site, the area generally existed in a natural state. The orchards within the Site had been abandoned for many years and the Site had regenerated into a secondary woodland. The condition of streams thereat was as good as normal natural streams;
- (b) the tree survey did not cover some young trees with tree trunk diameter less than 95mm at breast height, and hence, there would be more than 1,260 trees, as claimed in the tree survey, to be felled in future;
- (c) during their site visit, it was observed that species found within the Site were similar to those in the country parks. The Site and the surrounding areas formed an integrated habitat supporting a variety of species, and hence the ecological value of the Site as a “GB” zone should not be considered as low. The condition of the Nature Trails was similar to those in the country parks with mature secondary woodland and ecological function. The entire “GB” zone was functioning as a country park for Tsing Yi in terms of ecological and recreational aspects;

- (d) there were better alternatives for public housing development in other areas, rather than using “GB” zone. For example, the restructuring and consolidating of brownfield operations in Shek Kong within multi-storey buildings could help release the brownfield sites for public housing developments in a scale similar to that of Mei Foo Sun Chuen; and
- (e) based on KFBGC’s experience in stream conservation, the design and effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures of “green channel” were questionable. In particular, KFBGC had already raised the concern to the Government that the use of gabion as banks of the diverted stream was not a good solution as such design could not retain the sediments along the river bank for ecological regeneration.

R94/C1 – DHKL

R351 – John Robertson Budge

R3708 – Yeung Cheuk Yin

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Samuel Wong made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was not suitable for residential development due to the presence of potentially hazardous installations (PHIs) in the vicinity, i.e. the oil depot in southwest Tsing Yi (namely Shell Tsing Yi Installation (STYI)). Half of the Site fell within the 1 km Consultation Zone (CZ) of STYI, and there was another oil depot located within 2 km of the Site;
- (b) it was the Government’s intention to reduce risk by relocating the oil depots to southwest Tsing Yi. Thus, the proposed residential development with population located within 1km of STYI was unreasonable and would put the future residents’ life in danger;
- (c) according to the Hazard Assessment (HA) in support of the proposed development, it was concluded that the individual risk criteria fell within the level of “As Low As Reasonably Practicable” (“ALARP”), but not the so-

called “acceptable” level as claimed by PlanD and the difference in risk potential amongst the two levels could be more than 10 times. While the mountain backdrop to the southwest of the Site might function as a physical barrier in case of hazardous event, the building height (BH) (about 220mPD) of the proposed development at the Site was higher than the ridgeline. Hence, the highest storeys of the proposed development would be directly exposed to STYI in future. It was also noted that Ching Wah Court, the nearby residential development which also fell within the 1 km CZ of STYI and was slightly taller than the ridgeline, was in existence in 1986 before the development of STYI and should not be considered as a comparable example to support the proposed development at the Site;

- (d) the Government should develop brownfield sites instead of slope areas for public housing as the latter would involve higher construction and maintenance cost. Also, there were other alternatives, e.g. a flat land near Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Kwai Fong Station which was more than 30,000m² in area; and
- (e) some existing housing developments in Tuen Mun, Tai Wo Ping and Tsing Yi already demonstrated that developments on sloping sites had induced more site formation and slope works due to safety issue, and felling of trees outside the development sites.

R96 – Tsui Hiu Kit, K&TDC Member

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tsui Hiu Kit made the following main points:

- (a) he was a K&TDC member and the constituency he was responsible for included Ching Wah Court. In general, increasing land supply to address the housing demand was supported, but the Site was not a suitable location;
- (b) he recalled that K&TDC received the consultation documents in respect of the proposed development at the Site provided by the Government on 7.5.2021 for

discussion at a meeting on 11.5.2021. There was insufficient time for K&TDC member to consult the locals. The consultation documents received by K&TDC were less than ten pages and in lack of sufficient details. It was considered unacceptable comparing with the documents of over a hundred pages submitted for the Board's consideration. Adequate information should be provided for DC consultation;

- (c) there was a traffic bottleneck at CHR near the bus stop at Hong Shun House and the exit of carpark of Cheung Hong Estate especially during peak hours. Road widening works, which had been suggested by K&TDC, should be carried out immediately to address the traffic problem before the proposed development at the Site could be allowed by the Board;
- (d) there would be new residential developments in Tsing Yi, such as CHR North public housing development (at Cheung Ching Estate), The Met. Azure (薈藍) (near Cheung Wang Estate), The Grand Marine (明翹匯) (near Mayfair Gardens), and Ching Fu Court (at Tsing Yi Road/Tsing Hung Road). The new population intake would increase the demand for more local traffic on the existing road networks which were already saturated, especially along CHR and Chung Mei Road;
- (e) there was insufficient parking facility in Tsing Yi, in particular for the area around the Site, and serious illegal street parking at CHR and Chung Mei Road was observed;
- (f) there was insufficient night clinic service for the residents. The proposed development would not improve the provision of community facilities, but would adversely affect the local community with the increase in population; and
- (g) other alternative sites for public housing development were suggested to the Government, such as the one near Tsing Yi North Coastal Road. However, there was no response from the Government.

R97 – Lo Yuen Ting, K&TDC Member

18. With the aid of some site photos, Ms Lo Yuen Ting made the following main points:

- (a) she was discontent with the consultation arrangement for K&TDC as insufficient documents were provided to K&TDC members and there was inadequate time for conducting local consultation. There were various local issues in Tsing Yi that the Government had not resolved for many years, such as insufficient public transport services and provision of carpark, health care services and community facilities. No detailed information on the provision/enhancement of new facilities/services in Tsing Yi was provided by the Government. Without resolving these local issues, introducing additional population in Tsing Yi would worsen the quality of the living environment of residents there;
- (b) since 2014, K&TDC had conveyed to the Government the public comments that the Site was not suitable for housing development. The existing local road networks, including TYRW, Tsing Tsuen Bridge, Fung Shue Wo Road and Liu To Road, were saturated with traffic congestion especially during the peak hours or when there was road accident, and would not be able to cater to the additional traffic generated by the proposed development. The findings in the Preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (PTTIA) was questionable in that the new residential developments such as CHR North public housing development, The Met. Azure and The Grand Marine as well as the newly completed Transport Department Vehicle Examination Complex in Tsing Yi were not taken into account in the traffic estimation. The PTTIA indicated that there remained only about 30% traffic capacity for the section of TYRW near the Site while the existing traffic capacity of Tsing Tsuen Bridge had already reached 80%;
- (c) the Site was located near a black spot of traffic accidents with some of them involving fatal injury, as TYRW was a high speed road frequented by many heavy vehicles and there was a petrol filling station in the vicinity of the Site;

- (d) the air ventilation assessment (AVA) and VIA in support of the OZP amendment indicated that the proposed development would affect the prevailing winds to the surroundings of the Site and there would be adverse visual impacts on the nearby communities, and the proposed measures could not mitigate such adverse impacts; and
- (e) the construction cost was high for the proposed development. K&TDC had suggested other alternative sites near Tsing Yi North Coastal Road or areas reserved for Container Terminal No. 10. However, there was no response from the Government.

R100 – Poon Chi Shing

R2929/C1286 – Chan Shiu Ying

R4097/C801 – Cheung Lai Fong

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Poon Chi Shing made the following main points:

- (a) the Government had not resolved the issues previously raised by the locals, such as the lack of community facilities and traffic congestion. The locals were discontented with and against the proposed development at the Site;
- (b) as the PTTIA focused only on the traffic flow and there was no discussion on the estimation of the capacity of public transport services, it was doubtful whether the Transport Department (TD) would be obligated to provide adequate public transport services for the existing and future residents in Tsing Yi. The road improvement works previously committed by the Government for the development of Ching Fu Court had not yet been realised;
- (c) the Site was considered not suitable for housing development as TYRW was a sloping road with steep gradient and there had always been traffic safety concerns thereat. For instance, there were many traffic accidents involving injury in September 2021. The proposed ingress/egress design of the

development allowing only left turn from the Site would unreasonably increase traffic circulation at Tsing Yi Interchange;

- (d) it was doubtful whether the proposed footbridge connection was cost effective. K&TDC previously suggested a similar footbridge which the Government considered at that time that there were technical constraints due to the sloping topography and the cost was estimated to be over \$50 millions merely for the lift towers of the footbridge. The design of the footbridge could cater for over 10,000 new residents walking from the Site to Cheung Hong Estate for public transport services was also questionable;
- (e) the BH of about 220mPD for the proposed development would be the tallest development in Tsing Yi in future. It would block the views from Mount Haven, but the VIA did not include any viewpoint from Mount Haven which should be regarded as sensitive receivers in respect of visual impact; and
- (f) there was a noise barrier for mitigating the traffic noise from TYRW for Cheung Hang Estate. However, there was no noise impact assessment conducted nor mitigation measures proposed for the proposed development at the Site.

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

R101/C3 – MHOC

R1885 – Shing Kam May

R4278/C190 – Mount Haven Concern Group Committee

20. With the aid of visualizer and some pictures, Mr Leung Chee Kin Roger made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Vice-chairman of MHOC. The proposed development would cause a lot of problems to the surrounding areas and jeopardize the living environment, health and welfare of the residents of Mount Haven, who had been enjoying the fresh air, scenic view of woodland valley and good daylight

etc. The consequence of allowing the proposed development was irreversible;

- (b) the “GB” zone served as greenery areas for the residents of Mount Haven and contributed to a quality living environment. The felling of more than 1,260 trees for the proposed development was a kind of deforestation which would seriously affect the ecological environment of the “GB” zone. There were four to five *Aquilaria sinensis* of high conservation value within the Site, but no details on the transplantation proposal was provided. The implementation of translocation of *Nanhaiopotamon hongkongense* was also questionable as no detailed arrangement was formulated in the planning stage;
- (c) the topography of the Site imposed technical constraints on the proposed development and extensive site formation work, especially substantial land filling would be required, resulting in higher construction cost and longer construction time. Hence, the proposed development at the Site was not cost-effective at all;
- (d) he disagreed with the “infill development approach”, and there were better locations for public housing development than the Site such as the mobile cabin hospital site in Tsing Yi and the industrial area in the northern Tsing Yi. Other alternatives would be brownfield and idle Government sites, as well as the developments in LTV and Northern Metropolis;
- (e) the Site was within 1 km of STYI which was for storage of aviation fuel and was toxic and highly flammable. The fuel at STYI could be easily spread out to the Site by wind. Hence, no residential development should be allowed within the 1km of such dangerous PHI. No details on the fuel type were mentioned in the HA and the recommendations were questionable;
- (f) the scale of the proposed development, with plot ratio (PR) of 6.4 near the low-density residential development of Mount Haven zoned “Residential (Group B)” was not acceptable. It was noted that the PR for housing developments in Tai Po taken forward through rezoning of “GB” was only 4.8;

- (g) the proposed development would block the daylight penetration to Mount Haven, especially for Blocks 1, 2, 3 and 6, as well as the open views from Mount Haven and Ching Wah Court. No wind tunnel test was carried out under the AVA, and there might be wind shear impact on Mount Haven. The Site would also induce potential flooding and landslide impacts on Mount Haven;
- (h) the additional population of the proposed development would further increase the demand on hospital and clinic facilities/services as well as community facilities/services for the elderly and child care in Tsing Yi which had long been in deficit;
- (i) according to the PTTIA, the proposed development would induce more traffic flow at Tsing Yi Interchange and Tam Kon Shan Interchange leading to Kwai Chung and other urban areas. The usage of these interchanges would increase from about 40%-50% to 60%-80% by the design year 2037, which would be close to saturation. The assessment had not taken into account the long-term additional traffic generated by the planned transport facilities, e.g. the three-runway system under airport expansion and Route 11, the relocation of wholesale poultry market to Tsing Yi, as well as the recurrence of economic activities after the end of pandemic. There was also no long-term traffic and transport planning for Tsing Yi as a whole;
- (j) the proposed ingress/egress for the Site was not desirable and would cause traffic safety concerns at TYRW;
- (k) the proposed development was not supported by adequate assessments. The MHOC had previously requested for inspection of various assessment reports, but it was noted that most of the assessments would only be undertaken at the detailed design stage;
- (l) there was insufficient and no proper public consultation for the proposed development, and insufficient time for K&TDC to study the details of the

proposed development. K&TDC unanimously passed a motion that the proposed development should be suspended or withdrawn; and

- (m) to conclude, the proposed development was unanimously objected to as the location of the Site was not suitable for development. The project should be abandoned permanently unless the residents of Mount Haven and the nearby residents were satisfied with the proposed mitigation measures.

R104/C836 – Dao Wing Yi

R1992 – Dao Ching Yi Tina

R1993/C838 – Dao Che Chong

R1994/C839 – Chow Yuk Wah

R1995/C837 – Lin Di

R1996/C841 – Dao Chun Ming

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Dao Wing Yi made the following main points:

- (a) she played a short video clip showing the environment of the Site and the local activities related to the “Liu To Music Festival” held at the valley area in Liu To;
- (b) she was a resident of Cheung Hang Estate for many years, and she was proud of her father for having participated in the construction of TYRW, which was the main vehicular access of Tsing Yi for residents of Cheung Hang Estate, Cheung Wang Estate, Mount Haven and The Met. Azure. The “GB” zone was like the backyard full of memories for the nearby residents;
- (c) the Nature Trails was frequently visited by the nearby residents who found the experience enjoyable. There were also local community groups organizing different activities such as eco-tour or photography event, for the nearby residents;
- (d) there was a lack of consultation with the locals and explanation on the

proposed development by the Government;

- (e) the proposed development would adversely affect the natural environment and ecology of the area. The long construction time of 10 years would induce air and noise pollutions affecting the nearby residents of Mount Haven and Ching Wah Court as well as the teachers/students at the nearby Lok Sin Tong Leung Chik Wai Memorial School and Po Leung Kuk Chan Yat Primary School;
- (f) the additional population of more than 10,000 people would bring significant pressure on the traffic network, especially CHR, and the capacity of which had already been saturated for a long time;
- (g) there was no hospital in Tsing Yi, but the demand for such services was high. The additional population from the new residential developments would further increase the pressure on health care services in Tsing Yi in future; and
- (h) given the high construction cost and long construction time, it was doubtful whether the proposed development was worthwhile to be pursued. In gist, the Site was not suitable for housing development, and the project should be permanently suspended.

[Dr Venus Y.H. Lun joined this session of meeting during Ms Dao's presentation.]

22. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, 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 Site and building height

23. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether alternative sites for the proposed public development in Tsing Yi had been considered and the potential of the alternative sites mentioned by representers/commenters; and
- (b) elaboration on the overall BH profile in the surrounding areas and whether the BH of the proposed development could be reduced.

24. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK made the following responses:

- (a) to increase land supply for housing development, 13 sites including The Met. Azure, Ching Fu Court, The Grand Marine and the Site were previously identified within K&T District and they were currently in different planning/development stages. The alternative sites suggested by the representers/commenters, mainly including shipyards in the northern Tsing Yi currently in operation; a site without vehicular access and reserved for recreation and tourism related use in western Tsing Yi; industrial areas adjoining the oil depots and the container terminal in the southern and southeastern Tsing Yi respectively; and the existing open space near St. Paul's Village and petrol filling stations along TYRW were considered not suitable for housing development; and
- (b) for optimal utilisation of land resources for public housing development with public transport interchange (PTI) and GIC facilities, the proposed BH of 220mPD for the proposed development was considered reasonable. As shown on Plan H-5 of the Paper, the maximum BH of Cheung Wang Estate, Cheung Hang Estate, Cheung Hong Estate and Mount Haven was 196mPD, 190mPD, 154mPD and 103mPD respectively.

Implementation programme, cost estimate and site formation

25. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether any cost estimate was made under the EFS;

- (b) whether the 10-year construction programme for the proposed development was reasonable comparing with those of other public housing developments, and whether there was scope to shorten the construction period; and
- (c) the type of materials to be used for land filling during site formation, and apart from the proposed land filling, whether other site formation methods had been considered such as platform on stilts.

26. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD and Mr Dickson K.C. Mok, SPO/DC, HD made the following responses:

- (a) while the internal initial cost estimate was acceptable to the departments concerned, the final cost estimate for the proposed development would need to be further assessed at detailed design stage. CEDD and HD would work closely together on the site formation works required for the proposed development with a view to controlling the overall construction cost;
- (b) the 10-year implementation programme was tentatively scheduled for commencement in 2024, and could be broadly divided into two major stages: site formation by CEDD and construction of superstructures for the proposed development by HD. The site formation stage would require about 4.5 years to complete various processes including land acquisition and clearance exercise, translocation of valuable species and stream diversion works etc., which would need to be largely completed before the commencement of site formation works. The construction of superstructures stage was tentatively scheduled for commencement in 2028 after the site formation work stage. It was estimated to take about five to six years to complete due to the proposed development on a sloping site and the construction of podium structures accommodating a PTI and social welfare and carpark facilities as compared to the four to five years required for public housing development on levelled land with no major geotechnical issues and without podium or basement. There was scope to shorten the programme, and CEDD and HD would work closely to achieve that; and

- (c) construction and demolition materials would be considered for the proposed filling works at the Site. Nevertheless, CEDD would further liaise with HD on the requirements of filling material in order not to severely limit the choice of piling options. As for the site formation method, the current plan was to use land filling at the bottom with stilts above to support the platform of the development which could reduce the construction cost and time. In other words, the Site would not be filled entirely from the bottom of the valley up to the existing level of TYRW. However, due to the provision of a PTI at grade level, it would be technically difficult to lower the entire site level (or to adopt a stepped height podium design) for the proposed development to further minimise the scale of site formation works and land filling required.

Provision of GIC facilities

27. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the future population of Tsing Yi in 10 years' time and the population increase in Tsing Yi due to the proposed development in terms of percentage;
- (b) whether hospital services for residents in Tsing Yi were adequate taking into account the proposed development;
- (c) whether there was provision of primary and secondary schools to cater for the additional population due to the proposed development; and
- (d) whether the surrounding natural greenery of the proposed development could be counted as local open space (LOS), so that the size of the podium for providing LOS could be reduced.

28. With the aid of some Powerpoint slides, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK made the following responses:

- (a) according to the 2016 Population By-census, the population of Tsing Yi was

estimated as about 184,000 whereas the planned population of the proposed housing development would be about 10,300 (about 5.6% of the Tsing Yi population). There was currently no other planned residential development in Tsing Yi;

- (b) hospital services for Tsing Yi, including the Site, were under the Kowloon West Cluster (KWC) which comprised Caritas Medical Centre, Kwai Chung Hospital, North Lantau Hospital, Princess Margaret Hospital and Yan Chai Hospital, all of which provided about 4,835 beds in total. According to the First and Second Ten-year Hospital Development Plans (HDPs) of the Hospital Authority, about 2,310 additional beds (including about 1,000 additional beds in Princess Margaret Hospital and 300 additional beds in Yan Chai Hospital) would be provided for serving the population in KWC. There was no hospital in Tsing Yi, and the closest hospital for the Tsing Yi residents was Yan Chai Hospital in Tsuen Wan and it would take about 8 minutes to drive or about 20 to 30 minutes by public transport to get there from Tsing Yi; for Princess Margaret Hospital, it would take about 13 minutes to drive or about 40 to 50 minutes by public transport. There were also clinics in Tsing Yi, including two public clinics, i.e. Tsing Yi Cheung Hong General Out-patient Clinic in Cheung Hong Estate and Tsing Yi Town General Out-patient Clinic on Tsing Luk Street;
- (c) taking into account the additional population, there would still be a surplus of 55 classrooms for primary school and 1 classroom for secondary school in Tsing Yi. Thus, no additional school was requested by the Education Bureau; and
- (d) the provision of 1m² of LOS per person within the proposed development was in accordance with the requirement of HKPSG. As a general rule, natural greenery area in the vicinity of a development could not be counted as LOS for serving that particular development. Besides, provision of LOS was not the determining factor for the scale of the podium, which was related more to the provision of a PTI and GIC facilities.

Traffic and Transport

29. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) taking into account the proposed development, elaboration on the traffic capacity of the road networks (including the construction stage) and any traffic and transport measures to be carried out in the area;
- (b) whether there were alternatives for the 1.9 km sewerage pipes underneath CHR which would cause potential traffic impact to the road networks during the construction stage;
- (c) clarification on the provision of parking spaces in the proposed development, and whether additional parking spaces could be provided to benefit the surrounding residents; and
- (d) whether there was any potential traffic safety problem associated with the ingress/egress design of the proposed development in view that TYRW was a high speed road.

30. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD and Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK made the following responses:

- (a) based on the PTTIA for the proposed development, the volume to capacity (V/C) ratios for CHR and TYRW (section between CHR and Liu To Road) would be about 0.79 and 0.46 respectively in the design year 2037. Any road with V/C ratio equal or less than 1.0 would have sufficient capacity to cope with the anticipated traffic volume. Regarding the traffic capacity for the junction of TYRW/CHR, the remaining capacity at the morning peak hours in the design year 2037 would be about 40%. The daily capacities of TYRW and CHR (section between Chung Mei Road and Tsing Yi Road) adopted in the assessment were about 1,900 and 2,200 vehicles per hour for each bound respectively. During the construction stage, about 144 vehicular trips per day

were anticipated to be generated, hence insurmountable traffic problem were not anticipated. Suitable construction traffic management during the construction stage would be considered to minimize the number of construction vehicles during peak hours;

- (b) the proposed 1.9 km sewerage pipes underneath CHR were the feasible option in EFS. CEDD was currently exploring a shorter alternative along CHR and Chung Mei Road which could reduce the construction cost and minimise the impact on the local traffic;
- (c) the provision of parking facilities for the proposed development would comply with the requirements of the HKPSG, i.e. 1 parking space per every 8 to 14 units. While the exact provision would be determined in the detailed design stage, an upper end provision has been adopted for the purpose of assessment; and
- (d) the concerned section of TYRW was not a traffic accident black spot. The ingress/egress of the proposed development was designed in accordance with the Transport Planning and Design Manual promulgated by TD. Regarding the comments on whether right-turn exit could be allowed from the Site to TYRW (southbound), this option would be further reviewed in the detailed design stage subject to traffic safety consideration.

Air Ventilation and Visual Impact

31. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) elaboration on the visual impacts of the proposed development and the mitigation measures; and
- (b) major findings of the AVA and whether wind shear issue was relevant.

32. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK and Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD made the following responses:

- (a) as there were no strategic viewpoints, only local viewpoints where the public frequently accessed/visited (e.g. parks, trails, footbridges etc.) had been selected for assessment in the VIA. The photomontages for the selected local viewpoints showed that the proposed development, which would be situated on a higher level of the hilly and vegetated terrain, would unavoidably result in changes in visual character of the Site and loss of some visual permeability and openness. As such, the visual impacts were considered to be ranging from “slightly to moderately adverse” for viewpoints located further away from the Site to “significantly adverse” for those close to the Site, even with mitigation measures (e.g. landscape treatment, building separation, adoption of sensible building design with use of finishing materials/colour/façade etc.) put in place. That notwithstanding, for viewpoints away from the Site, it could be observed that the proposed development could be generally perceived as an extension of the surrounding high-rise residential clusters; and
- (b) the AVA focused on the evaluation of the local wind environment with assessment on the prevailing winds and whether the proposed development would bring forth any adverse impacts for which mitigation measures would be required. According to the AVA, the prevailing winds came from mainly the south-southwest, south, south-southeast and east during the summer time. Building setback along the stream at the western fringe of the Site to allow for wind flow from the south in general and building gaps between residential towers and on top of the podium for wind flow from the east were proposed. Wind shear, which was understood to be a phenomenon involving the change in wind speed and/or direction over a short distance with possible implications for aviation safety, was not a relevant aspect to be taken into account in the AVA-Expert Evaluation (AVA-EE) under the EFS.

Ecology and Stream Diversion

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

- (a) how the stream diversion would be implemented; how the ecological impact

caused by stream diversion could be minimised by the proposed mitigation measures; and if there was any successful case of stream diversion in Hong Kong;

- (b) whether translocation of the aquatic fauna of conservation importance, i.e. *Cryptopotamon anacoluthon* and *Nanhaipotamon hongkongense*, from the Site to the adjoining “GB” zone would be possible; and whether the ecological value of the adjoining “GB” zone could be further enhanced; and
- (c) elaboration on the ecological assessment, and whether there were any updates.

34. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD and Mr Eric Y.H. Wong, SNCO(C), AFCD made the following responses:

- (a) the existing stream within the Site would be diverted alongside the western fringe of the Site (the diverted watercourse). While maintaining the stream flow from the south to north, the diverted watercourse would also be designed to allow revitalisation of habitat for the aquatic fauna species with incorporation of ecological elements such as rock pools, riffles, and features that could facilitate variation in water flow and maintain ecological connectivity. To increase the habitat complexity of the diverted watercourse, gabions with irregular surface for retaining sediments will be used to build the watercourse bank, in the hope of simulating the environment and function of a natural habitat for the aquatic fauna. Although no direct comparable case could be provided for reference, as observed from AFCD’s experiences, if the water quality of the natural stream could be maintained in the upper stream course while the river bank in the lower stream course had suitable substrata, the vegetation in the lower stream course could be re-generated and converted into a habitat similar to the natural stream over the time. Examples of watercourses which were enhanced with adoption of man-made features included the revitalization of Kai Tak Nullah and other drainage works for natural streams in Northwest New Territories (NWNT) carried out by the Drainage Services Department;

- (b) CEDD would endeavour to translocate any ecologically valuable species identified within the Site as much as practical. Plants, aquatic fauna and birds were the three main categories of species that were assessed by their ecological values and mobility. Four immature *Aquilaria sinensis* were identified and suitable locations would be carefully selected for transplantation in future. As there were other streams nearby, CEDD would assess whether those streams would be suitable for the translocation of the aquatic fauna such as *Cryptopotamon anacoluthon* and *Nanhaipotamon hongkongense*. For raptor species, such as Crested Goshawk, their range of activity was large when compared with the area of the Site, no translocation proposal was proposed as the birds could look for areas suitable for foraging; and
- (c) the ecological assessment was carried out between May and October 2019 and the ecological value of the species identified was evaluated based on the relevant criteria of the Technical Memorandum on Environmental Impact Assessment Process (i.e. Table 3 of Annex 8). It concluded that the ecological value of the recorded plant and aquatic fauna species was considered “low to moderate” and the impacts on them were assessed to be “low to moderate”. The ecological assessment had been reviewed after receiving some representations in which some other species (e.g. Crested Goshawk) were mentioned. The consultants had further examined the latest records of HKBWS and considered that the Site was not the habitat for Crested Goshawk and the proposed development would not induce impact on this species.

35. A Member raised that Kai Tak Nullah was not a comparable example as it was a man-made nullah, whereas the stream within the Site was natural. Mr Nip Hin Ming (R91) further supplemented that the examples in NWNT mentioned by AFCD were Kam Tin River and Shan Pui River which were man-made river channels subsequently benefited by the tidal effects, rather than stream flow effects, and a new habitat was recreated. The recreated habitat was not equivalent to the original natural habitat. Besides, given the slope within the Site was steep, the speed of stream flow would be so high that could hardly allow sediment depositing along the bank of diverted stream, especially with the use of gabions which was considered a bad design.

Hazard assessment

36. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) clarification on the purpose of CZ for PHIs and whether the level of “ALARP” for the societal risks as reported in the HA was an acceptable safety level for the proposed development; and
- (b) whether the BH was a factor affecting the risk level.

37. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD made the following responses:

- (a) as the Site fell within the 1km CZ of the PHIs, i.e. the STYI, a HA was required to assess whether there would be any potential hazard impact on the proposed development. The HA was conducted in accordance with the prevailing risk management policy and the potential risks had been assessed in compliance with the Risk Guidelines adopted by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD). The risk scenarios were assessed by taking into account the materials/fuel stored in the oil depots; the operational process carried out by the oil company; and probability of various risks to be occurred based on some international data etc. The HA concluded that the individual risk criteria for the proposed development complied with the Risk Guidelines under HKPSG whereas the societal risks were within the level of “ALARP”. The assessment results were submitted to the Coordinating Committee on Land-use Planning and Control relating to Potential Hazardous Installations (CCPHI) which endorsed the assessment on 20.10.2021; and
- (b) the height factor was not relevant in assessing the potential risk of PHIs. It was not correct to adopt the hills to the southwest of the Site as a buffer from the PHIs in respect of potential risk, and the BH of the proposed development, be it higher or lower than the level of the nearby hilltops, was irrelevant to the result of HA.

38. In response to an enquiry from the Chairperson, Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD, elaborated that a portion of Ching Wah Court also fell within the same CZ. While Ching Wah Court had been in existence before the STYI was moved to the current location, HA would be required if there was any new extension development in that area of Ching Wah Court.

Public consultation

39. A Member enquired on the consultation process and procedures for the current OZP amendment and the documents provided to the Board for consideration. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD explained that administrative and statutory consultation procedures had been carried out for the OZP amendment. K&TDC was consulted on 11.5.2021 and the consultation documents were provided to the secretary of the K&TDC in advance in accordance with their requirements. In response to the motion passed by K&TDC to suspend the proposed development at the Site or to identify an alternative site, the Development Bureau (DEVB) issued a letter to K&TDC on 4.6.2021 providing responses to their concerns and further explaining on the need for rezoning of the Site to meet the housing needs. The extract of minutes of K&TDC meeting on 11.5.2021 and DEVB's letter were in Annexes V and VI of the Paper. The amendment to the OZP was then considered and agreed by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board on 11.6.2021 (the Interim Report of the EFS for the proposed amendment was attached as Attachment V of MPC Paper No. 5/21). The draft OZP was exhibited on 2.7.2021 for public inspection for two months and any person might make representation to the Board in respect of the draft OZP. During the exhibition of the draft OZP and representations, 5,277 valid representations and 1,627 valid comments respectively were received. Besides, PlanD, CEDD and HD jointly attended the residents' meeting hosted by the MHOC and briefed them on the proposed development and the justifications of the OZP amendment on 28.8.2021. The current hearing meetings were subsequently arranged for the Board to consider the representations and comments in respect of the draft OZP.

40. In response to a Member's enquiry on the local consultation carried out by members of K&TDC, Mr Tsui Hiu Kit (R96) and Ms Lo Yuen Ting (R97) replied that they had engaged the community through distribution of leaflets, online consultation, street interview etc. after receiving the consultation documents from the Government in May 2021. They emphasised

that there was insufficient time for the K&TDC members to consult the locals and the consultation paper for K&TDC was too flimsy. The Chairperson clarified that the purpose of consulting DCs, in general, was to provide a preview on the upcoming OZP amendment and DC members could make representations in respect of the OZP amendment(s) within the statutory exhibition period. On that basis, the documents received by K&TDC would not be the same as that submitted for the Board's consideration. It should be noted that the exhibition of draft OZP for representations/comments as well as the hearing of the representations/comments were parts of the statutory public consultation procedures in the plan-making process.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng left, Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong joined and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu rejoined this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

41. As Members did not have further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. She thanked the representers/commenters, their representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate the representations/comments in closed meeting after all hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The representers/commenters, their representatives and the government representatives left the meeting at this point.

42. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 2:45 p.m.

[Professor Roger C.K. Chan left this session of the meeting at this point.]

43. The meeting was resumed at 3:10 p.m.

44. 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

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West
Transport Department
Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

45. The following government representatives, representers, commenters and representers'/commenters' representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

PlanD

Mr Derek P.K. Tse	- DPO/TWK
Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan	- Senior Town Planner/Kwai Tsing

CEDD

Mr C.F. Leung	- CE/SD(W)
Mr K.W. Lee	- Senior Engineer/5

HD

Mr Dickson K.C. Mok	- SPO/DC
Ms Joanne M.Y. Chan	- SA/3
Mr S.W. Lo	- Planning Officer
Mr Y.T. Tso	- Civil Engineer

AFCD

Mr Eric Y.H. Wong	- SNCO(C)
-------------------	-----------

<i>WSP (Asia) Ltd.</i>]
Mr Calvin C.W. Li]
Ms Jessica K.Y. Fung]
]

<i>Ecocystems Ltd.</i>] Consultants
Mr Klinsmann Cheung]
]
<i>Meinhardt Infrastructure</i>]
<i>and Environment Ltd.</i>]
Mr David C.M. Lee]

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R141/C70 – Yu Sze Man

R229/C1616 – Tong Ka Lai

R3983/C426 – Wong Kwan Nok Jeremy

C1556 – Chu Hei Chun

Ms Tong Ka Lai - Representer/Commenter and Representers’
and Commenters’ Representative

R174/C1122 – Chan Wan Chi

R181/C630 – Leung Wai Shing

R1149/C628 – Leung Ho Lun

Ms Chan Wan Chi - Representer/Commenter and Representers’
and Commenters’ Representative

R207/C1404 – Ha Wai Sze

R226/C746 – Hui Keung

R433/C1020 – Lau Yim Wan

R2221/C20 – Lai Chim King

R4362 – Hui Sau Po

R4363/C1086 – Lo Sai Fat

R4370 – Lo Ka Lam

Ms Lau Yim Wan - Representer/Commenter and Representers’
and Commenters’ Representative

R208/C1035 – Szeto Lam Kwan

R3996/C1034 – Leung Siu Ling

Ms Leung Siu Ling

- Representer/Commenter and Representer's and Commenter's Representative

R247/C1623 – Wong Kwok Kuen

R4302/C1065 – Wong Cheuk Ying

R4305/C1066 – Lok Ka Lee Junie

Mr Wong Kwok Kuen

- Representer/Commenter and Representers' and Commenters' Representative

R1751/C1207 - Chang Pai Li

R1752/C1208 – Lai Wei Hsuan Joyce

R1754/C246 - Chang Tsz Nok

Ms Lai Wei Hsuan Joyce

- Representer/Commenter and Representers' and Commenters' Representative

46. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

R141/C70 – Yu Sze Man

R229/C1616 – Tong Ka Lai

R3983/C426 – Wong Kwan Nok Jeremy

C1556 – Chu Hei Chun

47. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Tong Ka Lai made the following main points:

Suitability for Public Housing Development

- (a) the Paper was misleading to state that the Site was mainly surrounded by public housing developments, and play down the proximity of the Site to Mount Haven which was a medium-density private housing development. In fact, Mount Haven was more relevant in assessing suitability of the

proposed development and any development on the Site should be compatible with Mount Haven;

- (b) the Government failed to show that the Site was suitable for the public housing development. It was only indicated in the Paper that the proposed development was technically feasible and there were no insurmountable technical problems. The proposed development with 3,800 units on a small site was too dense when compared with other public housing developments, like Cheung Hang Estate;
- (c) the Site was in a deep valley subject to topographical constraints. Construction of the proposed development would be difficult and the cost would be phenomenal. It was not worthwhile to develop the sloping Site which would only provide some 3,800 public housing units;
- (d) the construction period was exceedingly long with four to five years for the infrastructure works and another five to six years for the building works, with a total of ten years or more. As a result, the proposed development could only be completed in 2034. It would not help meet the pressing demand for public housing. The demand for public housing might change in ten years taking account of the high migration rate to overseas in recent years or more people residing in the Greater Bay Area in future. In any event, there would be ample provision of public housing in the Northern Metropolis in only a few years after the completion of the proposed development;
- (e) the Government should propose public housing elsewhere on top of hillslopes closer to existing public housing developments such that the development could make use of the existing infrastructural and communal facilities. There were more suitable sites in Tsing Yi such as those at Tam Kon Shan, Rambler Crest or other brownfield sites;
- (f) there was no need to provide the proposed community facilities and a large number of car parking spaces at the Site;

Environmental Aspect

- (g) Mount Haven was built in a deep valley enclosed by hillslopes except for the side facing the elevated section of TYRW. The Site was located within the valley in between Mount Haven and TYRW. The proposed massive podium built close to Mount Haven and to a level of about three to six storeys above TYRW would adversely affect the residents of Mount Haven particularly those living on the lower and middle floors. The air ventilation and daylight impacts would be serious but so far, the Government could not provide any data on the actual air ventilation impact on Mount Haven. It was unlikely that the proposed building setbacks and buildings gaps between the residential towers would be able to mitigate the problems. The proposed development would block the prevailing and summer winds from the south and southeast to Mount Haven and Liu To Village;
- (h) the construction noise and air pollution would adversely affect the physical and mental health of the residents of Mount Haven and nearby developments during the prolonged 10-year construction period, particularly for those staying at their homes in the daytime, e.g. the elderly, children and those working at home. The students in the nearby schools and housing developments would also be severely impacted by the construction works. While the Government had indicated that mitigation measures would be adopted, it was unlikely that the mitigation would be effective taking into account similar cases in Richland Gardens and Anderson Road where residents there complained about construction noise nuisance;

Traffic Aspect

- (i) the proposed development and 1.9 km sewerage pipes underneath CHR would cause severe traffic congestion, especially during peak hours; and

Others

- (j) an unprecedented number of opposing comments were received but the views contained therein were ignored.

48. Ms Tong also played a video from a resident of the neighbourhood which made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was not suitable for development. It was not worthwhile to wipe out the landscape and wildlife of the Site in exchange for only some 3,800 public housing units which would not be available within the next 10 years. The proposed stream diversion and compensatory planting could not mitigate the irreversible impacts on the natural environment;
- (b) the residents of the general area covering the Site relied on road-based public transport and the proposed development would cause traffic congestion;
- (c) the residents of the proposed development would be subject to safety hazard due to the proximity to the oil depots (i.e. within the 1 km CZ). Their safety should not be ignored; and
- (d) the existing medical and educational facilities in the area were already insufficient. The proposed development would aggravate the shortfall.

[The Vice-chairperson and Mr L.T. Kwok joined and Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung left this session of the meeting during Ms Tong's presentation.]

R1751/C1207 - Chang Pai Li

R1752/C1208 – Lai Wei Hsuan Joyce

R1754/C246 - Chang Tsz Nok

49. Ms Lai Wei Hsuan Joyce made the following main points:

- (a) there was no consultation with the local residents and public views were neglected;
- (b) the proposed development within a steep valley would take 10 years or even more for completion. It failed to provide a quick answer to address the housing shortage. The high construction cost was a waste of public money. The local residents, especially the elderly and children, would be subject to 10 years of construction noise and air quality impacts. There should be better site options for public housing developments;
- (c) the proposed development that would involve felling a lot of trees and affect a stream and a hiking trail would cause substantial and irreversible ecological, landscape and environmental impacts. The technical assessments of the EFS failed to properly assess the impacts of the proposed development and the findings were not convincing;
- (d) traffic congestion was already severe in Tsing Yi. The proposed development and 1.9 km sewerage pipes underneath CHR would aggravate local congestion, as well as affect road safety and access for emergency services. Besides, the bus services in the area would not be able to cope with the additional transport demand arising from the proposed development; and
- (e) there were already insufficient commercial, medical and community facilities in the area to serve the existing population, and the situation would worsen with the proposed development.

R174/C1122 – Chan Wan Chi

R181/C630 – Leung Wai Shing

R1149/C628 – Leung Ho Lun

50. With the aid of some videos and photos, Ms Chan Wan Chi made the following main points:

Impacts on the Nature Trails

- (a) a section of the Nature Trails was within the Site where abundant wildlife and a stream were present. The Nature Trails was very popular for people of Tsing Yi and Hong Kong. It was also promoted by the Hong Kong Tourism Board to visitors to Hong Kong. The proposed development would cause irreversible impacts which could not be effectively mitigated by the proposed stream and trail diversion and compensatory planting. People would not hike there during the construction period due to the environmental impacts. The natural beauty and serenity of the larger area covering the Site should not be sacrificed for a housing development;
- (b) the Nature Trails linked the Site and Mount Haven to the ridgeline of the hill to the west with the highest point at 214mPD. The BH of the proposed development would be 220mPD which was higher than the level of the sections of the Nature Trails near the Site. The wall effect of the proposed development would obstruct the views of the Nature Trails. It was incorrect to conclude in the EFS that the visual impacts of the proposed development on the Nature Trails were only “slightly to moderately adverse”;

Others

- (c) the proposed development and construction vehicles would cause traffic congestion on TYRW. The proposed mitigation measures (building gap and setback) within the proposed development would not address the air ventilation impacts on Mount Haven. The proposed development would overshadow and cause daylight problems to Mount Haven and the schools across the road. The proposed mitigation measures would not be able to resolve the problems;
- (d) the proposed development at the Site would be a waste of public money. The Government should identify another site on flat land for public housing development;
- (e) the development intensity with about 3,800 flats at such a small site was too

high, as compared with other public housing developments in the area such as Cheung Hong Estate; and

- (f) the proposal for a public housing development at the Site should be withdrawn.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi left this session of the meeting during Ms Chan's presentation.]

R207/C1404 – Ha Wai Sze

R226/C746 – Hui Keung

R433/C1020 – Lau Yim Wan

R2221/C20 – Lai Chim King

R4362 – Hui Sau Po

R4363/C1086 – Lo Sai Fat

R4370 – Lo Ka Lam

51. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lau Yim Wan made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development was opposed and should be withdrawn;

Environmental, Visual and Air Ventilation Aspects

- (b) the proposed development would require the felling of some 1,200 trees within the Site and destroy the habitat of many species. The substantial impact on the ecology should not be ignored. The compensatory proposal to plant merely some 300 trees was not acceptable and these new trees would need a long time to grow. It was also doubtful whether the proposed transplanting of selected species would be successful. Even if it would succeed, the ecology of the area and the Nature Trails would still be adversely affected;
- (c) the daylight and air ventilation impacts on the lower floors of Mount Haven would be significant. The separation of at most 40m between the proposed development and Mount Haven would not be adequate;

- (d) given the bulk of the proposed podium and residential towers, it would be impossible to fully mitigate the visual impact on Mount Haven with measures such as façade treatment. The tall buildings would also directly impact the schools nearby;
- (e) the ten years of construction impacts were unbearable;

Social and Housing Aspects

- (f) many villagers of Liu To Village had been living there for a long time. They should not be cleared for the proposed development;
- (g) with a 10-year construction programme, the proposed development could not timely meet the housing need. The project was not meaningful from the housing policy angle. It was also a waste of public money;

Others

- (h) the “GB” zone should be retained as it protected the hill to the west, which was a natural buffer from the oil depots further west. The Site was within the 1 km CZ of STYI. The Government representatives said in the morning session that Ching Wah Court was also within that CZ, but it should be noted that Ching Wah Court was completed in 1986 and 1987 before the STYI started operation in Tsing Yi in 1991. The Government had ignored the hazard to future residents of the proposed development; and
- (i) the PTTIA of the EFS was not up-to-date as it only used data as of 2018 or even as early as 2015. In any event, the proposed development would cause traffic congestion in Tsing Yi and the traffic on TYRW would be disrupted. As TYRW was sloping and vehicles travelled very fast there, it would be difficult for vehicles to enter/exit the Site. TYRW was an elevated bridge and there was no scope to widen it for road improvement. The development would aggravate public transport problem in the area, noting that the existing

services to MTR Tsing Yi Station and to Tsuen Wan were already insufficient.

[The Chairperson and Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left this session of the meeting during Ms Lau's presentation. The Vice-chairperson took the chair of this session of the meeting after the Chairperson had left.]

R208/C1035 – Szeto Lam Kwan

R3996/C1034 – Leung Siu Ling

52. Ms Leung Siu Ling made the following main points:

- (a) the Government should not select such difficult site within a valley for public housing development;
- (b) the traffic condition in the area was not satisfactory. The EFS failed to propose effective measures to mitigate the traffic impacts; and
- (c) the adverse environmental impacts during the 10 years of construction as well as the daylight and air ventilation impacts of the proposed development would threaten the physical and mental health of the residents of the area. Their well-beings should not be sacrificed.

53. Ms Leung Siu Ling also played an audio recording of her neighbour, Mr Szeto Lam Kwan (R208/C1035), which included the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development would block the summer prevailing winds and create weak wind flow in the downstream area where Mount Haven was located. The air ventilation impact could not be fully mitigated and would adversely impact the health of the residents; and
- (b) the proposed development would only be a waste of public resources. The natural environment including the stream should not be destroyed. Other sites should be selected for public housing development instead.

R247/C1623 – Wong Kwok Kuen

R4302/C1065 – Wong Cheuk Ying

R4305/C1066 – Lok Ka Lee Junie

54. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wong Kwok Kuen made the following main points:

- (a) the Government's assessment undertaken for the proposed development did not comply with the Board's criteria in assessing developments within the "GB" zone, including (i) presumption against development and for passive use; (ii) avoidance of landscape and visual impacts; (iii) compatibility with the surroundings; and (iv) restraint on over-expansion of urban development;

Landscape and Ecological Aspects

- (b) being part of the Nature Trails, the Site was valuable for ecotourism and was a 'country park' equivalent for Tsing Yi people. Previously, there was a plan to create a tourist information centre for the Nature Trails near Mount Haven with coach parking spaces in Mount Haven. The substantial impacts on the existing vegetation and wildlife were not acceptable;
- (c) the figure of some 1,200 trees to be felled did not include the less mature trees, and the total number of affected trees could be more than 2,000. The some 300 trees to be planted as compensation would only be about 20% of the affected mature trees;

Compatibility Aspect

- (d) the proposed development would not be compatible with Mount Haven of which the PR was only 2.1. The EFS failed to properly assess the difference in terms of development intensity and the impacts on Mount Haven;
- (e) Mount Haven was located in a valley surrounded by public housing developments on three sides with the only opening for air ventilation from the

south via the Site and TYRW. The wall like structure of the proposed development, especially the podium, would block the wind to Mount Haven. The flats on the lowest six to seven floors of Mount Haven (with views to TYRW) would be particularly affected as those floors were below the road level but the proposed massive podium structure would extend from the valley floor to a few storeys above the road. The proposed L-shaped building block in the south would also block the wind penetration substantially. The proposed building setback from the northern boundary of the Site and building gaps would not be enough to resolve the air ventilation problems;

“GB” Buffer against Urban Expansion

- (f) the Site should be used for passive recreation purposes;
- (g) the “GB” zone in Tsing Yi covered hills that provided physical barriers separating the oil depots on the west side of the island from nearby residential developments. The Government should not propose housing development at the Site as it was within the 1 km CZ of STYI;

Rezoning for Public Housing Development

- (h) with a 12-year implementation programme, the proposed development could not meet the objective of the “GB” review to provide housing in the short to medium term; and
- (i) consideration should be given to developing public housing on other Tsing Yi sites such as service reservoir sites after reprovisioning the reservoirs in caverns or the petrol filling station sites at TYRW.

[Mr Daniel K.S. Lau and Dr Venus Y.H. Lun left this session of the meeting during Mr Wong’s presentation.]

55. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative, the representers, commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The

Vice-chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Vice-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.

Landscape Aspect

56. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) how the proposed development would affect the Nature Trails; and
- (b) the number of trees to be felled for the proposed development and whether compensatory planting would be provided in accordance with government guidelines.

57. Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD made the following responses:

- (a) the Nature Trails were accessible at TYRW (opposite to Ching Wah Court) and Liu To Road. The main section of Nature Trails was over 4 km long, and a section of 250m that passed through the Site and connected to TYRW would be affected. The EFS recommended a new section of hiking trail from TYRW to be re-provided to the west of the Site along the diverted stream; and
- (b) according to the EFS, some 1,200 trees would be affected. As most of the Site would be used for housing provision, there would be limited space and only compensatory planting of some 300 trees could be allowed. A compensatory ratio of 1:1 was a target but that might not be achievable in view of the site constraints.

Air Ventilation and Visual Aspects

58. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the project had undertaken any quantitative assessment of the air

ventilation impacts on Mount Haven. If not, how the impact on Mount Haven could be ascertained;

- (b) whether it was possible to adopt a more sensitive design for the proposed podium, tower layout and built form (the current proposal with tower façade seemingly longer than 60m) to minimise air ventilation and visual impacts on Mount Haven. Whether there was any possibility to build the podium on stilts to enhance air ventilation and also help preserve the existing stream and the Nature Trails; and
- (c) whether there were any drawings showing the interface between the proposed podium and Mount Haven and there were any photomontages showing the visual impact as viewed from Mount Haven.

59. Ms Joanne M.Y. Chan, SA/3, HD and Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD made the following responses:

- (a) the EFS had undertaken a qualitative assessment on air ventilation impacts through expert evaluation. The 4m-separation/void between the podium deck and the residential blocks above and the 15m-wide building gaps were proposed based on the findings of the qualitative assessment. These mitigation measures were initial proposals;
- (b) HD would undertake detailed design for the proposed podium and residential blocks, taking into account the site characteristics and optimisation of the site potential. A quantitative AVA would be undertaken at that stage to review the impacts on sensitive receivers in surrounding developments, including but not limited to the nearby residential developments and the schools. The proposed mitigation measures would be further reviewed taking into account the assessment results, the need to provide various transport, retail, educational and GIC facilities in the development and the target to optimize the development potential of the Site. HD would review the technical feasibility of the proposed development to be supported by columns and slopes and liaise with CEDD as appropriate to optimise the overall site formation and building

works; and

- (c) there was neither drawing nor photomontage specifically showing the interface between the podium of the proposed development and Mount Haven. According to the established practice for preparation of VIA, visual impacts should be assessed from public viewpoints, instead of the viewpoints from private developments (such as that from Mount Haven). Nevertheless, the physical separation of the nearest domestic blocks of the proposed development and Mount Haven was approximately 120m, which was similar to that between Cheung Hang Estate and Mount Haven.

60. Regarding a Member's question on the level of the proposed podium, the Vice-chairperson noted that the government representatives did not have the information at hand. He requested the government representatives to provide the information in the subsequent sessions of the meeting.

Construction Aspect

61. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether it was possible to compress the construction programme with some building works (e.g. piling works) commencing before completion of the site formation works; and
- (b) whether the proposed development would adopt the Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) method to shorten the construction period and reduce on-site construction works and their impacts on the surrounding sensitive receivers.

62. Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD and Ms Joanne M.Y. Chan, SA/3, HD made the following responses:

- (a) CEDD and HD would work closely together to explore the possibilities to optimise the design and shorten the overall development programme,

including the site formation, piling/building works; and

- (b) during the detailed design stage, HD would assess the use of precast elements, including the feasibility of MiC as appropriate, in order to enhance the construction process and minimize environmental impacts.

Traffic and Access Aspects

63. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the data used in the PTTIA of the EFS and whether the assessment had taken into account the latest known developments;
- (b) whether the access to Liu To Village would be affected; and
- (c) in relation to a point made by a representer (R100) in the morning session, whether the residents of the proposed development had to use lifts to leave the Site for taking public transport.

64. Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD made the following responses:

- (a) the PTTIA of the EFS was undertaken using the 2015 transport model prepared by the TD and the 2016-based population and employment data. The model took into account the carrying capacities of relevant road sections, traffic generation from existing and planned developments, and had been calibrated based on the traffic survey undertaken in 2019. The calibrated traffic model was capable of projecting the traffic conditions in the design year of 2037 for subsequent assessments;
- (b) the proposed development would affect the footpath between Liu To Village and villages including Yim Tin Kok Village. The affected section of footpath would be reprovisioned; and
- (c) the future residents could use the proposed PTI at the Site for public transport

or could use the proposed footbridge to cross TYRW for public transport stops nearby.

Others

65. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether any HA was undertaken for the proposed development in relation to the oil depots in the vicinity; and
- (b) the suitability of using the petrol filling station sites at TYRW as alternative sites for public housing development as suggested by a representer (R247/C1623).

66. Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD and Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD made the following responses:

- (a) a HA for the proposed development was undertaken in relation to the STYI as the installation was the only one with CZ covering the Site; and
- (b) there was currently no relocation plan for the said petrol filling stations and the concerned sites appeared to be too small for public housing developments. While the Government would continue to identify suitable sites for housing development, the Site which was technically feasible for public housing development would still be required to meet the housing demand.

[Mr Stephen L.H Liu left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

67. As Members did not have further question to raise, the Vice-chairperson said that the hearing session on the day was completed. He thanked the representers/commenters, their representatives, and the government representatives for attending the hearing. The Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in closed meeting after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The representers/commenters, their representatives and the

government representatives left the meeting at this point.

68. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.