

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 17.5.2022.

2. The following Members and the Secretary were present in 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

Dr C.H. Hau

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

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

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

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

## **Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

### **Agenda Item 1 (continued)**

[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 English and Cantonese.]

3. The Vice-chairperson said that the meeting was to continue the hearing of representations and comments in respect of the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY/31 (the draft OZP). It would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

4. The Meeting noted that the presentation to brief Members on the representations and comments including the background of the amendment, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and Planning Department (PlanD)'s views on the representations and comments was made by the government representative in the morning session on 16.5.2022. The PowerPoint and the presentation given by PlanD's representative had been uploaded to the Town Planning Board (the Board)'s website for viewing by the representers and commenters. Members' declaration of interests had been made in the same session of the meeting and was recorded in the minutes of the respective meeting accordingly.

5. Members noted that Messrs Andrew C.W. Lai, Paul Y.K. Au and Franklin Yu and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong, who had declared direct interests on the item, had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting. For those Members who had no direct interests or involvement in the submissions of the representations and comments and the public housing development, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

6. The Vice-chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members

agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

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

***Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)***

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

***Housing Department (HD)***

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Dickson K.C. Mok | - Senior Planning Officer/Development and Construction (SPO/D&C) |
| 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)) |
| Mr Y.K. Lau       | - Nature Conversation Office/Tsuen Wan                   |

***WSP (Asia) Ltd***

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

*Ecosystems Ltd*

Dr H.K. Kwok

] ] ]

**Representers, Commenters and their Representatives**

R331/C818 – Fong Hau Yee

Ms Fong Hau Yee

- Representer/Commenter

R587 – Choi Ping Hei

R647 – Lam Lok Hing

R4793 – Wong Pit Man

Ms Wong Pit Man

- Representer and Representers' Representative

R840/C524 – Chan Sze Mui

R3900/C1021– Mr So Chi Hung

R3933 – Chan Wai Ling

R4107/C860 – Chan Wai Chu

Mr So Chi Hung

- Representer/Commenter and Representers' and Commenters' Representative

R839/C1387 – Shum Tsui Ping Betty

R1402/C450 – Wong Fu Wing

R4073/C735 – Lam Fung King

R4093/C739 – Chan Yip Chun

R4192/C131 – Chan King Lok

Mr Wong Fu Wing

Ms Shum Tsui Ping Betty

] Representer/Commenter and  
] Representers' and Commenters' Representatives

R973/C1123 – Yau Hoi Man

Ms Yau Hoi Man

- Representer/Commenter

R1090 – Yau Wai Kan

R2482/C1160 – Chow Chun Yat

R4529/C402 – Kwok Hei Tai

R4531/C1291 – Leung Ming Kei

R5251/C198 – Wu King

C1289 – Yau Kam Wing

Mr Yau Kam Wing

- Commenter, and Representers' and  
Commenters' Representative

8. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. To ensure the efficient operation of the hearing, each representer, commenter or their representative was allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions on the day. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, representers, commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, representers, commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing of all the oral submissions from the representers, commenters or their representatives, the Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence, and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

9. The Vice-chairperson invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

R331/C818 – Fong Hau Yee

10. With the aid of some plans, Ms Fong Hau Yee made the following main points:

- (a) being a resident of Mount Haven, she had been living in Tsing Yi for a long time and witnessed its development over the years. She enjoyed

the scenic setting and tranquil character of the environment which was a paradise in her eyes;

- (b) the development programme of about 10 years was too lengthy and could not help expedite housing supply. There would be noise and air pollution during the construction stage. The physical and psychological well-being of the residents and students nearby would be adversely affected;
- (c) there would be 144 heavy vehicle trips travelling to and from the representation site (the Site) every day during the 10 years of construction. The traffic flows at Tsing Yi Road West (TYRW) and Ching Hong Road (CHR) would increase substantially and the influx of heavy vehicles would affect road safety especially on TYRW where vehicles travelled downhill at very high speed;
- (d) the massive podium (above 60mPD) would have adverse air ventilation and visual impacts on Mount Haven with reference to the photomontages extracted from the TPB Paper No. 10827 (the Paper). The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) had not assessed the impacts as viewed from Mount Haven. The Paper claimed that there would be a buffer distance of 120 m between the buildings in the proposed housing development and Mount Haven. However, the Site was very close to Mount Haven as seen on the plans. The 15m-wide building gaps among the three proposed buildings on the Site would be inadequate to mitigate the adverse impacts;
- (e) the impact on the Tsing Yi Nature Trails (the Nature Trails), which was the back garden of Tsing Yi and a popular trail for Hong Kong residents, had not been assessed. Local residents and hikers could no longer enjoy the scenic natural environment of the existing trails;
- (f) the extensive and costly site formation works would have adverse impact on slope stability and increase the risk of landslides; and

- (g) other less difficult sites in Tsing Yi or the territory should be considered for public housing development.

[Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng joined this session of the meeting during Ms Fong's presentation.]

R587 – Choi Ping Hei

R647 – Lam Lok Hing

R4793 – Wong Pit Man

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wong Pit Man made the following main points:

*Ecological Value*

- (a) she was a former member of the Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) and a member of 青衣島民, an organization founded in 2017 by a group of Tsing Yi residents. The organisation had been organizing guided tours for the public to enhance their understanding on biodiversity and high ecological value of the secondary woodland and streams along the Nature Trails;
- (b) she doubted how various species in the woodland and watercourse could be translocated and whether there were criteria for assessing successful translocation. Quoting the example of *Aquilaria sinensis* (土沉香) which required very rare quality of soil to grow well, there was no guarantee on their survival after transplanting. In addition, the Government should provide more details on the ecological impacts and compensation proposals;
- (c) the Preliminary Environmental Assessment (PEA) did not indicate the presence of Crested Goshawk (鳳頭鷹) in the study area even though they had been spotted at Liu To Road in 2019. The bird survey was



conducted between May and October and did not cover the migration seasons in spring and autumn;

*Risk of Oil Depot*

- (d) she showed the newspaper article reported in Ta Kung Pao on 8.5.1989 regarding the risks of concentrating dangerous industries in the south-western part of Tsing Yi. As quoted in the newspaper article, explosion at the oil depot would generate fume mass up to a height of 500m. The natural buffers provided by surrounding hills of about 100m to 300m in height were inadequate to protect residents nearby. It was unreasonable that the Fire Services Department had raised no objection to the proposed housing development which was within the 1 km Consultation Zone (CZ) of a Potentially Hazardous Installation (PHI). The Government should provide detailed information on mitigation measures to address public concerns on potential risk of explosion at the oil depot on the future residents at the Site;

*Traffic and Public Transport*

- (e) TYRW was an elevated road and the technical feasibility of any widening works for the road was doubted. The design capacity of the carriageway would be inadequate to cope with traffic flows generated by the additional population of 10,000;
- (f) the bus and Mass Transit Railway (MTR) services were inadequate to cater for the existing and planned population. The MTR Tung Chung Line with existing frequency of 36 train trips per hour and planned maximum capacity of 39 train trips per hour could hardly cope with the total additional population in Tung Chung, Siu Ho Wan and Tsing Yi. The passengers at MTR Tsing Yi Station would not be able to board the train;
- (g) the estimated traffic flows in the Preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (PTTIA) were lower than those indicated in the traffic impact

assessment previously conducted for the Transport Department Vehicle Examination Complex (TDVEC) in Tsing Yi. The PTTIA had not taken into account all of the future developments in Tsing Yi;

- (h) regarding the question on the number of traffic accidents near the Site raised by a Member during the hearing on 16.5.2022, there were 17 cases and 13 cases at TYRW and CHR respectively in 2020. Any traffic accidents on these strategic road links would cause major disruption to traffic on Tsing Yi Island;

*Development Intensity*

- (i) the proposed building height (BH) (220mPD) would be taller than the ridgeline of Tai Cheung Shan (the hill to the west) at 200mPD and the three tall towers would create wall effect. Extensive site formation works would be involved for the proposed housing development. Alternative readily developable sites such as the shipyards in the northern part of Tsing Yi, industrial areas and brownfield sites should be considered for housing development to reduce the cost and time of development;
- (j) the proposed development intensity was much higher than Cheung Wang Estate to the north. The proposed building bulk would be very massive with three blocks accommodating about 10,000 persons, as compared with seven blocks accommodating about 12,000 persons at Cheung Wang Estate; and

*Others*

- (k) there was a lack of detailed information about the proposed development when the Government consulted the K&TDC in 2021. The consultation document only included a concept plan of the proposed public housing without details, such as capital cost, design and construction time. Given the limited time and information available, the K&TDC had

requested concerned government departments to further provide detailed reports of various technical assessments and to conduct further local consultations. K&TDC had not agreed to the proposed amendment.

[Dr Venus Y.H. Lun joined and Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left this session of the meeting temporarily during Ms Wong's presentation.]

R840/C524 – Chan Sze Mui

R3900/C1021 – So Chi Hung

R3933 – Chan Wai Ling

R4107/C860 – Chan Wai Chu

12. Mr So Chi Hung, also representing two neighbours, made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Mount Haven;
- (b) with further increase in population, the current problem of heavily loaded bus services in Tsing Yi would worsen and result in long waiting time. Passengers at the interim stops were not able to board the bus especially during peak hours now. Noting that a new sewer was proposed underneath CHR to cater for the additional population from the proposed development, traffic congestion problem would worsen during the construction period;
- (c) the Site was located in a valley and accessed by the elevated road of TYRW. It was doubted that the proposed road widening was technically feasible. The lengthy development programme of 10 years reflected that development at the Site was technically difficult and not cost-effective. Besides, it could not timely respond to the acute housing needs;
- (d) the need for more public housing flats was doubted in view of the high migration rate and declining birth rate, and there was a lack of local consultation during the plan-making process;

- (e) the proposed development would involve felling of some 1,200 trees and create irreversible adverse ecological impacts on flora and fauna in the stream and woodland, e.g. *Aquilaria sinensis*. The ecological value of important species should be preserved;
- (f) many residents of Mount Haven were retirees who treasured the existing quality of the green environment. The proposed high-rise development would create adverse environmental impacts, e.g. reduction in green space;
- (g) the proposed housing development would create adverse impacts on the physical and psychological well-being of the residents. The Government should not destroy their home. In finding new land for housing, the Government should not create more problems as in Tin Shui Wai, e.g. traffic, employment, family and social issues; and
- (h) the Site was located within the 1 km CZ of the oil depot in the west of Tsing Yi (namely Shell Tsing Yi Installation (STYI)). The Government should provide justifications for building housing within the CZ which would affect the safety of future residents.

R839/C1387 – Shum Tsui Ping Betty

R1402/C450 – Wong Fu Wing

R4073/C735 – Lam Fung King

R4093/C739 – Chan Yip Chun

R4192/C131 – Chan King Lok

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wong Fu Wing made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Mount Haven. While he supported the efforts in increasing land supply for housing developments in urban fringe areas, he objected to the proposed housing development at the Site, which was considered unsuitable for development. The development programme was too lengthy and there would be adverse traffic, noise and air quality

impacts on local residents and students of the primary and secondary schools nearby;

- (b) the proposed development would destroy the existing “Green Belt” (“GB”). It would involve felling of 1,200 trees with very small number of trees proposed for compensation. Mitigation was not the answer to destruction of nature;
- (c) the VIA concluded that impacts on some viewpoints were moderately to significant adversely. Some mitigation measures proposed in the VIA were unreasonable. For example, the adoption of sensible building design with use of finishing materials, colour and façade would be ineffective to mitigate the adverse visual impacts of the tall buildings on Mount Haven. In the absence of photomontage from the viewpoint from Mount Haven provided by PlanD, he prepared one based on Drawing No. H-2b of the Paper to illustrate the potential visual impact when viewing from a footbridge to the northeast of the Site to illustrate the visual impact generated by the massive podium that would be some five storeys above TYRW. As viewed from his home, the views of the green area and sky would be blocked by the podium and buildings at the Site. The viewpoint from the Nature Trails (VP6) was misleading because the proposed housing development was shown to be far away from Mount Haven where the Site would actually abut the recreation facilities at Mount Haven;
- (d) the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) concluded that there would be weak wind at Mount Haven. The proposed 6m-gap between the podium garden and the towers above at the Site could hardly serve as a mitigation measure and adverse air ventilation impact was anticipated. The proposed podium at a level higher than TYRW would have major impact on lower level flats at Mount Haven. The wide wind corridor to the east of Mount Haven and thus, the annual prevailing wind from the east would be largely blocked;

- (e) with the influx of new population of the proposed housing development, traffic flows along TYRW would increase substantially. TYRW would operate over its design capacity and traffic congestion was anticipated;
- (f) people in Tsing Yi was highly reliant on MTR service. The proposed development would overload the capacity of MTR service, in particular, the MTR Tsing Yi Station. Upon completion of the proposed development in 2032, the MTR service would not be able to cope with the additional population, thus affecting passengers living in Tsing Yi and those in the whole territory; and
- (g) notwithstanding that the proposed development could provide public housing units, it would also generate adverse impacts on the natural environment, traffic, supporting facilities and quality of life of existing residents. All these problems would outweigh the gain in housing supply. The development at the Site was not cost-effective and would be a waste of public money. Public housing should be built at suitable sites elsewhere, e.g. reclamation at Central Waters and brownfield sites. The proposed development should be withdrawn.

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Shum Tsui Ping, Betty made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Mount Haven;
- (b) as shown in Drawing No. H-2a of the Paper, the VIA had not included a viewpoint from Mount Haven and the assessment was not comprehensive;
- (c) according to information shown on the Hong Kong Housing Authority's website, enhancement measures would be incorporated for new public housing projects to improve environmental performance in respect of wind environment, natural ventilation, daylight penetration, thermal heat comfort and air pollution emission. However, the impacts of the proposed housing development on surrounding developments such as Mount Haven had been ignored by the HD;

- (d) the proposed development at the Site would reduce an existing 450m-wide wind corridor to the east of Mount Haven to about 110m. The prevailing wind flowing into the valley would be blocked and result in adverse ventilation impact on Mount Haven and the squatters nearby. Wind tunnel effect was also anticipated during typhoon and windy seasons with reduced width of the wind corridor. The proposed building setbacks and building gaps could not address the air ventilation problem;
- (e) according to a study on wall effect of high-rise buildings conducted by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, average wind speeds at the leeward side of 'wall effect' buildings, as in the case of Mount Haven, would be lowered by four times. The proposed development would bring irreversible adverse impact to the local wind environment; and
- (f) if development on the Site was inevitable, in view of the shortfall in elderly facilities in Tsing Yi such as residential care home for the elderly, a low-rise building providing elderly facilities to meet local needs might be considered to substitute the high-rise housing development.

R973/C1123 – Yau Hoi Man

15. Ms Yau Hoi Man made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Mount Haven and had been living there for about 11 years. She chose her residence there due to the green, pleasant and clean living environment;
- (b) the construction works would generate noise disturbance and air pollution affecting the residents and students of the day nursery cum kindergarten at Mount Haven as well as a popular open space (Liu To Road Garden) north of the Site; and

- (c) the proposed development would involve extensive tree felling and destruction of the habitats of existing fauna and flora in the woodland. It would degrade the living and natural environment.

R1090 – Yau Wai Kan

R2482/C1160 – Chow Chun Yat

R4529/C402 – Kwok Hei Tai

R4531/C1291 – Leung Ming Kei

R5251/C198 – Wu King

C1289 – Yau Kam Wing

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yau Kam Wing made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Mount Haven. He chose his residence there as the local environment was similar to the character of the place where he lived in his childhood;
- (b) the Government should review the population policy to cater for ageing of population, declining birth rate and high migration rate of professionals. According to the population policy promulgated in 2015, the One Way Permit Scheme was aimed at increasing labour supply. However, those new arrivals from the Mainland could not substitute the labour force of professionals who had emigrated and the housing supply could never catch up with the demand if the One Way Permit Scheme was not reviewed. Developments in the Greater Bay Area might also encourage outflow of young people and professionals. The population policy should be reviewed in a timely manner to cater for the recent demographic changes;
- (c) the Government's housing strategy had been evolving over the past two decades to meet and expedite housing land supply, but there was no comprehensive long-term plan. With the Northern Metropolis and Lantau Tomorrow Vision (LTV), the latter of which would start to have



housing developments completed in 2030, it was doubted why the Site was still needed to be developed for housing;

- (d) TYRW was an elevated road and there was no detailed information on road improvement measures in the PTTIA to deal with additional traffic flows. Information on the ingress/egress arrangement was unclear, especially how vehicles on TYRW (southbound) (opposite the Site) would access the Site. The Paper had not provided solid responses to address the concerns on various traffic issues including capacity of the MTR service (which was running at 36 trains/hour that was close to the maximum capacity of 39 trains/hour) and road network. The construction of a new 1.9 km sewerage pipes underneath CHR also would worsen the local traffic congestion problem;
- (e) the proposed development with a BH of 220mPD would be taller than the ridgeline to the west and would block the existing views from Mount Haven towards the hillside. Based on a photomontage he prepared with viewpoint from Yim Tin Village in the northeast of the Site, the annual prevailing wind from the east would be blocked by the proposed high-rise development;
- (f) the proposed high-rise development at the Site, which was within flight paths to the airport, might cause wind shear and have adverse impact on aviation safety;
- (g) the lengthy 10-year development programme, with six years for site formation, would involve high capital cost, generate long-term adverse impacts on local residents and students of the primary and secondary schools;
- (h) more than 1,000 trees would be felled and the existing watercourse and hiking trails would be adversely affected;
- (i) the Site was within the 1 km CZ of STYI to the southwest. The Government had neither provided justifications to support the deviation

from the safety standards nor proposed any arrangement for emergency evacuation of residents in the event of explosion;

- (j) public consultation conducted by the Government was ineffective as public comments had been ignored;
- (k) alternative sites should be considered for housing development such as redevelopment of old public housing estates, private recreation clubs, golf courses and the Kwai Chung Container Terminal; and
- (l) the proposed development would have long-term adverse impacts including construction noise, air pollution, daylight penetration and visual aspects. The mental well-being of the residents would be seriously affected and he would have to move out of the area if the development proceeded.

[The Chairperson joined this session of the meeting and resumed chairmanship during Mr Yau's presentation.]

17. As the presentations from the representers, commenters and their representatives in the morning session 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.

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

*Development Intensity*

- (a) whether the development intensity of the proposed housing development was higher than that of Cheung Wang Estate;

Visual Impact and Air Ventilation

- (b) whether the visual impact on Mount Haven had been assessed, and the basis for selecting the viewing points in the VIA;
- (c) whether the mitigation measures for the proposed housing development could meet the requirements in respect of air ventilation and daylight penetration, and whether the air ventilation impact on Mount Haven had been assessed;
- (d) whether the AVA provided any objective data of impacts on surrounding developments especially Mount Haven, and whether the 4m-high gap at the podium garden could improve air ventilation;
- (e) whether heat island effect as mentioned by a representer (R839/C1387) was assessed for the proposed development, and whether shadow study had been conducted;

Ecological and Environmental Aspects

- (f) information on the affected Nature Trails and measures for ecological compensation, and the criteria for gauging whether translocation of affected species were successful;
- (g) the reasons why the ecological survey was carried out between May and October and did not cover the migration seasons of birds in spring and autumn;
- (h) what the ecological value of the secondary woodland was;
- (i) noting that construction noise might affect the existing primary and secondary schools to the east of the Site, whether there were comments received from the concerned schools, and whether the potential impact on the schools had been assessed;

Others

- (j) whether TYRW was a bridge as indicated by some representers and commenters, and whether detailed information on the proposed road improvement works was available; and
- (k) noting the shortfalls in some Government, institution and community facilities (GIC) in Tsing Yi, whether there was scope to develop other facilities, such as hospital, elderly home etc. at the Site.

19. In response to the enquiries, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD, Ms Joanne M.Y. Chan, SA/3, HD and Mr Eric Y.H. Wong, SNCO(C), AFCD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides and visualizer, made the following main points:

Development Intensity

- (a) Cheung Wang Estate was completed between 2001 and 2003 with a domestic plot ratio (PR) of about 4.1. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the maximum domestic PR for housing sites located in Residential Density Zone R1 in New Towns (e.g. Tsuen Wan, Kwai Chung and Tsing Yi) would be raised generally by about 20% from PR 5 to 6 as appropriate (reflected the directive in the 2014 Policy Address). A further increase of domestic PR of 10% for public housing sites that were technically feasible was agreed by the Chief Executive in Council in December 2018. Hence, the domestic PR of 6.5 (increased by a total of 30% from PR 5 to 6.5) was in line with the policy directives;

Visual and Air Ventilation

- (b) According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41 on 'Guidelines on submissions of VIA for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board', only public vantage points, e.g. public open spaces, would be selected for the VIA. No vantage point was selected within private developments including Mount Haven. In the highly developed context

of Hong Kong, it was not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations. VIA would only assess the impacts on public viewers. That was the established framework for VIAs;

- (c) according to the AVA-Expert Evaluation (AVA-EE), various mitigation measures were proposed to enhance air ventilation, including (i) disposition of building blocks away from the western boundary of the Site to facilitate the penetration of summer prevailing winds from the southwest directions passing through the Site and to the neighbouring areas near Liu To Village and Mount Haven; (ii) building gaps among the three towers of not less than 15m to facilitate wind penetration from the east; and (iii) podium garden with 4m-headroom to facilitate air flows through the development;
- (d) the distance between the nearest domestic block of Mount Haven and the northern most domestic block in the proposed housing development was about 120m. It was similar to the existing distance between the closest domestic blocks of Cheung Hang Estate and Mount Haven;
- (e) the AVA-EE was a qualitative assessment based on the notional scheme prepared for the current OZP amendment and was incorporated into the technical report as attached to MPC Paper No. 5/21, which was available at the Board's website for public information. HD would conduct a quantitative AVA in accordance with relevant guidelines during the detailed design stage and the proposed mitigation measures would be further refined based on the result of quantitative AVA;
- (f) during detailed design stage, HD would conduct daylight impact assessment (including shadow study) to assess the impact on surrounding developments including but not limited to the nearby schools and residential developments. As the Site was located to the south of Mount Haven, morning daylight from the east would unlikely be blocked by the proposed housing development;

- (g) while no assessment was conducted on heat island effect, such effect would be alleviated with better wind environment which had been comprehended in the AVA-EE. Building setbacks of 10m-wide from TYRW, 30m-wide from the northern boundary and podium garden with 4m-headroom were proposed to enhance air ventilation through the Site to surrounding developments;

Ecological and Environmental Aspects

- (h) the total length of the Nature Trails was about 6.4 km (including the main trail and its branches) with multiple access points, including those near Cheung Wang Estate and Mount Haven. Only a small section of about 250m that passed through the Site and connected to TYRW would be affected. The Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) recommended a new section of hiking trail (about 600m) from TYRW to be re-provided to the west of the Site along the diverted stream;
- (i) the translocation arrangement was only applicable for less mobile species and birds, which were highly mobile, did not need to be translocated. According to the PEA, the four *Aquilaria sinensis* seedlings and two crab species (*Cryptopotamon anacoluthon* (鰓刺溪蟹) and *Nanhaipotamon hongkongense* (香港南海溪蟹) were proposed to be transplanted/translocated. The four seedlings would be transplanted to a habitat with suitable level of daylight penetration and soil quality. Regarding the crab species, there was a precedent case for successful translocation in 2021 for a public works project near Pik Wan Road in Yau Tong. The contractor was required to monitor the concerned species over a period of five months after translocation;
- (j) the PEA was conducted making reference to the Technical Memorandum on the Environmental Impact Assessment Process. Ecological surveys were carried out in summer when the mammals, birds, insects, herpetofauna and freshwater communities were generally more active, and a coverage of 6 months in the wet season was therefore chosen. The winter season would also be surveyed if a large number

of migratory birds would be expected using the study area but such arrangement was not applicable to the Site;

- (k) the ecological value of secondary woodland, in which the vegetation had been cleared by human activities and subsequently regenerated over a period of time, was relatively lower than that of primary woodland;
- (l) prior to rezoning of the Site, there were 420 ha of land zoned “GB” on the draft OZP (about 40% of the planning area). Rezoning of 2.73 ha to “Residential (Group A) 5” would only affect 0.65% of the areas zoned “GB”. The Site had been identified for development of public housing in the second stage of “GB” review. It was located at the fringe of the existing built-up area in Tsing Yi, in close proximity to clusters of public housing developments, and had a relatively lower conservation value;
- (m) quoting another site formation works project in Yau Tong as an example, construction nuisances, e.g. noise and dust, on schools could be mitigated by shortening the construction period, requiring contractors to use low noise construction plants and strict control on various construction operations in accordance with the Environmental Protection Department’s guidelines and requirements. The project team and the contractor would keep regular contact with the schools during construction period, and special arrangements could be made for examination periods to minimize impacts on students;

Others

- (n) as shown in Plan No. H-2 of the Paper, the southern section of TYRW up to the ingress/egress point and access to the public transport interchange (PTI) was at-grade while the section further north was elevated on a bridge. The road widening works were proposed at the at-grade section of TYRW, providing a right turn pocket of about 35m long to allow vehicles to access the Site. The current proposal only allowed vehicles to turn left into TYRW (northbound) when exiting the

Site. It would be further reviewed in the detailed design stage on whether vehicles exiting the Site would be allowed to turn right into TYRW (southbound);

- (o) the proposed housing development had reserved a gross floor area (GFA) equivalent to 5% of the domestic GFA for provision of social welfare facilities initially including those for elderly, child care and rehabilitation and the actual types would be subject to further discussion with relevant government departments at the detailed design stage; and
- (p) premises-based social welfare facilities could be provided in some suitable new developments according to 'Single Site, Multiple Use' model, such as the proposed public housing development. The Hospital Authority had already planned a number of hospital expansion and redevelopment projects in the Kowloon West Cluster under their First and Second Ten-year Hospital Development Plans to meet the community need on hospital services.

20. In response to a Member's question on whether the safety requirements of locating developments within the CZ of a PHI had been met, and whether there were precedent cases for developments to be allowed within the CZ of a PHI, Mr Terence S.W. Tsang, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department, explained that Hazard Assessment (HA) was required for proposed development within the 1 km CZ of the STYI (a PHI) to ascertain whether the relevant risk criteria in the HKPSG could be met. However, the requirement for a HA did not necessarily mean that no proposed development was allowed within such CZ. According to the findings of the HA, individual risk, i.e. the chance of death per year to an individual who lived or worked near a PHI was within acceptable risk guidelines of not exceeding 1 in 100,000 per year. The societal risks, i.e. the risks to the population near a PHI had also been assessed as part of the HA and the predicted risks were within the level of "As Low As Reasonably Practicable" ("ALARP"), which was also acceptable in view that all reasonably practicable risk reduction measures had been implemented at the PHI. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD supplemented that there was a precedent rezoning case for a proposed housing development within the CZ of a PHI at Lee Nam Road, Ap Lei Chau and the development had already been completed.



21. 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 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.

22. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 12:30 p.m.

23. The meeting was resumed at 2:00 p.m.

24. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

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

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

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

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

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

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

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

25. Members noted that the Chairperson had temporarily left the meeting. The Vice-chairperson took the chair of the meeting at this point.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

26. 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. K.W. Lee - SE/5  
Mr. Kay K.T. Lee - Engineer

***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)  
Mr Y.K. Lau - Nature Conservation Officer

***WSP (Asia) Ltd***

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

***Ecosystems Ltd***

Dr. H.K. Kwok ]

**Representers, Commenters and their Representatives**

R125 - Cheung Man Ting

R1163/C1112 - Chan Tsz Fung

R1164/C867 - Lay Ka Hing

R2243 - Tsang Ching

R3684/C705 - Chau Man Hon

R3971/C193 - Wong Yuet Lei

R3972/C192 - Li Chun Kit

R3973/C194 - Li Shun Yat

R3975/C195 - Li Shun Hei

R4144/C1413 - Lau Chui Kwan Vicky

R4350/C123 - Lee Kau Sun

R4355/C122 - Wong Wai Man

R4357/C1098 - Lee Ching Lam

R4358 - Quindo Karen Peralta

R4359/C1099 - Lee Cheuk Lam

R4776 - Wong Hung Sang Sunny

C854 - Kwan Yuet Seung

Mr Wong Hung Sang Sunny

- Representer and Representers' and Commenters'  
Representative

R139 - Lee Ka Hei Dominic Savio

R1000/C3317 - Cho Ka Man

R1010/C1233 - Chan Tsz Yip

R1001/C1234 - Chan Cheuk Ki

R1011/C316 - Chan Hiu Ying

R1614/C1466 - Ng Bik Yee

R1615/C1468 - Wu Yat Him

R1616/C1470 - Chan Suk Yin

R1617/C1467 - Wu Pui Him

R1618/C1469 - Wu Zhiwen

R1846 - Liu Wan Wan

R4030 - Chan Chi Lap

R4031 - Cheng Sin Man

R4032 - Chan Wai Lok

R4033 - Chan Sze Fan

R4037 - Cheng Wing Yan

R4041 - Ko Kun Tei

R4195/C1206 - Wong Tin Lun

R4259/C1318 - Cheung Kok Sin

C1627 - Wong Yuk Hong

Lee Ka Hei Dominic Savio

- Representer and Representers' and Commenters'  
Representative

R232/C1489 - Chow Hon Fai Danny

R4434/C809 - Chow Sai Man

R4551/C851 - Chow Tsz Hei

R4571/C508 - Ting Ka Wai

Chow Hon Fai Danny

- Representer/Commenter and Representers' and  
Commenters' Representative

R1340/C797 - Tang Shu Kuen

R1342/C792 - 黃鳳鳴

R3966/C1609 - Cheng Ping Kwan

R3967/C638 - So Sin Wan

R3968/C912 - Cheng Lok Wang

R4061/C793 - Lee Yuk Chun

R4121/C799 - Cheung Kim Ming

Mr Cheng Ping Kwan

- Representer/Commenter and Representers' and Commenters' Representative

R1396/C1607 - Li Yuk Yin

Ms Li Yuk Yin

- Representer/Commenter

R1494 - Simon Pickard

Mr Simon Pickard

- Representer

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

R125 - Cheung Man Ting

R1163 / C1112 - Chan Tsz Fung

R1164 / C867 - Lay Ka Hing

R2243 - Tsang Ching

R3684 / C705 - Chau Man Hon

R3971 / C193 - Wong Yuet Lei

R3972 / C192 - Li Chun Kit

R3973 / C194 - Li Shun Yat

R3975 / C195 - Li Shun Hei

R4144 / C1413 - Lau Chui Kwan Vicky

R4350 / C123 - Lee Kau Sun

R4355 / C122 - Wong Wai Man

R4357 / C1098 - Lee Ching Lam

R4358 - Quindo Karen Peralta

R4359 / C1099 - Lee Cheuk Lam

R4776 - Wong Hung Sang Sunny

C854 - Kwan Yuet Seung

28. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation and visualiser, Mr Wong Hung Sang Sunny made the following main points:

- (a) the PTTIA was considered inadequate for the following reasons:
  - the traffic impact on CHR during the construction of the 1.9 km sewerage pipes underneath the road was not assessed;
  - outdated data back in 2015 and 2016 were adopted and hence, new developments, such as The Grand Marine (明翹匯), The Met. Azure (蒼藍) and TDVEC were not taken into account in the assessment. In particular, TDVEC would generate more than 1,000 vehicular traffic per day;
  - the traffic of Tsing King Road was not assessed;
  - the result of manual traffic count survey undertaken in May 2019 should have been affected by the social incident and might not be reliable;
  - there was no assessment on whether the existing public transport network (including buses and railway) could accommodate the increased demand arising from the proposed development;
- (b) there were more than 40 bus and mini-bus routes along TYRW and CHR. The ingress/egress of and site formation works for the proposed development would seriously affect the traffic flow along the two roads;
- (c) the PTTIA pointed out that the reserve capacity (RC) of the junctions of TYRW/Liu To Road and TYRW/CHR would be significantly reduced in 2037. Although it was indicated that the two junctions would not be overloaded, there would likely be traffic congestions and traffic

improvement measures should be undertaken in advance;

- (d) the proposed development would comprise a variety of uses, including kindergarten, PTI and taxi stand which would generate various kinds of vehicular traffic. It was uncertain if the proposed 35m right-turn pocket at TYRW (southbound) to the proposed development would be sufficient to accommodate the peak hour traffic flow, which might cause traffic congestion on TYRW;
- (e) as right-turn exit from the proposed development was not allowed, all vehicles leaving the proposed development could only rely on the lane of TYRW (northbound) which would worsen the traffic condition of Tsing Yi north area;
- (f) TYRW was a sloping road with steep gradient. The proposed ingress/egress along TYRW would induce traffic safety issues to drivers from CHR. He queried whether the design of the proposed ingress/egress was in compliance with relevant standard;
- (g) the proposed development would worsen the illegal parking problem in the CHR and Liu To Road areas;
- (h) the proposed development contravened the requirement under HKPSG as it fell within the 1 km CZ of a PHI, i.e. STYI. There were records of accidents at the oil depots in Tsing Yi, as well as other PHIs in the Mainland and foreign countries. No residential development should be allowed within the 1 km CZ;
- (i) the pamphlet on “Planning for Liveable New Town – Tsuen Wan” published by PlanD in 2019 indicated that “the mountain in the central part of the island provided a physical barrier separating the oil depots in the south and west of Tsing Yi from residential developments in the northeast”. The proposed development with a BH of 220mPD was significantly higher than the mountain ridge and would be exposed to potential risk in respect of public safety;
- (j) the Paper indicated that the Coordinating Committee on Land-use Planning



and Control relating to Potential Hazardous Installations (CCPHI) had endorsed the HA on 20.10.2021. However, the HA did not address the potential risk and the Government refused to disclose the HA report. In fact, Members had expressed reservations on this aspect in considering the proposed OZP amendment;

- (k) the proposed development at the Site was not in line with the planning concept of Tsuen Wan and Tsing Yi and the planning intention of “GB” zone. One of the major criteria of stage two “GB” review was “sites close to supporting infrastructure facilities such as transport, water supply and sewerage”. However, the Site was not close to any transport infrastructure as substantial land filling and a 45m-tall podium was required to be constructed to link up the Site with TYRW, and construction of a 1.9 km sewerage pipes was required to provide sewerage facilities for the Site. As such, the Site was not in line with the criteria of stage two “GB” review;
- (l) in an exhibition arranged under PlanD’s outreach programme, it was mentioned that urban design was an art of shaping the built environment for people, it could enhance the visual coherence of building masses, connection between people and places, and quality of urban amenities, public realm and overall townscape, and helped create lively places with distinctive character, and promoted accessibility, comfort and safety of streets and public spaces. To achieve these objectives, breezeways and visual and wind corridors should be provided. However, the proposed development with a BH of 220mPD located in the vicinity of the Nature Trails violated the principle of sustainable development and the people-oriented approach, as well as the urban design concepts promoted in the exhibition;
- (m) VP7 and VP10 in the VIA could not truly reflect the visual impact of the proposed development on Mount Haven;
- (n) the affected portion of the Nature Trails was well vegetated and frequently used by the local community. Diversion of the Nature Trails along the podium of the proposed development, as proposed by the Government, would adversely affect the visual quality and air ventilation of the Nature

Trails;

- (o) the provision of hospital beds in Tsing Yi was insufficient and the proposed development would aggravate the problem; and
- (p) the proposed air pollution mitigation measures during construction of the proposed development such as regular watering for aggregating fines in exposed area and installation of wheel washing facilities were just normal good site practices. There would be substantial air pollution affecting users of the Nature Trails and nearby residents during the 10-year construction period.

[Dr C.H. Hau and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined this session of the meeting during Mr Wong's presentation.]

R1494 – Simon Pickard

29. Mr Simon Pickard made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Mount Haven and a civil and structural engineer with experience of about 37 years;
- (b) whilst the construction of public housing to meet the need of the society was supported, he strongly objected to the rezoning of the Site. Given that the Site was situated in a valley requiring massive retaining wall and large-scale pipe foundation, there would be long construction period of 10 years as estimated by the Government. Comparing with similar development on a greenfield site, it was estimated that the construction cost would be 50% higher and the construction time be longer for four to five years. The proposed development on such a difficult site, having considered the construction cost and time required for implementation would not be cost-effective; and
- (c) about 2 ha of flat land currently occupied by open-air bus terminus and carpark was available at Cheung Hang Estate which was considered more suitable for public housing development.

R139 - Lee Ka Hei Dominic Savio

R1000/C3317 - Cho Ka Man

R1010/C1233 - Chan Tsz Yip

R1001/C1234 - Chan Cheuk Ki

R1011/C316 - Chan Hiu Ying

R1614/C1466 - Ng Bik Yee

R1615/C1468 - Wu Yat Him

R1616/C1470 - Chan Suk Yin

R1617/C1467 - Wu Pui Him

R1618/C1469 - Wu Zhiwen

R1846 - Liu Wan Wan

R4030 - Chan Chi Lap

R4031 - Cheng Sin Man

R4032 - Chan Wai Lok

R4033 - Chan Sze Fan

R4037 - Cheng Wing Yan

R4041 - Ko Kun Tei

R4195/C1206 - Wong Tin Lun

R4259/C1318 - Cheung Kok Sin

C1627 - Wong Yuk Hong

30. With the aid of visualiser, Mr Lee Ka Hei Dominic Savio read out a letter from a surveyor and made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Mount Haven. Whilst he agreed with the Policy Address that supply of land for housing development should be increased to meet the keen housing demand, he considered that the construction time for the proposed development was too long and the development was not cost effective. The Site was not suitable for any housing development as it would lead to irreversible adverse impacts unbearable for the residents of Mount Haven;
- (b) there was a lack of public consultation and public comments had been ignored. He alleged that PlanD had issued a press release regarding the proposed amendment on 15.5.2022. Whilst objecting views were not

mentioned in the press release, there was no concrete evidence to support PlanD's recommendation of not proposing any amendments to the OZP to meet the representations;

- (c) town planning decision should be made after going through a comprehensive consideration process and be supported with studies and data. The Site was zoned "GB" on the Approved Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/30 and the zoning should not be changed simply based on the findings presented in the MPC paper No. 5/21 on proposed amendment to the OZP. Given that Mount Haven being located immediately next to the Site was zoned "Residential (Group B)", he wondered why the "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") zoning of higher density was considered acceptable for the Site;
- (d) the mountain to the southwest of the Site formed a long and continuous green backdrop to the adjacent residential and GIC developments and preservation of the ridgeline of the mountain should be given special consideration. The HKPSG stated that "appropriate height profile within individual viewsheds in rural areas should be protected to provide contrast to the urban areas". A photomontage prepared by a resident showed that the proposed development with a BH of 220mPD would be significantly higher than the ridgeline and adjoining developments and was not compatible with the surrounding built environment;
- (e) according to the VIA, the proposed development would impose "slightly to moderately adverse" to "significantly adverse" visual impacts on the surroundings from some selected viewpoints;
- (f) given the high development cost, more flats should be provided in the proposed development so as to lower the cost per flat. However, the resulting high-density and high-rise development would generate more significant visual impacts on the surroundings;
- (g) although the Site was not considered to have "high" ecological value, the Government should consider other alternative sites with less ecological

impacts before rezoning the Site from “GB”. Large-scale vegetation clearance and channelization of watercourses would result in irreversible damage to the habitat;

- (h) there would be significant loss of existing trees arising from the proposed development. 1,260 trees would be removed but only 215 to 255 trees would be planted as compensation. In addition, the compensatory trees would be less mature as compared with the existing trees;
- (i) *Aquilaria sinensis* were protected under the Forests and Countryside Ordinance (Cap. 94) and 4 within the Site would be transplanted. Such transplantation to a sloping “GB” zone would weaken the conditions of the trees;
- (j) the proposed localized vertical greening on the façade of the buildings as one of the landscape and visual mitigation measures would be unable to mitigate the adverse impacts caused by the proposed development, in particular that there would be a loss of 1,260 trees. Excessive maintenance cost would also be induced for the proposed vertical greening;
- (k) the Nature Trails (also known as the Kwai Tsing Reunification Health Trail) signified Hong Kong’s return to China and should not be disturbed. With the surrounding landscape affected, the re-routed portion of the Nature Trails would lose its ecological merit and characteristics and became a rear lane adjacent to the concrete development;
- (l) the PTTIA assumed that all traffic leaving the proposed development was only permitted to turn left onto TYRW (northbound). Since TYRW was a four-lane road with no central divider, there was no means to prevent vehicles from leaving the Site by turning right onto TYRW (southbound). The ingress/egress of the proposed development was located close to the junction of TYRW/CHR and this would have road safety concerns;
- (m) there was missing/incomplete information in the PTTIA, including whether the Base District Traffic Model had been used to calibrate the traffic flows for 2037, details and locations of major planned/committed developments

which had been taken into account in the assessment, the traffic flows and assumed capacities of the road links in 2037, and traffic generation of the proposed development during peak hours, etc.;

- (n) the operation performance and queue analysis of the proposed priority junction of TYRW and the site access were missing. As such, it could not demonstrate that the proposed 30m-long right-turn pocket to the development would be able to serve all right-turn traffic;
- (o) the findings of the PTTIA indicated that the Design Flow to Capacity (DFC) of Tam Kon Shan Interchange would be increased from 0.74 to 0.84 at a.m. peak hour, whilst the RC of the junction of TYRW/Liu To Road would be reduced from 36% to 17%. However, no mitigation measures were proposed;
- (p) no queue analyses at junctions along Tsing Yi Road, TYRW and CHR were conducted to ascertain the impact on the queue length resulted from the proposed development;
- (q) the existing public transport services as shown in the PTTIA were some 400m away from the proposed development and most of them were temporary or overnight services. These existing transport routes served multiple developments in Tsing Yi and would only bypass TYRW. The PTTIA did not demonstrate that the additional passenger demand generated by the proposed development would not overload the existing public transport services, or indicate whether new public transport services would be provided;
- (r) the existing footpaths along TYRW (southbound) and along both sides of CHR were only 2m to 2.5m wide. The PTTIA did not assess the impact on these footpaths arising from the proposed development;
- (s) a new 500mm sewerage pipe of approximately 1.9 km-long would be constructed underneath CHR and TYRW and its construction would induce considerable nuisance to the local community;

- (t) as the Site was situated in a valley, the proposed development would require a considerable extent of site formation, drainage, sewerage and infrastructure works resulting in considerable capital cost. The proposed development was expected to take more than 10 years for completion, which might incur additional allowance for labour and material cost fluctuation, risks and uncertainty. Development on flat land would be less expensive and 3 to 5 years faster, and this would be a better way to use public money to expedite production of more public housing flats;
- (u) eight rezoning applications from “GB” to “R(A)” were considered by the Board from 1990 to 2021. All of them were rejected and the common rejection reasons were pertaining to undesirable precedent for similar applications within “GB” zone and the cumulative effect of approving such similar applications. He wondered why this principle was not applied in the current OZP amendment;
- (v) the proposed development would set other undesirable precedents:
  - the photomontages clearly demonstrated that the proposed development was incompatible with the surrounding built environment, would intrude the natural ridgeline and damage the landscape setting. If vertical greening on the façade of the buildings could be considered as an acceptable mitigation measure, an undesirable precedent would be set for future public and private housing developments;
  - the proposed greenery coverage of the proposed development was less than 30%, which was not in line with the requirement under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines promulgated by the Buildings Department;
  - 99.7% of trees within the Site would be removed simply because they were considered as having “no value”. It was considered as an undesirable precedent that trees could be removed as long as they were claimed to have “no value”;
- (w) in gist, the proposed development with additional population of more than

10,000 would have significant adverse impact on the carrying capacity of road traffic and public transport, and on the provision of hospital beds, education and community facilities;

- (x) it was noted that Members' queries at the meeting on 16.5.2022 were not properly addressed, including whether it was justifiable to choose the Site for development which would require a construction period of 10 years and whether the construction period could be shortened; the standard of preserving the existing vegetation, how the proposed development would affect the Nature Trails; whether it was possible to adopt a more sensitive design to avoid wall effect; and whether there were alternative sites for the subject public housing development. He urged Members to make further enquiries on the above issues; and
- (y) he talked to an old lady who was living in caged home and had been waiting for public housing for a long period of time. She also wondered why the Government was not selecting more cost-effective sites to provide more public housing flats for those people in need.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong rejoined and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left this session of the meeting during Mr Lee's presentation.]

[The meeting was adjourned for a break of ten minutes. The Chairperson rejoined to chair the meeting during the break.]

R232/C1489 - Chow Hon Fai Danny

R4434/C809 - Chow Sai Man

R4551/C851 - Chow Tsz Hei

R4571/C508 - Ting Ka Wai

31. With the aid of PowerPoint presentations, Mr Chow Hon Fai Danny made the following main points:

- (a) the rezoning of the Site from "GB" to "R(A)" was not in line with the planning intention of the "GB" zone. The proposed development which would take 10 years to complete could not be regarded as a short to medium term land supply measure;



- (b) no natural terrain hazard studies had been conducted and the slope safety and construction cost were not ascertained. The proposed mitigation measures might further damage the surrounding environment and such impacts were not assessed;
- (c) upon completion of the proposed development, Mount Haven and Liu To Village would become the lowest part of the valley and would be subject to the risk of flooding and debris flow;
- (d) public housing development at the Site was not cost effective. Resources should be put in the LTV and Northern Metropolis projects to expedite the production of public housing flats;
- (e) given the high development cost, more flats had to be provided in the proposed development so as to lower the cost per flat. However, the resulted high-density high-rise development would generate more significant visual impacts on the surroundings;
- (f) the proposed development contravened Chapter 11 of HKPSG in that the proposed development would block the view towards the mountain backdrop and destroy the viewsheds;
- (g) visual impact of the proposed development on private developments should also be considered. No photomontage was prepared to demonstrate the visual impact on Mount Haven. Given the visual impacts for some selected viewpoints were “significantly adverse”, the rezoning of the Site should not be agreed to;
- (h) the Paper mentioned that the proposed development could be generally perceived as an extension of the surrounding high-rise residential clusters. However, the BH of Mount Haven adjoining the Site was only 103mPD and the proposed development with BH of 220mPD would be significantly taller than Mount Haven which could not be considered compatible with the surrounding environment. Visual openness for Mount Haven would be lost and could not be mitigated;

- (i) the air ventilation of Mount Haven and the health of residents would be adversely affected by the proposed development. There was no quantitative assessment on the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures in respect of air ventilation impacts;
- (j) according to the guidelines of CEDD, site formation or elevated platform should be adopted for development on sloping site. The proposed development requiring both site formation works and a podium of 46m high was not in line with the guidelines;
- (k) the government refused to disclose the HA report. STYI should be requested to undertake additional mitigation measures to minimise the risk;
- (l) the layout and disposition of Block 1 were different from the other two blocks of the proposed development. It was suspected that such differences were intended to fulfil the requirement of relevant technical assessments;
- (m) *Cryptopotamon anacoluthon* was a species of ecological significance and classified as vulnerable. The proposed translocation plan might have adverse impact on the species;
- (n) the number of compensatory trees was only 377, which was considered insufficient if compared with the loss of 1,264 trees. The proposed development also affected the Nature Trails;
- (o) the proposed development would aggravate the traffic congestion problem at TYRW and Ching King Road. Besides, no assessment was conducted for the most congested road sections such as Fung Shue Wo Road leading to Tsing Yi Interchange;
- (p) most of the public comments objected to the proposed development. Members should listen to the views of the public;
- (q) technical issues should be considered in the planning stage. When Ching Fu Court was rezoned for public housing development and considered by the Board in 2016, the Government had committed to improve the traffic

conditions in the area. However, no traffic improvement measures were implemented upon completion of the Ching Fu Court development; and

- (r) he used all his savings to purchase a flat in Mount Haven. The noise and air pollutions during construction of the proposed development would affect the health and wellbeing of the residents. Mount Haven would be enclosed by the development upon completion.

R1340/C797 - Tang Shu Kuen

R1342/C792 - 黃鳳鳴

R3966/C1609 - Cheng Ping Kwan

R3967/C638 - So Sin Wan

R3968/C912 - Cheng Lok Wang

R4061/C793 - Lee Yuk Chun

R4121/C799 - Cheung Kim Ming

32. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Cheng Ping Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) he was the representative of Ching Wah Court and had resided in Tsing Yi for about 20 years;
- (b) there was a lack of information on the proposed development available for Ching Wah Court residents. Residents residing near CHR were not aware of the proposed development;
- (c) the 10-year construction period of the proposed development would cause nuisance to Tsing Yi residents, nearby students and other wildlife in terms of air, noise and environment. It would also generate health impact on the residents, especially the elderlies. Besides, the site formation works involved diversion of existing streams within the “GB” zone and would affect the quality of water and the ecological value of the area;
- (d) removal of trees in the “GB” zone would lead to soil erosion and affect the safety of hikers and residents nearby. Ching Wah Court had been subject to the same issue as illegal construction works for columbarium use were found within the “GB” zone to the south of Ching Wah Court;

- (e) STYI was located within 1 km from Ching Wah Court. As the “GB” zone served as a physical barrier separating STYI in the south and west of Tsing Yi from residential developments in the northeast, the Site was not suitable for residential development;
- (f) TYRW was a major road connecting Tung Chung and Tsuen Wan with heavy traffic flows. The safety aspect of the proposed ingress/egress of the Site at this heavily-trafficked road was questionable. Moreover, the proposed development would bring about additional traffic load to CHR, which currently served 19 schools and three elderly care centres with more than 500 beds. He queried the conduct of the PTTIA during Easter holidays and period of Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examination, which would underestimate the traffic flow of CHR;
- (g) according to the Hong Kong Observatory, the prevailing wind of the area was from southeast and southwest. The development proposal with three blocks aligned along TYRW would create a wall effect blocking the prevailing wind and daylight;
- (h) it was queried whether the recently completed developments in Tsing Yi had been taken into account in considering the provision of public facilities and public transport services. With the increase in population, medical services and public transport services would be overloaded;
- (i) although the technical assessments concluded that no insurmountable drainage and sewerage impacts were anticipated, CHR would be required to be closed for construction of the proposed sewerage pipes underneath, which would result in unacceptable traffic impacts. In addition, traffic generated by TDVEC, concrete batching plant and the Hongkong United Dockyards would worsen the traffic condition of CHR; and
- (j) upon completion of the proposed development, more people would use the facilities in Ching Wah Court. There were concerns on public safety and the maintenance cost of the public area for residents and owners of Ching Wah Court.

[Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang, Stephen L.H. Liu and Stanley T.S. Choi left this session of the meeting during Mr Cheng's presentation.]

R1396/C1607 - Li Yuk Yin

33. Ms Li Yuk Yin made the following main points:

- (a) according to aerial photos, the Site was covered by lush green trees which were proposed to be felled for the proposed development. Vegetation clearance would affect the slope safety and the quality of the Nature Trails;
- (b) alternative site such as the vacant land at Sze Mei Street and Choi Hung Road in San Po Kong were considered more suitable for public housing development. It was also noted from a local newspaper that three proposed housing projects in Kwai Tsing district were delayed. It was not necessary to rezone the subject "GB" site for public housing development;
- (c) the development intensity of the Site was too high. Comparing with Cheung Hang Estate and Cheung Wang Estate with similar population but larger site areas, it was unreasonable to house 10,300 people on the Site which was small;
- (d) there was a lack of shopping/retail facilities and public transport services to serve the future residents as well as the existing residents and schools nearby. Supermarket, fast food shop, clinic, child care centre, kindergarten and bus station should be provided in the podium of the proposed development for better land utilization. The public transport services should also be enhanced;
- (e) the proposed development with graveyards in the surroundings would not be welcomed by the future residents;
- (f) the current traffic condition of the area was very busy with many heavy vehicles, drum trucks and oil trucks passing by during rush hours. Traffic

generated from construction works for the proposed development would worsen the traffic condition of the area. In case of accident, the traffic would be seriously affected; and

- (g) the Board previously rejected an application for columbarium use on a site adjoining Tai Lam Country Park. The same consideration should be applied to the current rezoning of “GB” site and the rezoning should not be agreed to.

[Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui and Dr Venus Y.H. Lun left this session of the meeting during Ms Li’s presentation.]

34. As the presentations of 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, their representatives and/or the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

*Procedural matters*

35. Noting some representers/commenters in yesterday’s and today’s sessions of the meeting alleged that PlanD had previously issued a press release stating that the representations would not be supported, hence making a foregone conclusion before hearing by the Board, two Members requested that the said issue as well as the hearing and decision-making procedures be clarified. In response, the Chairperson made the following clarifications on the procedural matters:

- (a) PlanD did not issue such press release as mentioned by some representers/commenters. As per the prevailing practice, to facilitate Members’ consideration of the representations/comments, PlanD had prepared a paper which consolidated the submissions from representers and commenters, departmental comments and PlanD’s recommendations. The paper had been uploaded to the Board’s website which could be accessed by the public, including the media who could write any news report/article

anytime quoting the information presented therein, including, amongst others, PlanD's recommendations of not supporting the representations; and

- (b) notwithstanding PlanD's recommendation of not proposing any amendment to the OZP to meet the representations, Members would make independent judgement when deliberating on the recommendation upon completion of the hearing. In considering the representations and comments, three full-day hearing sessions had been arranged for Members to hear the oral submissions from the representers/commenters and/or their representatives and make inquiries on their views as well as the rezoning proposal. Upon completion of the hearing, deliberation session would be arranged in which Members would decide whether to propose amendments to the OZP to meet the representations. The decision of the Board would be conveyed to the representers and commenters as soon as possible after the deliberation session.

Impacts on Ching Wah Court

36. A Member enquired whether the EFS had taken into account Ching Wah Court and whether there was any adverse impacts on Ching Wah Court. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the EFS, which confirmed no insurmountable technical problems arising from the proposed development, had taken into consideration all relevant existing, planned and committed developments within the study area of various assessments, which included but not limited to Ching Wah Court;
- (b) Ching Wah Court was located to the east of the proposed development. Given that the prevailing winds of the area mainly came from the east and south, the air ventilation of Ching Wah Court, which was located in the upstream area of the prevailing eastern winds, would not be affected by the proposed development; and
- (c) whilst visual impact on private developments would not be assessed in accordance with the prevailing practice, a public viewpoint at CHR

adjoining Ching Wah Court was selected and assessed.

37. The Chairperson invited the representatives of HD to explain about the management of Ching Wah Court from the perspective of the public using the facilities there. In response, Mr Dickson K.C. Mok, SPO/DC, HD made the following main points:

- (a) there would be a proposed footbridge connecting the Site and the northern footpath along CHR leading to the major activities hub in Cheung Hong Estate, whereas Ching Wah Court was located at the south of CHR. As a PTI was planned within the Site, it was not expected that a large amount of future residents from the Site would access Ching Wah Court for commuting purpose in the future; and
- (b) there were some retail facilities in Ching Wah Court. The general public and residents of the proposed development could access these facilities in future.

Slope safety

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

- (a) whether natural terrain hazard studies had been conducted for the proposed development and the details of the assessment results;
- (b) the confidence level of the assessments and whether the construction works would affect the safety of the slopes; and
- (c) whether the proposed slope works would further affect the “GB” zone and vegetation outside the Site.

39. In response, Mr. K.W. Lee, SE/5, CEDD, made the following main points:

- (a) under the EFS, a preliminary natural terrain hazard study had been conducted according to GEO Report No. 138 in order to identify and assess any



potential natural terrains that might affect the proposed development. Natural terrain hazards including Open Hillslope Landslide (OHL); Channelized Debris Flow (CDF)/ Failure within Topographic Depression (TDF)); Deep-seated landslide; Rockfall (RF); and boulder fall (BF) had been assessed. The study indicated that given a diverted stream would be constructed at the toe of the natural terrain hillside catchments, which could serve as a buffer area to contain the landslide debris from hillside catchments due to OHL and TDF, the landslide debris would not reach the proposed development;

- (b) given the site configuration, the proposed site formation works within the Site would not affect adjacent hillside slopes. Notwithstanding that, further investigations would be carried out in the detailed design stage to confirm the assessment results; and
- (c) the EFS indicated that based on the current layout of the proposed development, the proposed slope works would be confined within the proposed works boundary of site formation works and would unlikely affect the adjoining “GB” zone and the vegetation thereat.

Hazard assessment

- 40. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:
  - (a) whether development was prohibited within the 1 km CZ of PHI and the mechanism for allowing development within the CZ;
  - (b) results of the HA and how the assessment results could be better conveyed to nearby residents; and
  - (c) details of the HA, including the methodology and factors considered.
- 41. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) the guidelines for development within the CZ of PHI was laid down in Chapter 12 of HKPSG. The Government's policy was to minimize the potential risks associated with a PHI to internationally acceptable levels by controlling the siting of PHIs and the land use in the vicinity. The CCPHI was established in December 1986 to coordinate Government actions in relation to PHIs in Hong Kong. Development proposals leading to an increase in the number of persons living or working within the CZ would be assessed against the Government's risk guidelines to ensure that risks to the public were confined to acceptable limits. The assessment had to be submitted to CCPHI for consideration;
- (b) the HA concluded that the individual risk criteria complied with the Risk Guidelines as outlined in HKPSG. The maximum level of off-site individual risk associated with the PHIs would not exceed 1 in 100,000 per year (the average annual risk of dying in a traffic accident was about 1 in 10,000), whilst the societal risks were within the level of "ALARP". The proposed development was technically feasible on hazard aspect and the assessment had been endorsed by CCPHI. While there was no requirement to publicise the assessment results, the public and the local residents could further get hold of the details and the assessment results in this hearing; and
- (c) details of the HA including the methodology and key considerations would be provided by the expert in the next session of the meeting.

Transport and Traffic

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

- (a) whether the PTTIA conducted in 2019 had incorporated the recently completed developments such as TDVEC, as well as the additional traffic flow arising from the planned strategic roads, bridges and infrastructures serving Tsing Yi;
- (b) how the design of the vehicular ingress/egress of the proposed development

complied with the relevant safety requirements;

- (c) elaboration on the concept of RC in the PTTIA; and
- (d) whether there were mitigation measures to ameliorate the adverse traffic impacts arising from construction of the proposed sewerage pipes underneath CHR.

43. In response, Mr. K.W. Lee, SE/5, CEDD, made the following main points:

- (a) to assess the traffic flow upon completion of the development, a design year of 2037 (i.e. 3 years from completion of the development) was adopted. TDVEC and other known developments were included in the assessment. The planned strategic roads and bridges were not included in the Area of Influence of the PTTIA agreed amongst relevant parties, hence were not covered in the assessment. Manual traffic count survey was carried out in May 2019 before the outbreak of social incidents and the data collected was considered reliable;
- (b) the design of the vehicular ingress/egress complied with the requirements of the Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM). The proposed right-turn pocket of about 35m long on TYRW was considered adequate to cater for the queuing length envisaged. The proposed road layout would also allow sufficient sightline for vehicles from right-turn pocket turning into the access road of the proposed development. The location of the ingress/egress would be located at least 60m away from the junction of TYRW/CHR was in compliance the requirements of TPDM;
- (c) RC was adopted to assess the performance of signalised junctions. Taking the junctions of TYRW/CHR and TYRW/Liu To Road as examples, which were relatively busy within the area, the assessment indicated that there were still 28% and 17% of RC respectively. As advised by TD, the traffic condition would be considered acceptable with a RC exceeding 15%; and

- (d) the proposed 1.9 km sewerage pipes underneath CHR developed in the EFS was only one of the feasible options. CEDD was currently exploring a shorter alternative (about 800m) along CHR and Chung Mei Road which could minimise the impact on the local traffic. Besides, trenchless construction method would be adopted at critical locations to minimise adverse traffic impacts to local road network.

*Building height and development intensity*

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

- (a) how the maximum BH of 220mPD was formulated; and
- (b) whether assessment was conducted regarding the effect on flat production if the BH was lowered to the level similar to that of Cheung Wang Estate or Cheung Hang Estate.

45. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development had a domestic PR of 6.5, which was higher than the adjoining developments, e.g. Cheung Wang Estate with domestic PR of 4.14. According to the notional scheme prepared by the HD, a BH of 220mPD was proposed to accommodate the domestic PR of 6.5, as well as the required GIC facilities such as PTI and community facilities. As such, the proposed BH was higher than the adjoining developments. It was noted that HD would explore measures to minimise the BH as far as possible in the detailed design stage; and
- (b) while no assessment on the effect on flat production for a lower BH was available, a rough estimate could be provided for Members' consideration in the next session of the meeting.

Podium Design

46. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the exact distances between the various blocks in Mount Haven and the proposed development, as well as the levels of podium at Mount Haven and the proposed development;
  - (b) whether the proposed development had contravened the guidelines of CEDD regarding the use of site formation or elevated platform for development on sloping site; and whether an elevated platform, instead of a podium structure, could be constructed to minimise blockage of wind so as to improve the air ventilation; and
  - (c) the estimated cost of site formation and construction of superstructures for the proposed development.

47. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, in response to Members' question and a similar one raised on 16.5.2022 regarding podium level, said the building distance between the nearest residential blocks in Mount Haven and the proposed development was about 120m, whilst the distance between the nearest residential block in Mount Haven and the Site boundary was about 97m. The building distance between the nearest residential blocks in Mount Haven and Cheung Hang Estate was also about 120m. He also drew Members' attention to that the separation of the nearest residential blocks in Cheung Hang Estate and the proposed development would be about 167m, which could maintain the openness of the eastern side of Mount Haven. In addition, the gap between buildings in Cheung Hang Estate was about 40m. As for the podium level at Mount Haven, the height was about 42mPD. The preliminary design of the podium at the Site had adopted a stepped height concept with the first level of podium adjoining Mount Haven at about 46mPD, the second level at about 60mPD, whilst the highest level at about 80.5mPD. Subject to further detailed design, the stepped height decking levels with mitigation measures such as plantings and vertical greenings would be considered to minimize any potential impact on the surrounding areas, including but not limited to Mount Haven.

48. In response, Mr. K.W. Lee, SE/5, CEDD, made the following main points:

- (a) information on CEDD's guidelines regarding site formation works on sloping ground was not available at hand and could be provided in the next session of the meeting if needed; and
- (b) it was estimated that the site formation works would require about 4.5 years to complete. Given the project was still in a preliminary stage, it was considered not suitable to disclose the cost estimate at the moment.

49. The Chairperson supplemented that construction cost was not a relevant consideration of the Board, which should focus on the land use planning aspect. The Legislative Council would consider the construction cost when funding proposal was submitted for their approval.

Others

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

- (a) whether the proposed development had contravened the requirements of Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO);
- (b) how the design of the rerouted Nature Trails along the diverted stream would be compatible with the surrounding environment; and
- (c) merits of the proposed development to the local community.

51. In response, Mr. K.W. Lee, SE/5, CEDD, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development was not a designated project under EIAO. As such, the requirements in EIAO would not be applicable; and
- (b) the design of the rerouted Nature Trails would be compatible with the existing natural trail and alongside with the proposed diverted stream. With reference to the experience of the past drainage projects, ecological elements (e.g. rock pools, riffles, structures maintaining ecological

connectivity) would be included in the diverted stream to create habitats for the aquatic flora/fauna.

52. Regarding the merits of the proposed development, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, said that in addition to the new provision of 3,800 public housing flats to accommodate about 10,300 population, the proposed development would reserve a GFA equivalent to not less than 5% of the domestic GFA for the provision of social welfare facilities, which would likely include those for the elderly, children and rehabilitation facilities, to serve the community. A non-domestic PR of 0.2 had been reserved for provision of retail and supporting facilities to meet the needs of the future and nearby residents. Retail and supporting facilities were provided in the nearby public housing estates such as Cheung Hong Estate and Cheung Hang Estate. A pedestrian footbridge across TYRW was proposed to connect the Site with CHR and nearby areas such as Cheung Hong Estate to enhance the overall pedestrian connectivity. As for public transport services, a PTI would be provided in the proposed development to support any new service requirements and TD would closely monitor the progress of the public housing development and introduce/strengthen the public transport services as appropriate in a timely manner so as to meet the commuting demand in the area.

53. As some of the information requested by Members was not available at today's meeting, the Chairperson said that relevant departments should provide the following information at the next session of the meeting to facilitate the Board's deliberation of the representations and comments:

- (a) details of the HA including the methodology, factors considered and the mitigation measure identified in the assessment; and
- (b) implication on flat production if the BH of the proposed development was lowered to the level similar to Cheung Wang Estate or Cheung Hang Estate.

54. As to a representer's concern about whether the layout and disposition of Block 1 were to fulfil the requirement of technical assessments, the Chairperson noted that the proposed Block 1 adopted a different layout and disposition comparing with the other two blocks. The issue could be followed up at the next session of the meeting if needed.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

55. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing session on the day was completed. She thanked the representers/commenters, their representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in closed meeting after all hearing sessions were completed and 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.

56. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.