

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 23.5.2022.
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

Mr L.T. Kwok

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

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

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

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

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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 Cantonese.]

3. The Chairperson said that the meeting was to continue the hearing of representations and comments in respect of the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan 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 Chairperson said 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 and representers, commenters and their 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 |
| Mr Kay K.T. Lee | - Engineer |

Housing Department (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)) |
| Mr Y.K. Lau | - Nature Conversation Officer/Tsuen Wan |

<i>WSP (Asia) Ltd</i>]
Mr Calvin C.W. Li]
Ms Jessica K.Y. Fung]
]
<i>Ecosystems Ltd</i>] Consultants
Mr Klinsmann Cheung]
]
<i>Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Ltd.</i>]
Mr David C.M. Lee]

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R1521/C790 - Chan Pui Fan

R2120/C1282 - Chan Yuing Yee

R2121/C711 - Chan Pui Ying

R4095/C388 - Hui Lok Ching

R4096/C378 - Hui Lok Yiu

R4105/C390 - Hui Chun Lok

R4118/C391 - Hui Sui Lit

R4119/C709 - Chan Lai Wa

R5242/C791 - Chaipukdee Nitaya

Ms Chan Lai Wa - Representer and Commenter and
Representers' and Commenters'
Representative

R1582/C1619 - Cheung King Chi

R2102/C1036 - Ng Shuk Ying

R4094/C795 - Tang Yee Lam

Ms Cheung King Chi - Representer and Commenter and
Representers' and Commenters'
Representative

R1775/C1622 - Ng Yik Wai Victoria

R1777/C1426 - Chan Mee Sim

R2412/C1475 - Chiu Pui San

R2417/C1479 - Tsang Elspeth Yi Shuen

Ms Ng Yik Wai Victoria

- Representer and Commenter and
Representers' and Commenters'
Representative

R1965/C591 - Wong Pok Chun

R1969/C597 - Derigs Kwan Yee Ping

R2003/C592 - Castriciones Loida Basilio

R4210/C589 - Lau Ping Sheung

Mr Lau Ping Sheung

- Representer and Commenter and
Representers' and Commenters'
Representative

R2014/C595 - Kwan Wing Nam

R4420/C590 - Kwan Hang Ping

Ms Kwan Hang Ping

- Representer and Commenter and
Representers' and Commenters'
Representative

R2277/C721 - Cheng Wing Yan

R2290/C59 - Cheng Wing Chun

R2591/C720 - Wong Lai Yin

R4864/C1046 - Cheng Shing Hay

Ms Wong Lai Yin

- Representer and Commenter and
Representers' and Commenters'
Representative

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

R1521/C790 - Chan Pui Fan

R2120/C1282 - Chan Yuing Yee

R2121/C711 - Chan Pui Ying

R4095/C388 - Hui Lok Ching

R4096/C378 - Hui Lok Yiu

R4105/C390 - Hui Chun Lok

R4118/C391 - Hui Sui Lit

R4119/C709 - Chan Lai Wa

R5242/C791 - Chaipukdee Nitaya

10. Ms Chan Lai Wa made the following main points:

- (a) the benefit of the proposed public housing development at the representation site (the Site) could not outweigh its impact on the local area. Issues on traffic, nature conservation and lack of supporting facilities were yet to be addressed. The housing problem could not be solved by simply increasing housing supply, especially the housing development at the Site requiring a 10-year construction period;
- (b) road infrastructure on Tsing Yi Island was low in capacities and highly fragile. For example, previously, a traffic accident at Cheung Hang

Estate near the Site caused major disruption to the traffic in other parts of Tsing Yi;

- (c) before the construction of Tsing Tsuen Bridge (often known as the ‘North Bridge’), if there was any disruption to the traffic/traffic jam at Tsing Yi Bridge (being part of Kwai Tsing Road which was often known as the ‘South Bridge’), many residents had to walk to Kwai Fong. The traffic to the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA) might also be affected;
- (d) the area already had a high-density public housing development of Cheung Hang Estate. Placing additional public housing in the area would have profound implications on environmental, air ventilation, light penetration and traffic aspects. Unlike other new towns such as Tseung Kwan O, Tsing Yi was a developed area and there was limited scope for increasing the infrastructural capacity to accommodate additional large-scale development;
- (e) the Site was at an inconvenient hillside location and not served by sufficient public transport. Extensive excavation/slope works and vegetation clearance were required to take forward the proposed development. Maintenance of slope would also incur significant costs to the future residents. Alternative locations with more flat topography in Kwai Tsing district should be considered for housing development for better cost-effectiveness. Developing unoccupied “Government, Institution or Community” sites or expediting urban renewal projects could be better alternatives;
- (f) the oil depots at Tsing Yi South were a potential hazard to the future population at the Site;
- (g) many of the bus services serving Tsing Yi were operating at their capacity and many residents had difficulty boarding buses, even during non-peak hours. Frequent temporary road closure due to maintenance/repair works of underground pipelines further worsened the overall traffic conditions in Tsing Yi;

- (h) some Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) members considered that there was insufficient time for them to consult the public. PlanD should review the proposal and visit the area and discuss with local residents on the project before further pursuing it. The views of the local community should be respected and there was scope for fine-tuning the scale of the development to reduce its impact on ecology, tree felling, sunlight penetration, air ventilation and wall-effect. For example, the public housing development near Mayfair Gardens was reduced from five blocks to three blocks taking into account the public comments;
- (i) a number of subsidised housing developments would be completed in Tsing Yi area in the coming years. The new population would overstrain the capacity of facilities, such as public clinics, in the area. The Government should resolve the associated issues when planning for additional public housing developments; and
- (j) she was disappointed that before the hearing sessions were held, PlanD already indicated its view of not supporting the representations to the press.

[Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang, Ricky W.Y. Yu and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting during Ms Chan's presentation.]

R1582/C1619 - Cheung King Chi

R2102/C1036 - Ng Shuk Ying

R4094/C795 - Tang Yee Lam

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Cheung King Chi made the following main points:

- (a) the responses provided by the Government were unable to properly address many of the concerns raised. For example, the Government responded in the Paper that the ingress/egress point onto Tsing Yi Road West (TYRW) and the public transport interchange (PTI) at the Site would be constructed to suitable technical and safety standards of the

Highways Department. Noting that TYRW was a sloping elevated road with very busy traffic including many heavy vehicles going downhill on the side of the Site, there were doubts on whether the proposed access arrangement was practical and safe. Even if the technical requirements for road design could be met, drivers' behaviour remained an uncertain factor and the threat posed by heavy commercial vehicles, such as school buses, buses, oil tankers, container trucks to other road users was particularly worrying at that location;

- (b) TYRW was a major road with busy traffic. Vehicles normally queued back and had to wait for more than one traffic light cycle to pass through junctions near the Site. Consideration should be given to widening TYRW for increasing its traffic capacity;
- (c) the Government stated that the visual and air ventilation impacts of the proposed housing development were not unacceptable. However, given that the podium of Mount Haven was at only about 42mPD, the proposed housing development with a maximum building height (BH) at 220mPD, equivalent to a BH of about 160m on top of a 14m-tall podium, would definitely create a 'high-wall' and block air ventilation for Mount Haven. The proposed 15m-wide building gaps, 10m and 30m-building setbacks and the 4m-high void at the podium garden could only mitigate some air ventilation impact at the street and podium level. There were no data and modelling of air ventilation impacts and no effective mitigation measures for Mount Haven were proposed. If noise barriers were erected within the setback area along TYRW in the future, it would further worsen the air ventilation;
- (d) high-density development at the Site was incompatible with the surrounding environment. In the photomontage provided in the Paper, trees were screening the lower part of the proposed development at the Site. The photomontages could not reflect the actual building bulk and associated visual impact;

- (e) she was a resident of Mount Haven for about six to seven years. As observed during her daily commute on bus route No. 42A, many passengers at Mayfair Gardens, Cheung Ching Estate and Rambler Crest in the mid-way stops could not board the fully loaded bus. Many public housing projects, including Home Ownership Scheme flats had been planned/would be completed in Tsing Yi and the traffic problem would likely worsen in the coming years;
- (f) the Transport Department (TD) promised a number of years ago to improve the public transport service for Tsing Yi when the public housing development at Tsing Hung Road was proposed. However, no real improvement was observed by the local community over the years. The local community now had doubts on the improvement works for the Site proposed by the Government and whether they would be implemented properly;
- (g) the area near Mount Haven was covered by dense vegetation and provided residents with a very comfortable living environment. The proposed development at the Site involving major site formation and tree felling would significantly affect the ecology of the woodland. The Tsing Yi Nature Trails (the Nature Trails), which were frequently visited by the locals, would also be affected;
- (h) the potential impact of wind shear, flash rainstorm causing flooding and landslide and heat island effect should be assessed. Building the proposed public housing on the Site involved expensive construction and slope maintenance costs. Considering the location and severe technical constraints associated with the Site, suitable technical assessments should be conducted early on to ascertain technical feasibility of the proposal;
- (i) there were insufficient retail and supporting facilities in the area to meet the demand from the new population of the proposed development; and

- (j) the proposed development with only some 3,800 units would take about 10 years to complete and it would not be able to meet the changing needs of the community after a decade.

R1775/C1622 - Ng Yik Wai Victoria

R1777/C1426 - Chan Mee Sim

R2412/C1475 - Chiu Pui San

R2417/C1479 - Tsang Elspeth Yi Shuen

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Ng Yik Wai Victoria made the following main points:

- (a) she was a registered geotechnical engineer involved in traffic engineering and urban planning projects, with working experience in many roads and bridges construction, such as the widening of the Tolo Highway and master planning projects;
- (b) the points raised by her in her representation and comment submissions had not been fully addressed. Whilst the Government had conducted a Preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (PTTIA), the conclusion that no traffic improvement work was required was unconvincing. There were doubts on the methodology used and validity of the findings of the PTTIA;
- (c) K&TDC members had not been duly consulted on the current traffic problems in Tsing Yi. K&TDC members also expressed concerns that the paper for consultation with the district council was only provided to them three days before the meeting and only limited information on traffic aspect was provided. Despite unanimous objection from K&TDC members, the Government decided to proceed with the project;

Traffic Impacts

- (d) Tsing Yi currently already suffered from various traffic issues. The road network of Tsing Yi generally did not have sufficient remaining capacity

to handle new large-scale developments. There was grave concern among the community that the traffic problem might worsen with the additional population of the proposed housing development at the Site;

- (e) Tsing Yi was served by a strategic road network comprised Tsing Tsuen Bridge, Kwai Tsing Road, Tsing Ma Bridge, Ting Kau Bridge and Stonecutters Bridge. The network provided major connections to urban areas and Tung Chung as well as the HKIA. There was also a local road network in the area comprising Liu To Road, TYRW, and Ching Hong Road (CHR) etc. In fact, TYRW and CHR functioned in a manner similar to strategic roads, in that they carried large volume of territorial through-traffic such as airport buses and heavy vehicles serving facilities in Tsing Yi South. Given that the road network of Tsing Yi was closely interrelated with limited alternative routes, blockage or traffic delays at any section/junction would cause a domino effect significantly impacting the rest of the road network on the island;

PTTIA

- (f) the PTTIA was flawed as it had a selective and incomplete study area. A number of critical roads and junctions, such as Liu To Road, Tsing King Road, Tam Kon Shan Interchange, Tsing Yip Street and Tsing Luk Street had not been included in the assessment. In particular, the Tam Kon Shan Interchange and Tsing King Road near Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Tsing Yi Station were severely congested for most time of the day and should not be excluded from the PTTIA;
- (g) the data used in the PTTIA was outdated, therefore, its findings were invalid. According to the PTTIA report, traffic model from 2015 and traffic survey data and population information from 2019 were used. It was inappropriate to use such outdated model and data to project the traffic situation of 2037. Many of the committed developments in Tsing Yi had not been included;

- (h) the traffic data surveyed in 2019 would likely be inaccurate due to a variety of reasons. There had also been a major shift in people's habit towards online shopping since the pandemic. The result of the traffic survey conducted in 2019 did not reflect the prevailing traffic congestion problems experienced by the local community on a daily basis in Tsing Yi. Surveys conducted by the residents themselves in second half of 2021 at key junctions also showed a different result from the 2019 data surveyed by the Government. The Government should update the traffic data based on the traffic flow of 2021 and come up with a 2021 traffic model;
- (i) many drivers from Mount Haven had to make a detour to avoid lengthy queue near its junction with TYRW. Assessment on queue length at the critical junctions near the Site was missing in the PTTIA;
- (j) the TD Vehicle Examination Complex (TDVEC) at Sai Tso Wan Road, which was opened in 2022, was a large-scale facility with a variety of examination facilities for all kinds of vehicles and the traffic to be generated would be substantial. Based on the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) for TDVEC, about 25% of the traffic to TDVEC would utilise Tsing Tsuen Bridge and another 20% of the traffic would use Kwai Tsing Road. Traffic from Tsing Tsuen Bridge and Kwai Tsing Road would access the area via TYRW and CHR. Two junctions, one near Greenfield Garden and another on TYRW to the south of the Site, would have negative capacity. As a result, improvement works to junctions near Greenfield Garden and at TYWR were required to handle the traffic for the TDVEC. In contrast, the current PTTIA, which was conducted more recently than the TIA for the TDVEC, concluded that the traffic situation in Tsing Yi would remain acceptable with the addition of the proposed development. It appeared that the PTTIA had not duly considered the traffic impact of the TDVEC;

- (k) it was considered that the assumptions on peak hours in the PTTIA were inaccurate and they were significantly different from those used for the TIA for the TDVEC;
- (l) some of the residential clusters in southwest Tsing Yi were generally not within walking distance to MTR Tsing Yi Station. It meant that an additional connecting/shuttle bus trip to the MTR Tsing Yi Station was required. It appeared that these connecting bus/shuttle trips had not been assessed in the PTTIA;
- (m) it was unclear whether the traffic generated by school buses for the kindergarten at the Site had been considered in the PTTIA. School buses to/from schools outside Tsing Yi picking up/dropping off students residing in the proposed housing development would place additional traffic burden on the local road network. Many of the questions remained unanswered in the PTTIA which could not reflect the actual traffic situation in Tsing Yi;

Access Arrangement

- (n) the proposed development with ingress/egress point at TYRW was not in line with the Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM) which stated that wherever possible, run-ins should not be permitted on Trunk Roads, Primary Distributors or District Distributors;
- (o) Tsing Yi residents mainly used Tsing Tsuen Bridge, Kwai Tsing Road and Tsing Ma Bridge/Ting Kau Bridge to travel to other districts. Tam Kon Shan Interchange was the busiest interchange in Tsing Yi and congestion at Tsuen Tsing Interchange at the Tsuen Wan side would cause congestion on Tsing Tsuen Bridge. The current proposal allowing only left turn at the egress of the Site. As such, traffic to Kwai Tsing Road or Tsing Ma Bridge/Ting Kau Bridge on the south had to detour north. More traffic problems would be created for areas near Tam Kon Shan Interchange and southbound traffic would also overload the Tsing Yi Interchange. It was

very likely that southbound traffic would use Liu To Road for U-turn and further overload Liu To Road;

- (p) the proposed right-turn pocket about 30m in length in the middle lane of TYWR for accessing the Site was insufficient as it could only accommodate two buses or five private cars. If there were more vehicles lining up, it would block the southbound traffic on TYRW and effectively reducing it to a one-lane road;
- (q) if there were both buses and school buses stopping near the Site, the traffic along TYWR would have to decelerate. The slow traffic would result in excessive queue length at junctions near the Site;
- (r) the proposed PTI at an underground location was uncommon and inconvenient for pedestrians. It was unclear whether the vehicles would have difficulties accessing it and there might also be safety concerns. Traffic from the PTI would again burden the congested road network in the vicinity;

Local Traffic Issues

- (s) during peak hours it was very difficult for residents to board the buses. Many passengers could not get on at stations along the routes even during off-peak hours. The bus service for Tsing Yi area was often unreliable;
- (t) a sewerage pipe would be constructed underneath CHR. However, there was severe illegal parking problem of private cars and heavy vehicles on CHR throughout the day. There was no assessment on parking demand and supply, and it was unclear where those on-street parking could be accommodated during the construction. Construction traffic from the Site would further burden CHR during construction of the sewerage pipe thereat;

- (u) Liu To Road was congested for most time of the day. Ingress/egress point of Mount Haven at Liu To Road was often blocked by vehicles tailing back at its junction with TYRW;
- (v) the construction period of more than 10 years was very long. Construction works for many major infrastructure projects did not require 10 years to complete. Besides, it was likely that the proposed development would be subject to delay given the prevailing shortage in labour and construction materials. Many construction vehicles trips would be generated during both the site formation stage for removal of excavated soil or transport of fill materials, and during the building construction stage for transport of prefabricated components for the housing blocks. Based on a sectional drawing in the PTTIA, it was estimated that about 248 dump trucks trips were required to transport fill material for the 1m-wide area along the sectional plane. Considering the site was 260m-long from north to south, the number of construction vehicle trips generated would be very substantial;
- (w) additional construction traffic would also worsen the severe deterioration of the road surface of TYRW and Kwai Tsing Road due to frequent heavy vehicle traffic;
- (x) there was limited scope to improve traffic through fine-tuning of traffic signal timing, as most of the traffic lights near the Site were already operating at a 120-second cycle and it was impractical to further increase the cycle length;
- (y) if the Board eventually did not propose any amendment to the OZP, it was considered that traffic improvement measures were required to mitigate traffic impact generated by the proposed development; and

Supporting Facilities

- (z) according to the table at Annex VIII of the Paper on provision of Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, there was a

deficit in hospital bed, child care facility, community care service facility and residential care home for the elderly. There were insufficient supporting facilities such as retail facilities and clinics in Tsing Yi. Many residents had to travel to nearby areas such as Tsuen Wan or Kwai Fong for their daily needs.

R1965/C591 - Wong Pok Chun

R1969/C597 - Derigs Kwan Yee Ping

R2003/C592 - Castriciones Loida Basilio

R4210/C589 - Lau Ping Sheung

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and the visualiser, Mr Lau Ping Sheung played two videos showing traffic situation of TYRW with voice recordings from local residents, and made the following main points:

- (a) TYRW was a major road connected to the Lantau Link. It was paramount to ensure traffic safety on this road;
- (b) the current proposal for the Site with an ingress/egress point onto TYRW seemed to have contradicted the standards as specified in Chapter 8 paragraph 3.3.1(b) of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), which stated that trunk roads should have no direct frontage access and stopping restrictions should apply at all times. For 'Rural Roads A' which was a level below Truck Roads, direct frontage access should be avoided where possible;
- (c) TYRW was not suitable to be used for ingress/egress for the proposed development at the Site due to traffic safety concerns. Traffic at the junction of TYRW and Liu To Road to the north of the Site was already heavy. Sudden deceleration of vehicles getting in/out of the Site on a downward-sloping portion of TYRW might pose potential safety hazard to other road users;

- (d) the proposed arrangement with a right-turn pocket on the middle lane of TYRW for southbound traffic to access the Site was problematic. Heavy vehicles travelling at high speed downhill on TYRW might not be able to stop in time to give way to the right-turning traffic from the pocket area. Traffic safety issues had been reported by transport services labour unions to the Legislative Council in as early as 2004. For the current proposal, he had concerns that heavy/long vehicles that could not stop in time at the junction of TYRW/CHR might result in a head-on collision with the traffic turning right onto the Site;
- (e) the section of TYRW between Fung Shue Wo Road and CHR was a sloping stretch of straight road frequently used by buses and school buses as well as traffic to the bus depot, fuel depot and construction material companies in Tsing Yi South. The road condition was deteriorating due to the high volume of heavy vehicle traffic and repaving works were often required. At the moment, the traffic to HKIA was substantially reduced due to the pandemic. When air traffic resumed in future, traffic in Tsing Yi would become very busy again;
- (f) from a wider perspective, the proposed PTI at the Site was located on the fringe of the developed area in Tsing Yi. It was not in line with the principles set out in the HKPSG, which stated that PTIs were “usually provided in town centres or other regional focal points where passengers interchange between services and modes”. The proposed underground PTI was not within walking distance to other points of interests such as office, retail facilities or recreational facilities. There was no apparent reason to provide a PTI at the Site. On the other hand, the PTI might worsen the traffic conditions in the area; and
- (g) the response from CEDD that a detailed TIA would be conducted in the subsequent stage was unsatisfactory. More comprehensive planning ahead was required before pursuing the development at the Site.

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

R2014/C595 - Kwan Wing Nam

R4420/C590 - Kwan Hang Ping

14. With the aid of the visualiser, Ms Kwan Hang Ping made the following main points:

- (a) there was inadequate bus service for Tsing Yi area and there were often long queues at bus stations on narrow pavements during both peak and non-peak hours. With the proposed housing development adding more than 10,000 population to the area, there would be even more passengers waiting at bus stops;
- (b) Cheung Hang Estate with six blocks and 4,500 units could accommodate about 14,100 persons. Cheung Wang Estate with seven blocks had 4,300 units and accommodated about 12,800 persons. In comparison, the proposed housing development at the Site with a much smaller area would take over 10 years to complete and could only provide 3,800 units to accommodate some 10,000 persons. The benefit of the project was clearly low and not a cost-effective option to pursue;
- (c) there were a primary school and a secondary school located to the east of the Site. The schools would be affected by the construction noise and air pollution generated at the Site. The construction vehicle traffic and noise would adversely affect the quality of the local environment. Clearing of the Site with dense vegetation was also against the global trend for sustainable development; and
- (d) alternative “Green Belt” (“GB”) sites in Tsing Yi area with less site constraints or sites currently occupied by facilities that could be relocated into caverns should be considered for development. The construction period should also be reduced from 10 years to five years.

R2277/C721 - Cheng Wing Yan

R2290/C59 - Cheng Wing Chun

R2591/C720 - Wong Lai Yin

R4864/C1046 - Cheng Shing Hay

15. Ms Wong Lai Yin made the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in Tsing Yi for a long time and she now resided in Mount Haven. The proposed development at the Site within a valley with dense vegetation cover would adversely affect the environment;
- (b) the Site was a difficult site to develop and required a long construction period, which also meant that the nearby residents and students had to suffer from air pollution for more than 10 years. Children and elderly would be more susceptible to such impact. There might likely be delay in the construction programme and the impact would become more profound; and
- (c) there were many committed housing development projects in Tsing Yi with a total of more than 10,000 new units. With the proposed housing development, the traffic situation would become even more problematic.

16. 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. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

17. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions on traffic aspect:

- (a) whether the traffic data used in the PTTIA was outdated as claimed by some representers, and whether the data collected in 2019 was more

representative as compared to those taken in 2021 and 2022 during the pandemic;

- (b) whether the traffic from the TDVEC and school bus trips from the proposed kindergarten in the Site had been considered in the PTTIA;
- (c) a presenter considered that the findings of the PTTIA were flawed as according to the TIA for TDVEC, one of the road junctions at TYRW to the south of the Site would have negative capacity, however, the PTTIA for the proposed development at the Site indicated that all nearby junctions would be operating at satisfactory levels. In that regard, what the major findings of the PTTIA were and whether the traffic impact had been underestimated;
- (d) whether the design flow to capacity ratio (DFC) of 0.84 for the Tam Kon Shan Interchange meant that the traffic would become unacceptable;
- (e) whether the proposed ingress/egress of the Site onto TYWR complied with the safety requirements stipulated in the relevant guidelines;
- (f) whether consideration had been given to address the illegal parking problem in the area and improving public transport services to facilitate the locals in their daily travelling needs;
- (g) what the rationale was for providing a PTI at the Site and whether the PTI could enhance access to public transport for nearby residents; and
- (h) whether temporary closure of TYRW was required during the construction period.

18. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD, and Ms Jessica K.Y. Fung, consultant of CEDD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the PTTIA was conducted using the 2015 Base District Traffic Model (BDTM), which was the latest traffic model developed by TD for evaluating traffic impact in projects. 2016-based Territorial Population and Employment Data Matrix (TPEDM) including the relevant demographic data was considered and data from traffic survey conducted in May 2019 were used for calibration of the model. Data from 2021 and 2022 might not be representative as traffic volume for those years might have been affected by the pandemic;
- (b) the TDVEC as well as other committed developments and the school bus traffic generated by kindergarten on the Site had been considered in the PTTIA. Regarding the school bus trips associated with the proposed development, they had been duly considered in the PTTIA. Trip generation figures from TPDM had considered the typical trips that would be generated by different facilities and flat sizes, including school bus trips serving the residents. The adopted methodology was consistent with the established practice for conducting TIA in Hong Kong;
- (c) road link performance of TYRW and CHR at design year of 2037 had been assessed in the PTTIA and the volume/capacity (V/C) ratio was below 0.85 which met TD's requirement. Compared with the reference scenario (without the development at the Site), the V/C ratio for TYRW (northbound) near junction of TYRW/Fung Shue Wo Road would increase from 0.47 to 0.61 in the morning peak, whereas the ratio for TYRW (northbound) fronting the Site would increase from 0.33 to 0.46. The V/C ratio for CHR (eastbound) would remain at about 0.6 at morning peak whereas for CHR (westbound) it would increase from 0.72 to 0.79 at morning peak. Tam Kon Shan Interchange (design flow to capacity (DFC) from 0.74 to 0.84), junction of TYRW/Liu To Road (reserve capacity (RC) from 36% to 17%), and the roundabout at Fung Shue Wo Road/Tsing Yi Heung Sze Wui Road (DFC from 0.64 to 0.66) would all operate within their design capacities. Overall speaking, the road/junction performances with the proposed development would be within acceptable level. The PTTIA for the proposed housing development at the Site and the TIA for the TDVEC were two separate TIAs

which had different base years and might adopt different methods in projecting the future traffic growth, hence directly comparing their findings would not be appropriate. The PTTIA for the Site adopted a BDTM approach which was more specific on travel patterns/routes, whereas the TIA for the TDVEC might have used other approach such as growth rate approach, which was generally more conservative. TD had accepted the use of BDTM in the PTTIA for the proposed housing project;

- (d) DFC referred to design flow to capacity ratio, which was an indicator of the operational performance at a roundabout/priority junction. A DFC ratio less than 1.0 indicated that the roundabout/priority junction was operating within capacity, while a ratio greater than 1.0 indicated that it was overloaded. Based on observation by the consultant team, most of the vehicular traffic queuing at concerned critical junctions could be cleared within one to two cycles. Persistent and excessive queueing at junctions had not been observed during the traffic survey;
- (e) the proposed ingress/egress point at TYRW complied with the requirements of the TPDM, and direct frontage access onto a district distributor, e.g. TYRW, was not prohibited. The design of the ingress/egress would follow all applicable guidelines/standards to ensure that all safety requirements were fulfilled. A Road Safety Audit would also be conducted in the detailed design stage to ascertain that the design of the ingress/egress point was safe. Notwithstanding the above, there was scope for refinement at the subsequent detailed design stage to further enhance safety. The suitability of various options, including the use of traffic light at the ingress/egress point, would be explored. For the notional scheme, the option for allowing vehicles to turn right at the egress to TYRW (southbound) had not been considered in the priority junction arrangement;
- (f) the issues on illegal parking and shortage of on-street car parking spaces were noted, consideration would be given to explore whether there was a need to adopt suitable measures/design to alleviate the problem in the later stage. Regarding the provision of public transport services, TD would review the

bus route services about two years before the completion of the proposed housing development and would submit a bus route proposal to the K&TDC;

- (g) the proposed PTI would provide bus bays, taxi stand and general drop off area. While the PTI was not planned to be a large-scale and strategic PTI for the wider district, it could serve the future residents of the proposed housing, as well as residents from nearby residential developments such as Ching Wah Court via the proposed footbridge; and
- (h) based on the finding of the Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS), there was no plan for temporary closure of the section of TYRW near the Site to facilitate construction works.

19. The Chairperson and some Members asked Ms Ng Yik Wai Victoria (R1775/C1622) the following questions:

- (a) whether, based on her knowledge, a traffic model more updated than the 2015 BDTM was available;
- (b) whether, in her opinion, there were other viable alternative access arrangements for the Site; and
- (c) noting that the residents had conducted their own traffic survey in 2021/2022, whether she considered that the traffic volume in the PTTIA had been underestimated.

20. In response, Ms Ng Yik Wai Victoria (R1775/C1622) made the following main points:

- (a) while the 2015 BDTM was the latest version available, it was outdated and together with the 2019 survey data, it could not reflect the actual traffic situation in Tsing Yi nor align with the data collected by the local residents in 2021. Due to the pandemic, there had been drastic changes to both traffic volume, the types of vehicles that were on the road, as well as travel pattern of people;

- (b) the findings in the PTTIA were not consistent with the TIA of the TDVEC. The TIA for the TDVEC concluded that traffic improvement works were required to address the traffic impact associated with the TDVEC. In contrast, the TIA for the current public housing development concluded that the traffic in Tsing Yi would remain acceptable with the TDVEC and the proposed housing development. Therefore, she had doubts on the validity of the PTTIA;
- (c) the traffic of school buses to the Site for drop off/pick up of students to/from other schools outside the Site should also be assessed;
- (d) the Government's proposal to explore a signalised ingress/egress point at the Site would further lengthen the waiting time at nearby traffic lights at CHR and Liu To Road. Given that the traffic light signals at these junctions were already set to the maximum waiting time of 120 seconds per cycle, she did not consider such approach was viable;
- (e) the traffic problems in Tsing Yi were interlinked and the relevant departments should have consulted K&TDC to better understand the underlining issues, so that the traffic issues in Tsing Yi could be properly resolved in a more holistic manner. The public transport network, service frequency and reliability of the public transport services should all be enhanced. Without improvement to public transport as an alternative to driving, there could be no real improvement in the overall traffic conditions; and
- (f) she was unable to quantify the level of inaccuracies in the PTTIA. However, she had an impression that the traffic figures for TYRW, i.e. an increase of V/C ratio from 0.47 to 0.61, was on the low side as flawed baseline figures were used. In any case, it did not reflect the traffic congestion experienced by many local residents in Tsing Yi. The data from 2019 used by the Government consultant in the PTTIA was lower than the figures surveyed by the residents in 2021 and the 2019 data was unlikely to be accurate, considering most traffic associated with HKIA

through Tsing Yi had been halted in 2021 and traffic volume was generally lower during the pandemic.

21. In response to the Chairperson's question on whether the methodology used by the Government's consultant in conducting the PTTIA, i.e. using a local traffic model to predict future traffic conditions, rather than the growth rate approach used for the TIA of the TDVEC, was suitable, Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, TD, said that when conducting a TIA, it was necessary for the project proponent to employ a suitable methodology that was commensurate with the scale and nature of the project. Generally speaking, the growth rate approach, which involved applying a uniform growth rate to traffic survey data of an area, might be used for projects that were smaller in scale or relatively simple in nature. For the current project which comprised three high-density public housing blocks located at TYRW, using a local traffic model to predict future traffic conditions was considered appropriate by TD. It was noted that all known committed projects in the area had been included in the PTTIA and a more detailed TIA would be conducted in the subsequent stage.

22. The Chairperson and some Members also raised the following questions:

Air Ventilation and Heat Island Effect

- (a) whether air ventilation assessment (AVA) had been conducted for the Site and whether the air ventilation impact on Mount Haven had been assessed;
- (b) whether noise barrier would be proposed in the setback area along TYRW;
- (c) whether there was scope to refine the layout of the proposed housing development to facilitate the flow of prevailing wind through the site;
- (d) whether heat island effect of the proposed development was assessed and what the assessment criteria were;

The Development Programme

- (e) noting that the Site was located in a sloping area and substantial site formation works were required for the proposed housing development, how long would the site formation works take and whether there was scope to shorten the total construction period;
- (f) whether there was scope to adopt enhanced measures to minimise the impact on the environment and disturbance to the residents;

Tree Preservation

- (g) what the compensatory planting proposal was and whether there was scope to carry out the compensatory planting early on before the construction commenced;
- (h) whether off-site planting that could re-establish a forest function would be explored as mentioned at the Metro Planning Committee meeting for consideration of the rezoning of the Site;

Others

- (i) how the Nature Trails would be affected, and if re-routing was required, whether an alternative route/access point could be provided early on;
- (j) with reference to Plan H-2 and Drawing H-4 of the Paper, what the dimension of the existing watercourse in the western part of the Site were as compared to the watercourse near the northern boundary of the Site and how those watercourses would be affected by the proposed development;
- (k) whether cavern developments could provide alternative sites to increase housing land supply;
- (l) how the concerns on lack of shops to provide daily necessities in the area could be addressed; and

- (m) whether the proposed development would result in safety concerns due to wind shear as pointed out by one of the representers.

23. In response, 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 Klinsmann Cheung, consultant of CEDD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

Air Ventilation and Heat Island Effect

- (a) an AVA-Expert Evaluation (AVA-EE) had been conducted and concluded that the proposed development at the Site would not result in insurmountable air ventilation impact. There would inevitably be some air ventilation impact on Mount Haven as compared with the current situation without the proposed housing development. Notwithstanding this, prevailing wind was from the south and east in general. Disposition of building blocks in the current notional scheme would not significantly affect the summer prevailing winds from the south and south-southwest to reach its downstream area near Mount Haven. Wind from the south-southeast directions towards the leeward side of the nearby environment might be affected, for which the proposed 15m-wide building separations and 4m-headroom void over the podium of the proposed development would help enhancing such wind flow towards Mount Haven. The building separation between Cheung Hang Estate and the proposed development of about 160m would also facilitate summer prevailing wind from the east to flow towards Mount Haven;
- (b) according to the current notional scheme for the Site, no noise barrier was planned along TYRW, which was a major local wind path for the area to the further north. Noise impact would be further assessed and mitigated by adopting suitable building dispositions and design measures, such as acoustic fins, at the detailed design stage;
- (c) quantitative AVA and daylight study would be conducted in the detailed design stage to achieve an optimal design with proposed mitigation

measures to minimise air ventilation and shading impacts on the surrounding areas;

- (d) the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines would be duly considered by HD in the detailed design stage. Suitable measures would be adopted to promote air ventilation which would also help to reduce potential heat island effect. Currently there was no established standard to assess the magnitude and “acceptable level” of heat island effect. Notwithstanding the above, various measures, such as provision of building separation of not less than 15m wide, building setbacks of 10m from TYRW and 30m from the northern boundary, and a void at the podium garden of 4m-headroom, had been proposed to enhance air ventilation for the area;

The Development Programme

- (e) it was estimated that the development at the Site would take about 10 years to complete. It included the time required for site formation works by CEDD and piling and building works by HD. For this site, it was anticipated that the construction period for piling and building works by HD would take about five to six years, with the construction period for piling works be less than two years. Suitable noise mitigation measures, such as using quieter methods and low-noise machinery for construction works, would be adopted during the construction period to minimise noise impact. CEDD would also, in consultation with HD, explore scope to optimise the development programme and fast-track the site formation works programme as far as practicable in the detailed design stage;
- (f) HD and CEDD would adopt the latest standards and best practices in the development process to minimize the nuisance caused by the construction works to the surrounding areas. HD would allow “pay-for-environment” in the contracts to encourage contractors to adopt more environmentally-friendly measures/equipment during construction.

Public relation team by contractors would also be set up to facilitate communication with local stakeholders during the construction period. On environmental impacts, CEDD would require contractor to complete translocation of precious aquatic species before stream diversion. CEDD had completed similar operations in other site formation contracts;

Tree Preservation

- (g) detailed tree survey would be conducted in the next stage to confirm the number of trees that needed to be felled and species worthy of preservation. Transplantation would be conducted before construction works commenced. Compensatory trees would be provided within the Site. As over 1,000 trees would be felled and it was not possible to compensate all of them on-site, opportunity for compensatory planting along roadside would be explored;
- (h) at the current juncture, no suitable site could be identified for large scale compensatory tree planting in Tsing Yi. CEDD would continue to liaise with LandsD and would endeavour to identify suitable sites for off-site compensatory planting. Whilst it might be difficult to provide compensatory planting to the extent of re-establishing a forest function, native plant species would be planted as far as possible;

Others

- (i) the Nature Trails comprised a number of local hiking trails, namely Kwai Tsing Reunification Health Section, Kwai Tsing Reunification Education Section, Ching Hom Path, Ching Wan Path and Fong Tin Mei Path. About 250m of the hiking trail near TYRW would have to be closed when site formation began. As the various paths within the Nature Trails were interconnected and there were multiple entrances (including two at Liu To Road and one near Ching Wah Court), hence, the public should have no major problems in accessing the Nature Trails during construction and after completing of the proposed hiking trail to the west

of the Site which would provide a connection to the footpath along TYRW;

- (j) the stream that traversed the western portion of the Site was mainly a collector of water flowing into the valley around the Site. The stream near the north of the Site collected water from a culvert near Mount Haven and generally had more water flow than the one in the west. Both sections of the affected stream would be diverted to the west and north of the Site respectively. The diverted stream would maintain a low flow rate at certain sections. Suitable ecological elements including tree planting would be provided in the diverted stream to enhance the ecological functions as habitats for aquatic fauna. Gabion wall with planting would be used for the diverted stream to create a more natural environment. The detailed programme on diverting the stream would be formulated in the detailed design stage;
- (k) according to the Cavern Master Plan, there was scope to relocate some public facilities such as sewage treatment plants to caverns to free up land for other developments. However, this was a long-term goal and would not provide readily available sites for public housing development;
- (l) for the concern on availability of retail facilities, shopping facilities with a gross floor area of about 1,500m², similar to the scale of the shopping facilities in the nearby Cheung Wang Estate, would be provided within the Site to meet the daily shopping needs of the residents. Shopping facilities were also available at Cheung Hang Estate and Cheung Hong Estate, while large-scale shopping mall and entertainment facilities such as cinema were available at Maritime Square; and
- (m) wind shear was mainly a phenomenon related to aviation safety, rather than building construction and was not assessed in the EFS.

24. The Chairperson asked Ms Cheung King Chi (R1582/C1619) to substantiate her views about wind shear. In response, Ms Cheung clarified that she was mainly concerned that the proposed tall building blocks at the Site would alter the local wind environment and result in

flash rainstorm that might cause severe flooding and landslide.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

25. 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.

26. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 2:15 p.m.

27. The meeting was resumed at 2:35 p.m.

28. 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 Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr C.H. Hau

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

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

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

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

29. 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

HD

Mr Dickson K.C. Mok - SPO/CD
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)

WSP (Asia) Ltd.]
Mr Y.F. Lim]
Ms Taylor P.H. Hung]
]

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

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R2800/C1257 – Tam Ka Wai

R4197 – Cheng Po Chu

R4198 – Chu Ka Kei

R4199 – Chu Kai Shing

R4203/C1261 – Kwok Miu Ling

R4204 – Yau Po Ting Winnie

R4227/C1262 – Yau Koon Chiu

R4228/C1263 – Yau Kar Ting Matthew

R4582/C1259 – Tam Ka Wong Thomas

Mr Tam Ka Wong Thomas

- Representer/Commenter and Representers' and Commenters' Representative

R2955/C1493 – Choi Ching Nam

R4777/C978 – Choi Yan Kit

Mr Choi Ching Nam

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

R2974/C980 – Kwong Sik Wah

R3678 – Lo Chui Wan

R4790 – Ma Sau Man

Ms Kwong Sik Wah

- Representer/Commenter and Representers' Representative

R3084 – Li Yan Sang

Mr Li Yan Sang - Representer

R3601 – Lai Wai Tung

Ms Lai Wai Tung - Representer

R3694 – Cheung Kin Ngai

Mr Cheung Kin Ngai - Representer

R4253/C1107 – Li Siu Ling

Ms Li Siu Ling - Representer/Commenter

R4608/C124 – Law Wing Ling

Ms Law Wing Ling - Representer/Commenter

R4707/C433 – Yue Mei Yin

Ms Yue Mei Yin - Representer/Commenter

R4709/C434 – Lai Pak Wah

Mr Lai Pak Wah - Representer/Commenter

R4778 – Cheung Man Lung

Mr Cheung Man Lung - Representer/Commenter

R4792/C1621 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer/Commenter

R4880/C1056 – Hung Kok

Mr Hung Kok - Representer/Commenter

C1260 – Tam Elliot Ho Chu

Mr Tam Elliot Ho Chu - Commenter

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

R2800/C1257 – Tam Ka Wai

R4197 – Cheung Po Chu

R4198 – Chu Ka Kei

R4199 – Chu Kai Shing

R4203/C1261 – Kwok Miu Ling

R4204 – Yau Po Ting Winnie

R4227/C1262 – Yau Koon Chiu

R4228/C1263 – Yau Kar Ting Matthew

R4582/C1259 – Tam Ka Wong Thomas

31. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tam Ka Wong Thomas made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed three 50-storey residential blocks were considered not sustainable and would have negative impact on the living quality of Mount Haven, such as creating wall effect affecting air ventilation and sunlight penetration;
- (b) the proposed development would induce more vehicular traffic and the traffic flow of the surrounding road networks, including Liu To Road, would be further saturated. Road safety of TYRW would also be affected. The traffic along CHR would also be affected due to construction of the proposed sewerage pipes underneath;
- (c) the increase of about 10,000 population would induce more demands for community and recreational facilities (including hospital and health care services) which had long been insufficient for Tsing Yi residents;
- (d) there would be air and noise pollution and nuisances caused to the residents nearby during the 10-year construction period;
- (e) there was a lack of local consultation and the local views were ignored;

- (f) the proposed development would cause irreversible negative impacts on the ecology of the “GB” zone and the environment of the surrounding areas. A large numbers of trees would be removed and streams would be diverted;
- (g) the development would induce risk of landslide; and
- (h) there were no justifications for the proposed development. The project would be a waste of public money and the Government should consider other better alternatives such as development on flat land. There should be reasonable and long term planning for development of public housing and the in-fill development approach was not agreeable.

R2955/C1493 – Choi Ching Nam

R4777/C978 – Choi Yan Kit

32. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Choi Ching Nam made the following main points:

- (a) he did not agree with rezoning the Site from “GB” for residential use. As set out in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, “GB” zone was not suitable for urban development;
- (b) the proposed development had not fulfilled the criteria in the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Development within Green Belt Zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 10) as new development in “GB” zone should only be considered under exceptional circumstances and compatible with the character of the surrounding areas; and it should not involve extensive clearance of existing natural vegetation and affect the existing natural landscape. However, the proposed development would bring visual impacts affecting visitors to the Nature Trails, involve extensive vegetation clearance, diversion of streams, cutting of slope and erection of large platform; and

- (c) the EFS conducted for the proposed development had misrepresented the policy addresses in that “GB” sites were mentioned in the 2013 and 2014 Policy Addresses while the 2017 Policy Address only mentioned that “brownfield sites” be explored for developments. Hence, only “brownfield sites”, instead of “GB” sites, should be considered for rezoning for development. Also, under the policy addresses, only sites considered “suitable” for housing development should be proceeded. However, the EFS only indicated that the Site had “potential” for housing development and concluded that the Site was “technically feasible” rather than “suitable” for housing development. In addition, the construction of the proposed development would last for about 13 years which could not be considered a land supply in short to medium term.

R3084 – Li Yan Sang

33. Mr Li Yan Sang said that he had been living in Cheung Hang Estate since 1993. As he needed to visit Princess Margaret Hospital, which he considered far away from his home, for regular healthcare services, he suggested the Government to build a hospital in Tsing Yi to serve the residents.

R2974/C980 – Kwong Sik Wah

R3678 – Lo Chui Wan

R4790 – Ma Sau Man

34. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Kwong Sik Wah made the following main points:

- (a) the first hearing date was scheduled for 16.5.2022 and the Paper was issued a week before. On 16.5.2022, there was media reporting that the representations on the OZP would be considered by the Board, but the amendment made to the OZP, as proposed by PlanD, would be approved by the Board. However, the fact that more than 5,100 adverse representations were received by the Board was not featured in the headlines of most of the news articles. She wondered whether PlanD had

colluded with the media to give pressure to the Board to approve the OZP amendment without taking account of the adverse representations;

- (b) she had been living in Tsing Yi for more than 10 years, and currently lived in Mount Haven. She had consulted some Tsing Yi residents of Cheung Ching Estate, Cheung Hang Estate, Cheung Hong Estate, Mayfair Gardens, Rambler Crest etc, and the residents considered that the 10-year construction period for the proposed development would be a waste of public money; there was no capacity for additional population in Tsing Yi; and the local traffic would be affected by the proposed development;
- (c) no school facilities would be provided in the proposed development even though there would be more than 10,000 additional population. Besides, there was no hospital in Tsing Yi and the residents needed to travel to other districts for hospital services;
- (d) the commitment to shorten the construction period as made by some government officials was in doubt. In reality, the completions of both private and public housing developments were usually delayed, rather than in advance, due to reasons such as bad/extreme weather (e.g. Typhoon Mangkhut) or impacts from other infrastructure works. Among the total public unit production of 101,300 for the period from 2020-21 to 2024-25, about 20% was delayed in production. Even if the construction period could be shortened to eight to nine years, it was still considered a very long period for the nearby residents and the long-term exposure to noise pollution and other nuisances was unbearable. She questioned whether any compensation would be given to the affected residents if the construction period was prolonged. On the other hand, if the construction period could be shortened, it was worried that the quality of the development might be compromised;
- (e) with reference to other public housing developments within “GB” zones in other areas such as Tan Kwai Tsuen in Yuen Long and To Yuen Tung in Tai Po, it was noted that the development intensity and BH restrictions there were much lower, the layout was much spacious, and the construction

period was much shorter as compared with those of the proposed development. She queried whether the public resources were unfairly allocated;

- (f) she also questioned the findings of the ecological assessment in that the ecological values of the Site was played down and the assessment in the International Union for Conservation of Nature's Red List regarding endangered species found in the Site was ignored;
- (g) inconsistent standards were adopted in relation to tree preservation for the Site and that for the Fanling Golf Course. For the Site, transplantation of *Aquilaria sinensis* (土沉香) was proposed to facilitate the proposed development. However, for the proposed housing development in Fanling Golf Course, no transplantation would be required for *Aquilaria sinensis*. It was considered that the conservation efforts made for the Site and Fanling Golf Course were different despite that they shared similar ecological values. She doubted whether government officials had skewed towards those in power and applied double standard in zoning amendments; and
- (h) the existing natural environment of the Site and its surroundings would be affected by the proposed development which required diversion of the natural streams and the Nature Trails and devastation of the secondary woodland within the Site. The valuable recreation space for the local community would be reduced. Hence, the Site was considered not suitable to be rezoned for housing development.

R3694 – Cheung Kin Ngai

35. Mr Cheung Kin Ngai made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in Cheung Hong Estate for about eight years and used to hike in the Nature Trails which was one of his leisure activities, especially that entertainment facilities were lacking in Tsing Yi. He enjoyed the natural environment very much. He objected to rezoning the

Site for development and the Government should consider other alternative sites near Tsing Yi Bridge and Ting Kau Bridge;

- (b) while the traffic congestion problem in Tsing Yi could easily be observed, it had not been reflected in the findings of the PTTIA. There were also insufficient public transport services (e.g. bus services), community facilities and services (e.g. wet market) in Tsing Yi. Tsing Yi was like a commuter town. In addition to hardware (e.g. infrastructure and facilities), provision of software (e.g. mental/spiritual supports provided by non-government organisations) in consultation with the Social Welfare Department was also important in the comprehensive planning for the Tsing Yi community;
- (c) the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for rezoning of other “GB” sites for development in Tsing Yi. There were valuable species in the Site and the translocation proposal for the affected species was not justified. The natural environment would be sacrificed for the proposed development; and
- (d) he did not object to provision of public housing but not at the Site.

R4253/C1107 – Li Siu Ling

36. Ms Li Siu Ling made the following main points:

- (a) the OZP amendment reflected that the increase of housing supply focused only on the quantity while the quality of living as well as the natural environment were ignored. The Site was not suitable for development of high-rise public housing, and the long construction period would increase the cost and was a waste of public money;
- (b) the responses to representations/comments made by the Government as indicated in the Paper and in the previous sessions of the meeting did not address the concerns raised by the public adequately. Once the rezoning proposal was approved, there would be no one to follow up with the

concerns and the well-being of nearby residents and teachers/students would be directly affected by the nuisances (e.g. noise and pollutions) generated during the construction period for the proposed development;

- (c) the assessments conducted during the pandemic situation would have implications on their reliability. Besides, outdated data was used in the assessments, for example, new developments in Tsing Yi completed in recent years which should also be taken into account in the various assessments;
- (d) the proposed development itself and the construction of which would induce more traffic which would prolong the commuting time for the existing residents, especially under poor weather. Also, there were lots of traffic accidents at TYRW and at the roundabout near Cheung Hang Estate;
- (e) since the development would take a long period for completion, it was doubted whether the assessments would still be valid after 10 years. It was noted that some of detailed technical assessments would only be conducted in a later stage after the approval of the OZP amendment, which might leave their concerns unsettled;
- (f) the proposed development would affect air ventilation of the surroundings. As a result, residents of Mount Haven would use more air conditioning which would increase living cost and energy consumption; and
- (g) the proposed development being situated on a sloping site would induce potential risk of landslide and this was harmful to the residents of Mount Haven. The individual and societal risks associated with the proposed development being located near the oil depot had not been resolved.

R4608/C124 – Law Wing Ling

37. Ms Law Wing Ling made the following main points:

- (a) she was a retiree and had been living in Mount Haven for less than five years. She objected to the proposed development and emphasised that the long construction period of the development would destroy the tranquil environment she had been enjoying due to the construction noise and other nuisances generated from the works. PlanD also acknowledged the adverse impacts that might be caused to residents of Mount Haven, and those impacts were considered irreversible by the residents;
- (b) as Mount Haven was situated in a valley, the proposed development to the south together with Cheung Hang Estate to the north would block the winds and sunlight to Mount Haven. Due to the close proximity, the Site would have potential structural risk affecting Mount Haven; and
- (c) the Board should listen to the adverse representations from the residents of Mount Haven, green groups, K&TDC members whose voices were being ignored by the Government.

R4709/C434 – Lai Pak Wah

38. Mr Lai Pak Wah made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to the proposed development. He requested that photomontages with viewpoints from Mount Haven be provided in the VIA;
- (b) the Site abutted TYRW which was a high speed sloping road with steep gradient, and there would be potential impact on traffic safety associated with additional traffic generated from the proposed development. According to the current traffic design, vehicles could only be allowed to turn left from the Site to TYRW (northbound). For vehicles heading to TYRW (southbound), they needed to firstly travel to Tam Kon Shan Interchange for a turnaround. This would induce additional traffic flow and hence congestion in the adjoining road network, especially on Tsing King Road leading to MTR Tsing Yi Station, impeding the commuter's journey to work. Liu To Road would also be affected by the additional

traffic generated by the Site because vehicles would need to pass through the junction of TYRW/Liu To Road in order to get from TYRW (northbound) to TYRW (southbound). Together with the new residents in The Met. Azure in future, the capacity of Liu To Road would be saturated and more traffic accidents were anticipated;

- (c) the junction of TYRW/CHR was busy. Previously, TD did not allow pipes improvement works at that junction due to traffic impacts. It was now questionable why TD had no concern on the PTTIA for the proposed development regarding the traffic flow and capacity of TYRW, noting that it was also a trunk road connecting to the airport;
- (d) it was unclear whether the traffic flow of construction vehicles had been included in the PTTIA, and whether the relevant sections of TYRW could cater for the large number of construction vehicles going to/from the Site throughout the entire construction period;
- (e) the Site fell within the 1 km CZ of STYI and there would be potential risk. Part of the existing natural hilly terrain, which acted as physical barrier separating STYI from the residential developments, would be removed. As such, it was not justifiable to conclude the potential risk as manageable level;
- (f) a natural slope would be replaced by a man-made one at the Site. It was unclear whether the relevant maintenance cost had already been reflected in the cost estimate for the proposed development; and
- (g) the long construction period of more than 10 years for the proposed development was not in line with the Government's policy of expediting housing supply. Such long construction period would induce high construction cost and a waste of public money. CEDD and HD could not clearly explain how they could co-ordinate the works so as to reduce the construction cost and time, and the effectiveness of the proposed construction methods (e.g. Modular Integrated Construction Method) was questionable. The Government should expedite the implementation of the Northern Metropolis development which would be far more cost-

effective than the proposed development.

R4778 – Cheung Man Lung

39. Mr Cheung Man Lung made the following main points:

- (a) he was the former Vice-Chairman of K&TDC. As there were lots of technical difficulties for development of the Site, the construction period would be inevitably long which would affect the daily life of the local community in Tsing Yi in various aspects. He urged that the OZP amendment should not be approved and the needs of housing supply should not outweigh the traffic congestion problems in Tsing Yi;
- (b) the information on the proposed development provided by PlanD was not comprehensive, and mistakes were found, such as wrong indication for the location of Tsing Yi Interchange on a Powerpoint slide at the hearing meeting on 16.5.2022. This reflected that there might be misleading information provided by PlanD for the Board's consideration;
- (c) traffic congestion problem in Tsing Yi was commonly observed by the residents and had been reflected in the numerous adverse representations. The local road network was anticipated to be saturated due to the additional population of about 10,000 from the proposed development. Although the PTTIA estimated that the remaining traffic capacity for Tam Kon Shan Interchange would be about 30%, such remaining capacity in reality was inadequate to serve Tsing Yi north area and the traffic from TYRW. Traffic congestions at Tam Kon Shan Interchange during peak hours were very frequent, adversely affecting the residents' commuting time and choice of routes;
- (d) TYRW was a busy sloping road frequently used by heavy vehicles (including tank wagons). As there would be a PTI within the Site and bus stops at TYRW to serve the new population of the proposed development, buses making stops would block the through traffic of

TYRW, resulting in additional traffic jams and accidents;

- (e) only one roundabout was designed within the proposed development. Under emergency situation, there would be numbers of fire engines at that roundabout which might tail back onto TYRW, affecting the nearby traffic flow given that the junction of TYRW/CHR was one of the major junctions in Tsing Yi;
- (f) there were insufficient open spaces in Kwai Tsing district. The OZP amendment would reduce the leisure areas and green spaces for the local residents;
- (g) there were lots of major utility pipelines in the surroundings of the Site. Diversion of these pipelines would affect the housing construction programme. Any damages to these pipelines during the construction period would affect the provision of services to Tsing Yi residents and create traffic congestions; and
- (h) it was uncertain whether the Site would be developed as public rental housing (PRH) or subsidised sales flats (SSF). The maintenance cost of the man-made slope would be a huge burden on the future residents if the Site was to be developed for SSF.

R4880/C1056 – Hung Kok

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Hung Kok made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident in Tsing Yi and considered that the proposed development was not worthwhile to be carried out, although he recognised the need for more public housing in Hong Kong;
- (b) the proposed development was not cost-effective and would be a waste of public money. There was no clear information on the cost estimate for the proposed development which would last for 12 years;

- (c) there were Lantau Tomorrow Vision and Northern Metropolis Development which could provide adequate land supply for more than a million housing units in future. According to the Census and Statistics Department (CSD), the population projection would peak at 2041, followed by gradual decrease. Coupled with the recent high migration rate, the future housing demand was questionable. Also, there was a downward trend on the number of applicants in the waiting list for PRH since 2017;
- (d) the Government had recently announced the intention to expedite land resumption and clearance for development. Development of brownfield sites was in fact a better alternative to rezoning of “GB” zones for development;
- (e) the proposed development was considered incompatible with the surrounding developments and would induce irreversible impacts on Mount Haven in terms of visual, air ventilation and blockage of sunlight penetration. The BH of Mount Haven was about 103mPD while the proposed development was 220mPD. Comparing with the existing site level of the indoor sports hall/tennis court (33mPD) at Mount Haven, the site level of 46mPD for the proposed development represented a significant level difference. The proposed development would be in close proximity to Mount Haven, inducing significant visual impact or wall effect on the later, and the proposed mitigation measures (e.g. setbacks) would be meaningless in this context;
- (f) given the sloping topography, the possibility of widening TYRW was questionable;
- (g) according to CSD, more than 50% of the residents in Tsing Yi would use railway for commuting, with shuttle bus services between home and MTR Tsing Yi Station. The planned developments/new stations along MTR Tung Chung Line in Tung Chung East and West and at Siu Ho Wan Depot would increase the burden on the capacity of MTR Tung Chung Line. Coupled with the increase in population in Tsing Yi, significant impacts

on the public transport facilities were envisaged; and

- (h) more than 1,000 trees would be felled and some valuable species would be affected. The potential ecological value of the natural streams within the Site might have also been undermined, as streams in Hong Kong were mostly seasonal and the ecological value of the habitats along the streams would vary between the wet and dry seasons. The proposed translocation of the affected species could not compensate for the loss of the ecological value of the habitats.

[Dr Venus Y.H. Lun joined this session of the meeting during Mr Hung's presentation.]

R4792/C1621 – Mary Mulvihill

41. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was not at the fringe of built-up areas but an integral part of a large woodland which had high conservation value, and the Nature Trails were also located thereat;
- (b) about 1,300 trees would be felled and the local ecosystem within the Site and in the surrounding areas would be destroyed or affected. The effectiveness of the compensatory planting proposal was in question. Lights from the proposed development would affect the natural habitat and the circadian rhythm of animals, birds and wildlife. The diversion of streams could cause irreversible damage to the natural system;
- (c) the natural ridgeline was a valuable asset to the community, and there would be significant visual impact generated from the proposed development;
- (d) the subject “GB” zone was a buffer between the densely developed residential nodes and a number of heavy industry and polluting facilities. Not much details about the risk assessment were provided in the Paper. It should be reminded that risk was not just a technical matter but a health

issue. The development at Lee Nam Road, Ap Lei Chau, which also fell within the CZ of a Potentially Hazardous Installation (PHI), was not a comparable example to the proposed development at the Site since the scales of the two developments were different. In addition to STYI, there were three other oil depots in southern Tsing Yi and the accumulative risk impacts of all PHIs should be assessed;

- (e) the PTTIA was undertaken based on outdated data and some new developments were not included in the assessment;
- (f) there was no space for further widening of TYRW as part of the road was in the form of a bridge;
- (g) the ingress/egress of the Site was not a signalised junction. TYRW was a busy high speed trunk road. Traffic congestion at TYRW (southbound) would be anticipated as vehicles entering the Site would need to wait at the pocket for a right-turn. For vehicles exiting the Site, only left-turn to TYRW (northbound) would be allowed and this would induce traffic travelling to the Tam Kong Shan Interchange for a turnaround;
- (h) the capacity of MTR Tung Chung Line had been ignored. As there would be more developments in Tung Chung and Siu Ho Wan, it was unlikely that the railway capacity could accommodate the additional population in the proposed development;
- (i) mitigation measures proposed for the housing development such as acoustic windows, acoustic fins, as well as minimisation of openable windows could not facilitate natural ventilation. These measures would degrade the quality of living;
- (j) there was a deficiency in the provision of community facilities in Tsing Yi. The GIC facilities to be provided in the proposed development could not redress the the demand of the public;
- (k) the vacancy tax was dropped by the Government and the market had many vacant small units. The proposed development was not cost-effective to

provide additional housing units. Steep terrain would require extensive stabilization measures and would be costly to construct and maintain; and

- (l) there should be a balance between development and respect of nature in order to avert catastrophe. Housing development should not be the only consideration and public views should be respected. The Board should be brave to consider a range of issues associated with the proposed development, disregarding the pressure from the media which only presented the proposal in a positive way without mentioning the objections received.

42. 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, 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.

43. Before proceeding to the Q&A session, the Chairperson responded to two allegations against the Government/PlanD made by some of the representers/commenters in their oral submissions. One of the allegations was that the Government/PlanD had steered the media not to report the number of adverse representations received in respect of the OZP amendment and to highlight PlanD's recommendation of not upholding the representations, so as to put pressure on the Board to accept PlanD's recommendation which was tantamount to "making judgement before trial". The Chairperson reiterated that it was an established practice that the Paper, which summarized all representations/comments received as well as PlanD's views and recommendations, be made available for public inspection at least a week before the hearing. The media could also access the Paper and it would be the media's own decision on when and how to report the contents of the Paper. How the media formulated the headlines and quoted the information in the Paper was outside the control of the Government/PlanD. PlanD had not orchestrated any media publicity with a view to influencing the Board's decision on the representations/comments and the OZP amendment.

44. As for the allegation regarding the acceptance of advantages by the government

officers in relation to the rezoning proposal, the Chairperson emphasized that while the representers/commenters might consider the rezoning proposal unjustifiable, all attending the hearing should speak in a responsible manner and should not make unsubstantiated allegations against other parties including the Government. Rezoning of “GB” sites was aimed to increase land supply for housing developments in the short, medium and long term. With adequate supply of public housing, the living quality of those in need could be improved, especially for those who were currently living in undesirable dwellings like sub-divided flats and who would not normally make representations to the Board asking for provision of more public housing for themselves. The government officers had worked on the associated rezoning exercise with a view to addressing the housing demand and improving the livelihood of those applying for public housing. The representers/commenters might consider that the officers had not undertaken the task in a thoughtful manner, and it was always acceptable to have different views on and enquiries into the rezoning proposal through the hearing process. However, it would be most unfair to PlanD or other officers discharging their official duties in good faith if representers/commenters made unfounded allegations about the officers having possibly accepted advantages and committed a criminal offence in the rezoning exercise. In case there was any evidence on acceptance of advantages by government officers, one should report the case to the relevant authorities immediately and take responsibility for the lodging of such a report.

45. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) clarification on the relevance between the current OZP amendment involving rezoning of “GB” site and the TPB PG-No. 10, and whether there was any misrepresentation in the EFS regarding the “GB” review in respect of whether the Site was suitable for housing development;
- (b) elaboration on the needs to rezone the Site from “GB” for the proposed development, which would take about ten years to complete, vis-à-vis other major development projects like the Northern Metropolis Development;
- (c) with reference to Drawing H-5 of the Paper, details on the stream diversion within the Site and how the diverted stream would be connected with the natural stream outside the Site near Mount Haven;

- (d) information on the existing capacity of MTR Tung Chug Line and whether it was able to cater for the demand for rail services arising from the proposed development; and
- (e) frequency of maintenance works required for TYRW which might be an indicator that the road was subject to serious deterioration due to frequent usage by heavy vehicles.

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

- (a) the TPB PG-No. 10 was to provide guidance and criteria for the Board to consider developments within “GB” zone under section 16 planning application. However, the current rezoning of “GB” was taken forward in the form of OZP amendment for which the context was different. Under the second stage “GB” review, the Site was identified as having potential for housing development and the EFS was undertaken to confirm its technical feasibility. As concluded in the EFS, there would not be any insurmountable technical problems associated with the proposed development at the Site. In other words, the Site was considered suitable for the proposed development;
- (b) the Northern Metropolis Development was a relatively long-term development plan. According to the Long Term Housing Strategy, the total housing supply target for the 10-year period from 2022-23 to 2031-32 would be about 430,000 units (301,000 and 129,000 units for public and private housing respectively). There would still be strong demand for housing units; and
- (c) about 600m of the existing stream would be affected under the current diversion proposal. As shown in Drawing H-5 of the Paper, there would be two sections of “diverted stream”. The first section of diverted stream would run from the south to the north along the western boundary of the Site up to a section of channelised stream outside the Site near Liu To Village/Mount Haven which would be retained intact. The second

section of diverted stream running along the northern boundary of Site would connect the aforesaid retained stream and the stream to the further east of the Site;

- (d) based on the information available in April 2021, the design capacity of the MTR Tung Chung Line was about 66,000 patronage per hour per direction, and the current used capacity was about 22,300 patronage per hour per direction. According to the PTTIA, the estimated patronage per hour per direction taking MTR Tung Chung Line generated by the proposed development would be about 2,800, which was a conservative assumption, and would constitute only about 4% of the design capacity; and
- (e) there was no information on the maintenance works for TYRW available at hand.

47. Regarding the long-term housing supply, the Chairperson supplemented that there would still be demands for both public and private housing beyond the current 10-year period and the housing units to be provided by the proposed development at the Site would help to meet such demands.

48. Noting that there were no further questions from Members, the Chairperson invited the Government representatives to provide the information in relation to questions raised by Members in the last hearing session on 17.5.2022, apart from the information that had already been provided in today's Q&A session.

Risk Assessment

49. Regarding the methodology adopted in HA, its findings and recommendations, and similar examples in Hong Kong, Mr David C.M. Lee, consultants of CEDD, Mr C.F. Leung, CE/SD(W), CEDD and Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation, made the following main points:

- (a) for any development falling within a CZ of PHI, a quantitative risk assessment (QRA) would be required. As shown in a flow chart of

methodology, major factors generally included in a QRA were “frequency analysis” (based on the historical failure data) and “consequence analysis” (including weather data). The failure (e.g. fire accident due to installations/facilities deterioration) and external events (e.g. earthquake) leading to accidental loss of containment would be assessed. Taking into account the relevant population data, a risk assessment was carried out to determine the “Individual Risk Contour” and “Societal Risk F-N Curve”. Mitigation measures would also be recommended as appropriate; and

- (b) as for the proposed development, a QRA (namely Hazard Assessment (HA) under the EFS) was undertaken as the Site fell within the 1km CZ of STYI where there were storage of Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) and oil depots. No other PHI CZ was involved. The population of the existing/proposed development and road users within the CZ were taken into account in the HA for calculation of individual and societal risks. Over 40 scenarios with around 200,000 possible outcomes had been simulated and considered. The HA revealed that the individual risks level at the Site was very low as indicated far away from the lowest “Individual Risks Contour” (equivalent to a chance lower than 1 in 1 billion per year). Also, as indicated by the “Societal Risk F-N Curve”, the societal risk for various cases, i.e. under operation stage and construction stage of the proposed development, are very similar to the baseline case without the proposed development. This reflected that the proposed development would not bring forth any significant change to the level of societal risk to the community. The societal risk of the proposed development was within the level of “As Low As Reasonably Practicable” (“ALARP”). The HA for the Site had been endorsed by Coordinating Committee on Land-use Planning and Control relating to Potential Hazardous Installations on 20.10.2021; and
- (c) as recommended in the HA, given that the societal risk resulted was within the level of ALARP, a cost-benefit analysis had been carried out, and recommended administrative measures, such as carrying out safety drills by the contractor during the construction period and preparation of the evacuation plan by the future property management company, to further

minimise the risk. Physical mitigation measures in the design of the scheme for the proposed development to cater for the risks were considered not necessary;

- (d) risk standards or methodologies adopted varied amongst countries which could not be compared directly. Nevertheless, as an illustration, it can be said that the approach adopted in Hong Kong on risk assessment is similar to United Kingdom Health and Safety Executive (UKHSE)'s approach, such as the use of "Individual Risk Contour" for site of concerned installation; and
- (e) as for similar example in Hong Kong, the amendments to the approved Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP No. S/H15/29 (subsequently approved by the Chief Executive in Council on 3.1.2017) involved a site at Lee Nam Road, Ap Lei Chau, which fell within the 500m CZ of PHI (LPG and oil products transit depot) and was rezoned for residential use.

50. A Member remarked that with reference to the UKHSE example mentioned by the consultant, the individual risk level for the proposed development as indicated by the "Individual Risks Contour" in the HA (i.e. a chance lower than 1 in 1 billion per year) was very low.

Changes in building height and associated Loss of Units

51. Regarding the changes in number of units in relation to the reduction of BH for the proposed development, Mr Dickson K.C. Mok, SPO/CD, HD replied that while the exact number of units to be provided was subject to detailed design, some rough estimations based on the current notional scheme in support of the OZP amendment could be provided for the Board's reference. Under the current notional scheme with a BH of 220mPD, about 3,800 units would be provided. If the BH of the proposed development was reduced to 200mPD (similar to Cheung Wang Estate) and 190mPD (similar to Cheung Hang Estate), the number of units would be reduced by about 550 and about 990 respectively.

[Mr Stephen L.H Liu and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

52. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. She 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 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.

53. As the meeting had run for three days and Members would need time to organise and consider the information and views received, the Board agreed to adjourn the meeting and conduct the deliberation in another session.

54. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.