

**Minutes of 1295<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 2.6.2023**

**Present**

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr C.H. Hau

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West)

Transport Department

Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung

Chief Engineer (Works),

Home Affairs Department

Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Director of Lands

Ms Sophia C.W. Chiang

Director of Planning

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)

Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng (a.m.)

Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Kitty S.T. Lam (a.m.)

Ms Karen F.Y. Lam (p.m.)

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1293<sup>rd</sup> Meeting held on 12.5.2023

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1293<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 12.5.2023 were confirmed without amendment.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[This item was conducted in Cantonese.]

- (i) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments of Draft Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs)

2. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations and comments in respect of two OZPs: (i) the draft Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/31; and (ii) the draft Wan Chai North OZP No. S/H25/5.

3. The Secretary reported that the amendments to the Kwai Chung OZP involved public housing to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) with the Housing Department (HD) as the executive arm of HKHA. The proposed public housing development at Shek Pai Street was supported by technical assessments conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). Representations had been submitted by the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R7/C1), Conservancy Association (CA) (R8/C2) and Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R860). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Ms Sophia C.W. Chiang  
(as Director of Lands) - being a member of HKHA;
- Mr Paul Y.K. Au  
(as Chief Engineer (Works),  
Home Affairs Department) - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL;
- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau ] being a member of Hong Kong Housing  
] Society (HKHS), which currently had  
Ms Lilian S.K. Law ] discussion with HD on housing  
development issues;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS, which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS, which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues;
- Dr C.H. Hau - conducting contract research projects with CEDD; being a member of HKBWS, a life member of the CA and his spouse being the Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of the CA;

- Mr K.W. Leung - being a member of the executive board of HKBWS and the chairman of Crested Bulbul Club Committee of HKBWS;
- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being an independent non-executive director of MTRCL; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - being a supervisor of a primary school in Kwai Chung.

4. The Secretary reported that the amendment to the draft Wan Chai North OZP involved rezoning a site for composite development comprising convention and exhibition facilities, hotel and office. Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP), AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) and Wong & Ouyang (Hong Kong) Limited (WOHK) were three of the consultants of the Hong Kong Trade Development Council (HKTDC) that prepared the technical assessments in support of the proposed development. Representation had been submitted by MTRCL(R9). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Franklin Yu - his firm having current business dealings with ARUP and WOHK;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - his firm having current business dealings with AECOM and MTRCL;
- Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho - his firm having current business dealings with AECOM;
- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being an independent non-executive director of MTRCL; and

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung - being a member of Infrastructure Development Advisory Committee of HKTDC.

5. As the item was for seeking the Board's agreement on the hearing arrangement for the two OZPs and was procedural in nature, all Members who had declared interests in relation to the amendments and representations should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

6. The Secretary introduced the details as below:

- (a) on 18.11.2022, the draft Kwai Chung OZP involving mainly: (i) rezoning of an area to the east of Shek Pai Street (SPS site) from "Green Belt" to "Residential (Group A)3" ("R(A)3") for public housing development (Item A1); (ii) rezoning of the Kwai On Factory Estate from "Industrial" to "R(A)4" for public housing development (Item B); (iii) rezoning of the Ex-Kwai Chung Incineration Plant site on Kwai Yue Street from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") to "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Columbarium (2)" for public columbarium development (Item C); and (iv) rezoning of a site at the former Salvation Army Kwai Chung Girls' Home at Lei Muk Road from "Open Space" to "OU" annotated "Buildings with Historical and Architectural Interest Preserved for Social Welfare Facility Use" to take forward the decision of the Metro Planning Committee to partially agree to a section 12A application (Item D), was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, 860 valid representations were received. The valid representations were subsequently published for three weeks and 1,810 valid comments were received; and

[Post-meeting note: The Secretariat reconfirmed after the meeting that the number of valid comments received within the publication period should be 1,811.]

- (b) on 13.1.2023, the draft Wan Chai North OZP involving rezoning of a site covering the existing Wanchai Tower, Revenue Tower, Immigration Tower, Kong Wan Fire Station and Gloucester Road Garden together with part of the Harbour Road from "G/IC" and an area shown as 'Road' to "OU(6)" annotated

“Exhibition Centre with Commercial Development” to facilitate a composite development comprising convention and exhibition facilities, hotel and office was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. During the two-month exhibition period, nine valid representations were received. The valid representations were subsequently published for three weeks and one valid comment was received.

7. The Secretary reported that in view of the similar nature of the representations and comments, the hearing of representations and comments for each OZP was recommended to be considered by the full Board collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearings, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter in the hearing sessions. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board of the Kwai Chung and Wan Chai North OZPs was tentatively scheduled for July 2023.

8. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the respective hearing arrangements in paragraph 7 above.

(ii) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 1 of 2023

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) in

“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 857 RP in D.D. 9,

Tai Wo Village, Tai Po

Application No. A/NE-KLH/611

---

9. The Secretary reported that a Notice of Appeal was received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) (TPAB) on 12.5.2023 against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 24.2.2023 to reject on review application No. A/NE-KLH/611 for a proposed house (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) at a site zoned “Agriculture” (“AGR”) on the Kau Lung Hang Outline Zoning Plan.

10. The review application was rejected by the Board for the following reasons:



- (a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone, which was primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It was also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) land supply was still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zones of Yuen Leng, Kau Lung Hang and Tai Wo villages which were primarily intended for Small House development. It was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zones for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.

11. Members noted that the hearing date of the appeal was yet to be fixed and agreed that the Secretary would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.

(iii) Appeal Statistics

12. The Secretary reported that as at 29.5.2023, a total of 6 cases were yet to be heard by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) and 5 decisions were outstanding. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	43
Dismissed	170
Abandoned/Withdrawn/invalid	213
Yet to be heard	6
Decision Outstanding	5
<hr/>	
Total	437

## **Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District**

### **Agenda Item 3**

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft So Kwun Wat Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM-SKW/14

(TPB Paper No. 10899)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

13. The Secretary reported that the amendment to the draft So Kwun Wat Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM-SKW/14 (the draft OZP) involved rezoning of a site for departmental quarters of the Correctional Services Department in Siu Lam, Tuen Mun. A representation had been submitted by the Siu Lam Integrated Rehabilitation Services Complex (R841) and the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (TWGHs) was one of the operators. Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had declared an interest on the item for his firm having current business dealings with TWGHs.

14. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had no involvement in the submission of R841 and agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng joined the meeting at this point.]

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

15. The Vice-chairperson said that notifications 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.

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

***Government Representatives***

Planning Department (PlanD)

- Mr Raymond H.F. Au - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun  
and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW)
- Ms Janet K.K. Cheung - Senior Town Planner/TMYLW  
(STP/TMYLW)

Correctional Services Department (CSD)

- Mr Lawrence C.K. Chow - Senior Superintendent
- Mr Wilson S.W. Yeung - Principal Officer
- Mr Kendrick K.T. Liu - Principal Officer

Urbis Limited

Ms Winona S.M. Ip ]

OZZO Technology (HK) Limited

Ms Oliver L.Y. Cheung ] Consultants

SMEC

Mr Fed K.K. Ng ]

Mr Charls C.F. Liang ]

***Representers, Commenters and their Representatives***

R4 – Tang Kwai Chuen Alan

R261 – Koh Soo Lee

R262 – Tang Yue Him Nicholas

R606 – Anna Bogushevskaya

R605 – Alexey Shumkov

- Mr Tang Kwai Chuen Alan - Representer and  
Representers' Representative

R7 – Chak Mo Ling (翟慕玲)

R286 – Ho Ming Wai

R292 – Winocean Development Ltd

R299 – Chung Kwok Wa (鍾國華)

R300 – So Kit Ching

R312 – Chan Choi Wan Irene

R340 – Leung Wai Man

R345 – Chu Tak Ming (朱德明)

R385 – Mak Pik Shan Nancy (麥碧珊)

R359 – 李澤光

R385 – Chung Pui Wah

R412 – Wong Yiu Shing (黃耀成)

R457 – 吳惠蓮

R486 – Lau Chi Leung Ricky

Mr Wong Yiu Shing

- Representer and Representers'  
Representative

R8 – Ho Kin San (何鍵榮)

R223 – Yeung Po Yee (楊寶儀)

Ms Yeung Po Yee

- Representer and Representer's  
Representative

R9 – Cho Yee Mui (曹綺梅)

R45 – Chan Tat Wai (陳達威)

R326 – Fung Ka Lok

R330 – Chan Mee Kuen Shirley (陳美娟)

R336 – Leung Kwok Chun

R355 – Kwok Chi Kwong Danny (郭志光)

R357 – Tsang Wai Kwong

R386 – 陳詠欣

R421 – 趙文娜

R436 – Tse Yuk Fung (謝玉鳳)

R456 – Cheung Wai Chuen Jimmy (張偉泉)

R779 – Chiu Lai Yuen

Ms Cho Yee Mui - Representor and Representors' Representative

R12 – Im Man Ieng

R13 – Chan Tsz Kin

Ms Im Man Ieng - Representor and Representor's Representative

R17 – Coman Anca Ioana

R372 – Coman Anica

Ms Coman Anca Ioana - Representor and Representor's Representative

R20/C3 – Kong Man Wai

R81 – Choi Mow Sang

Mr Choi Mow Sang - Representor and Representor's/Commentor's Representative

R39 – Lam Kit Fun Kid (林潔芬)

Ms Lam Kit Fun Kid - Representor

R46/C2 – Pui Lan Lee (李佩蘭)

R112 – Andrada Amalia Sibal

R113 – 林燕

R116 – Kong Chun Ming Kevin

R117 – Kong Choi

R133 – Kwok Fat Cheong

R134 – Kwok Lam Yin Ming

R170 – Kwok Shek Yeung Aaron

R171 – Kwok Shek Hung Jerome

R172 – Lolita Suyat Reyes

R418 – Chan Choi Ching

R551 – Lee Pui Lin

R577 – Kwok Siu Lan (郭兆蘭)

R578 – Lai Ming Chung (黎明頌)

R651 – Cheng Pok Yan

R730 – Wong Yin

R733 – Ho Wai Kuen Betty

R834 – Wong Lung Nui

R835 – Chan Tim Lam

Ms Lee Pui Lan

- Representor, Representatives'  
Representative and Commenter

R54 – Choi Siu Sum

Mr Choi Siu Sum

- Representor

R55 – 陳錦明

R56 – 陳進業

R57 – Lam Sau Ying Cathy (林秀英)

R60 – Chan Chun Wei Michael

Ms Lam Sau Ying Cathy

- Representor and Representatives'  
Representative

R69 – Wong Kwok Cheung Michael

R99 – Kong Tommy Ming Fung

R315 – Ling Ching (凌靜)

R316 – Chau Mui (周梅)

R317 – Sri Lestari

R405 – Wong Kwok Ho (黃國豪)

R479 – Li Fai (李輝)

- Ms Li Fai - Representer and Representers' Representative
- R80 – Wong Ching Man Ruby  
Ms Wong Ching Man Ruby - Representer
- R115 – Kong Chun Yin Andy  
莊豪鋒 - Representer's Representative
- R142 – Wong Dawn  
R144 – Wan May Sheung Tracy  
Ms Wan May Sheung Tracy - Representer and Representer's Representative
- R231 – Lam Wai Fun (林慧芬)  
Ms Lam Wai Fun - Representer
- R253 – Chau Tak Lam (周德林)  
R256 – Chau Pui Chi  
R257 – Chau Chun Hei  
Mr Chau Tak Lam - Representer and Representers' Representative
- R274 – Yeung King Chung Spencer  
R349 – Chan Siu Chi (陳兆治)  
R581 – 林翠英  
Mr Yeung King Chung Spencer - Representer and Representers' Representative
- R291 – Leung Ching Kwan Grace  
Ms Leung Ching Kwan Grace - Representer

R293 – Cheung Cho Kit (張祖傑)

R352 – Yuen Yee Fan

R389 – Cheung Yat Tung

R390 – Chan Hang Sheung

R391 – Cheung Ho Tung

Ms Yuen Yee Fan

- Representer and Representers'  
Representative

R329 – 梁志強

Mr Leung Chi Keung

- Representer

R331 – 冼娟明

冼娟明

- Representer

R380 – Kuk Yi Tan Glory (曲怡丹)

R415 – Chow Jin (周靜)

R503 – Kuk Yi Kwan Spring (曲怡瑤)

R504 – Kuk Pui David (曲渤)

R800 – 張冬菇

R802 – 張馬騰

Ms Chow Jin

- Representer and Representers'  
Representative

R556 – Liu Chloe Hoi Yee

R557 – Chan Lai Kwan

R558 – Liu Kwok Chuen

Mr Liu Kwok Chuen

- Representer and Representers'  
Representative

R589 Yu Yee Hung

R591 Tuniah



Ms Yu Yee Hung - Representer and Representers' Representative

R648 – To Kok Yin

R650 – Kan Man Wai Betty

Mr To Kok Yin - Representer and Representers' Representative

R688 – Quan Ho

R689 –Wong Cheung Chu Anthony

Mr Wong Cheung Chu Anthony - Representer and Representers' Representative

R700 – 王岳

R702 – 岳秀芝

R703 – 于美鶯

R704 – 于美嘉

岳秀芝 - Representer and Representers' Representative

R701 – 王瑞岩

R705 – 于美懿

王瑞岩 - Representer and Representers' Representative

R731 – Yip King Wai

Mr Yip King Wai - Representer

R736 – Lee Yin Ling Stevie (李燕玲)

Ms Lee Yin Ling Stevie - Representer

R737 – Li Pui Sang (李培生)

Mr Li Pui Sang - Representer

R738 – Wu Ho Sing (鄔浩成)

Mr Wu Ho Sing - Representer

R751 – Tam Chun Hin (譚駿軒)

R754 – Wong Sui Yee Catherine (黃瑞儀)

Ms Wong Sui Yee Catherine - Representer and Representers' Representative

R832/C1 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

R841 – 小欖綜合康復服務大樓

Mr Wu Yat King Kingson - Representers' Representative

17. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome. He then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. He said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers, commenters, and representers' representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer, commenter, and representer's representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters, and representers' 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, and representers' representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representers, commenters, and representers' representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers, commenters, and representers' representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

18. The Vice-chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the draft OZP, the grounds/views of the representers and commenters and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10899 (the Paper). The amendment was to rezone a site at Hong Fai Road (the Site) mainly zoned "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") with a small portion in "Green Belt" ("GB") to "G/IC(1)" with stipulation of building height (BH) restriction of 90mPD for redevelopment of the existing 3 to 4-storey departmental quarters (DQs) of CSD to a 21-storey DQs.

[Mr Franklin Yu joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

19. The Vice-chairperson then invited the representers, commenters, and representers' representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments:

R69 – Wong Kwok Cheung Michael

R99 – Kong Tommy Ming Fung

R315 – Ling Ching (凌靜)

R316 – Chau Mui (周梅)

R317 – Sri Lestari

R405 – Wong Kwok Ho (黃國豪)

R479 – Li Fai (李輝)

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Li Fai made the following main points:

- (a) she was the representative of Palatial Coast Owners' Committee which did not support the proposed DQs redevelopment;
- (b) there was a lack of stakeholder consultation. The residents of Palatial Coast had written to CSD in 2018 regarding the proposed DQs redevelopment and was informed that the proposal was under consideration. In addition, the proposal had not been submitted to the

Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) for consideration as the TMDC was not functioning in 2019;

- (c) Hong Fai Road, which was the major access to the proposed DQs redevelopment and Palatial Coast, was a traffic accident blackspot. The road that was narrow and had a dead end, had been paralysed when traffic accidents occurred or when there was flooding. The proposed DQs redevelopment at the junction of Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road would block the sightline of drivers and cause more traffic accidents. Besides, traffic from Palatial Coast was suspended from time to time to meet the operational needs of the correctional institutions nearby. The traffic would further increase when the Siu Lam Integrated Rehabilitation Services Complex (IRSC) came into operation. The traffic network would be further overloaded by additional traffic generated by the proposed DQs redevelopment;
- (d) the residents of Palatial Coast had concerns on pedestrian safety and footpath capacity in the area. There was no proper pedestrian crossing facility along Hong Fai Road. The sharp bend near the junction of Siu Lam Road and Hong Fai Road was a blind spot and very dangerous for pedestrians crossing Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road. The existing narrow footpath (about 0.8m-wide) on one side of Hong Fai Road was substandard. The surface of the footpath was uneven with lots of catch pit covers ; and
- (e) relevant Government departments should clarify whether the proposal would be abandoned if technical assessments conducted during the detailed design stage indicated that there were adverse impacts.

R7 – Chak Mo Ling (翟慕玲)

R286 – Ho Ming Wai

R292 – Winocean Development Ltd

R299 – Chung Kwok Wa (鍾國華)

R300 – So Kit Ching

R312 – Chan Choi Wan Irene

R340 – Leung Wai Man

R345 – Chu Tak Ming (朱德明)

R358 – Mak Pik Shan Nancy (麥碧珊)

R359 – 李澤光

R385 – Chung Pui Wah

R412 – Wong Yiu Shing (黃耀成)

R457 – 吳惠蓮

R486 – Lau Chi Leung Ricky

21. Mr Wong Yiu Shing made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Palatial Coast. The Site was located in a valley surrounded by slopes and woodland. The proposed DQs redevelopment would involve felling of 40 trees and create wall effect;
- (b) since the operation of the third runway with flights every two minutes, the residents of Palatial Coast had suffered from aircraft noise problem. Future residents living at the Site would suffer from the impact of aircraft noise and the Site was not suitable for the proposed DQs redevelopment;
- (c) heavy vehicles used during the construction period would generate road safety problem and affect the residents of Palatial Coast. A section of Siu Lam Road abutting and providing access to Palatial Coast (Access Road) that was maintained by them, also provided access to the Site. Increased traffic and heavy vehicle traffic induced by the proposed DQs redevelopment would lead to congestion and increase their maintenance cost. The CSD should share the maintenance cost and responsibility of the Assess Road;
- (d) the Site was small and the proposed DQs redevelopment was not cost-effective and a waste of public funds. The project cost was based on previous estimates and could not reflect the actual expenditure to be

incurred. The CSD could consider buying flats on the market for their staff, which would be better value for money; and

- (e) the residents of Palatial Coast objected to the proposed DQs redevelopment. The Government should abandon the proposal to avoid confrontation with citizens.

R556 – Liu Chloe Hoi Yee

R557 – Chan Lai Kwan

R558 – Liu Kwok Chuen

22. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Liu Kwok Chuen made the following main points:

- (a) all residents of Palatial Coast objected to the amendment;
- (b) the response in paragraph 5.2.3 of the Paper regarding pedestrian safety was unacceptable. There was a blind spot for pedestrians crossing Hong Fai Road because their sightline was blocked by a sharp bend at the junction with Siu Lam Road. The road design could not meet the relevant standards for minimum sight distance (50m). There would be substantial increase in pedestrian flow and vehicular traffic when the IRSC came into operation and more accidents were anticipated; and
- (c) the narrow footpath along Hong Fai Road was substandard. The uneven surface with lots of catch pit covers had resulted in injuries and he was one of the victims who tripped and fell at the footpath. Stones might fall from the steep slopes abutting the footpath of Hong Fai Road and would cause safety concerns to pedestrians. It was recommended that Government should improve the pedestrian facilities in the area before considering any redevelopment at the Site.

R9 – Cho Yee Mui (曹綺梅)

R45 – Chan Tat Wai (陳達威)

R326 – Fung Ka Lok

R330 – Chan Mee Kuen Shirley (陳美娟)

R336 – Leung Kwok Chun

R355 – Kwok Chi Kwong Danny (郭志光)

R357 – Tsang Wai Kwong

R386 – 陳詠欣

R421– 趙文娜

R436 – Tse Yuk Fung (謝玉鳳)

R456 – Cheung Wai Chuen Jimmy (張偉泉)

R779 – Chiu Lai Yuen

23. Ms Cho Yee Mui made the following main points:

- (a) CSD staff usually worked on shifts and they would sleep at their DQs during daytime. They would be seriously affected by aircraft noise since the frequency of flights passing the area was at two-minute intervals between 5:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m.;
- (b) the existing footpath along Hong Fai Road was substandard and could hardly cope with additional pedestrian flow generated by the proposed DQs redevelopment; and
- (c) in view of the above-mentioned problems, she doubted whether the Site was suitable for redeveloping into DQs.

R17 – Coman Anca Ioana

R372 – Coman Anica

24. Ms Coman Anca Ioana made the following main points:

- (a) she was disappointed to learn that according to the recommendation of the

Paper, the 840 opposing representations would not be upheld;

- (b) the Paper only provided responses to address the concern on construction noise but not the safety issue associated with piling on porous terrain. Construction works at the Site might cause cracks on Siu Lam Road and the swimming pools of Palatial Coast;
- (c) the existing 0.8m-wide footpath of Hong Fai Road was substandard and residents sometimes had to walk on the road way. The pedestrian impact assessment had not taken into account additional pedestrian flow to be generated by the IRSC. The capacity of the footpath was already overloaded during the construction period of the IRSC. It was estimated that the pedestrian flow would increase by about 50% when the IRSC was in operation;
- (d) some views of the representers on technical aspects including geotechnical and flooding had not been properly addressed. The traffic impact assessment (TIA) was conducted during COVID when people were working from home. The traffic impact had not been properly assessed. The redevelopment might encounter technical problems during the detailed design stage;
- (e) the Paper indicated that the Noise Exposure Forecast 25 (NEF 25) contour did not cover the Site and therefore the aircraft noise was not an issue. However, the aircraft noise level in the area could be up to about 100dB(A) and residents in the proposed DQs redevelopment would be severely affected;
- (f) the existing road network would be adversely affected by additional traffic generated by the proposed DQs redevelopment; and
- (g) the Government should explore the alternative sites proposed by the representers.



R115 – Kong Chun Yin Andy

25. 莊豪鋒, assistant of a legislative councilor, made the following main points:

- (a) the cumulative traffic impact of the IRSC and the proposed DQs redevelopment on the existing road network, particularly Hong Fai Road, had not been assessed. The traffic impact of the IRSC, with planned provisions of about 1,150 beds and 1,700 places for day care services (equivalent to trips generated by three primary/secondary schools) would be problematic. The heavy vehicle traffic during the construction period would increase maintenance cost of the Access Road;
- (b) the existing narrow footpath (about 0.9m-wide) of Hong Fai Road was substandard. According to the advice of the Highways Department, widening of the footpath would involve closure of sections of Tuen Mun Highway (east-bound) and therefore was not feasible;
- (c) as an alternative to the proposed 21-storey development, consideration could be given to retaining the existing low-rise DQs on the Site and build a new low-block next to the existing one to provide additional units with less traffic and visual impacts; and
- (d) usage of Siu Lam Road would increase tremendously with the proposed DQs redevelopment and the Government should take over the maintenance responsibility of the road.

R20/C3 – Kong Man Wai

R81 – Choi Mow Sang

26. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and a video, Mr Choi Mow Sang made the following main points:

- (a) he supported the views of the residents of Palatial Coast that the Site was not suitable for the proposed DQs redevelopment. The Site was located

under the regular flight path and the frequency of flights passing the area was about 34 flights per hour (about a flight every 1.8 minutes), including flights after midnight. The vertical distance between aircrafts and roof-tops of buildings at Palatial Coast was only about 1,200 feet and they had recorded aircraft noise level up to 100dB(A) with their own sound meters. Despite being just outside the NEF 25 contour, Palatial Coast was subject to severe aircraft noise impacts;

- (b) the aircraft noise levels estimated by the Government in 2000 when the airport at Chek Lap Kok first commenced operation were around 80.7dB(A) in Ma Wan and 81.6dB(A) in Sha Lo Wan. According to a press release issued by the Airport Authority (AA) in 2001, all areas in Hong Kong except Sha Lo Wan could meet the aircraft noise standard based on the predicted NEF 25 contour. Residents at Sha Lo Wan were provided with financial subsidies to install noise abatement measures, but the aircraft noise was 80dB(A) (i.e. lower than that recorded at Palatial Coast). However, the forecast which was based on outdated assumptions was inaccurate. The third runway was not in operation when AA conducted studies for the new airport and three-runway system (3RS) about 20 and 13 years ago respectively;
- (c) according to a plan extracted from AA's 3RS environmental impact assessment (EIA) report, the NEF 25 contour only reflected annualised impacts and therefore could not reflect the severity of noise impacts during busy periods with more frequent flights. According to AA's study, information on runway utilisation modes in 2021 indicated that aircrafts using runway 07L-25R (i.e. the third runway), which had flight path passing through Siu Lam area, were mostly arrival flights. These flights were the main source of aircraft noise affecting Palatial Coast. The same runway utilisation mode would be adopted in 2032 (i.e. the design saturation year of 3RS). Hence, the aircraft noise problem would continue to permanently affect Siu Lam area including the proposed DQs redevelopment;

- (d) according to the 3RS EIA report, operation of the third runway would generate hazard to human life/potential hazard and risk (less than 1 in 100,000 chance of death per year). The airplane engines would continuously emit nitrogen dioxide, respirable suspended particulates, fine suspended particulates, sulphur dioxide and carbon monoxide which were harmful to human health; and
- (e) the Site was not suitable for the proposed DQs development in view of the aircraft noise and other issues. The proposed noise mitigation measure of acoustic insulation by well-gasketed window was unacceptable. Future residents of the DQ had to live in units with non-openable windows and would be deprived of fresh air.

R39 – Lam Kit Fun Kid

27. Ms Lam Kit Fun Kid made the following main points:

- (a) she shared the views expressed by other representers and requested the Board to reconsider the amendment;
- (b) the pedestrian access to Siu Lam Village via Hong Fai Road was unsatisfactory because the footpath was substandard. There were many elderly and children using that footpath; and
- (c) the Board should visit the Site to understand the problem of pedestrian safety in the area.

R589 – Yu Yee Hung

R591 – Tuniah

28. Ms Yu Yee Hung said that she shared the views expressed by other representers in their presentations and suggested that the Board should reconsider the amendment.

R731 – Yip King Wai

29. Mr Yip King Wai made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Siu Lam Village;
- (b) the Site was not suitable for the proposed DQs redevelopment and there were alternative sites available;
- (c) the traffic generated by the large number of Government facilities, including the IRSC, in the area as well as the proposed DQs redevelopment had been under-estimated. The TIA only assumed 1 to 2% increase in trips during construction, which had failed to take account of trips from heavy vehicles and machineries. The TIA should also take into account traffic generated by new developments along Castle Peak Road. In addition, the proposed DQs redevelopment might lead to illegal parking problem;
- (d) road maintenance works were carried out at Hong Fai Road frequently in recent years and local traffic on the two-lane road was affected by temporary traffic arrangements during the works period. The influx of heavy vehicles during the construction period of the proposed DQs development would also affect the living environment of existing residents;
- (e) there was no proper pedestrian crossing facility along Siu Lam Road and Hong Fai Road. The footpaths in the area were substandard with uneven surface which were unsafe especially for elderly residents living in Siu Lam Village; and
- (f) the assessments included in the Paper were not objective because the comments were provided by Government departments.

R253 – Chau Tak Lam (周德林)

R256 – Chau Pui Chi

R257 – Chau Chun Hei

30. Mr Chau Tak Lam made the following main points:

- (a) there were risk and safety concerns during the construction period of the proposed DQs redevelopment when tower cranes were used for transferring construction materials within the Site. If surveillance cameras were installed on the tower cranes, there might be privacy issues given proximity of the Site to residential developments nearby; and
- (b) the influx of construction vehicles would have adverse traffic impact on the existing road network, particularly Siu Lam Road, and might cause cracks on the road. During the construction period, there would be adverse environmental impacts and dust generated from the Site would pollute the swimming pools in Palatial Coast.

R274 – Yeung King Chung Spencer

R349 – Chan Siu Chi (陳兆治)

R581 – 林翠英

31. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yeung King Chung Spencer made the following main points:

- (a) he was responsible for overseeing maintenance works in the Palatial Coast Owners' Committee. Construction of the proposed DQs redevelopment would increase maintenance cost of the Access Road, which was maintained by Palatial Coast. The foundation works at the Site would affect the geological structure, induce land subsidence and affect stability of the retaining walls of Palatial Coast, particularly those near the two swimming pools. In the event that the retaining structures of the swimming pools collapsed, traffic in the area would be affected since the

concerned retaining walls were located at road junction; and

- (b) in view of the potential increase in usage and maintenance cost of the Access Road generated by the proposed DQs redevelopment, CSD should either abandon the proposal or share the maintenance cost with Palatial Coast and reserve sufficient funds to tackle contingency situations.

R291 – Leung Ching Kwan Grace

32. Ms Leung Ching Kwan Grace made the following main points:

- (a) there was no proper pedestrian crossing facility in the area which created safety issue for residents travelling to and from the bus stops nearby. The sharp bend near the junction of Siu Lam Road and Hong Fai Road was a blind spot for pedestrians. The proposed DQs redevelopment at the road junction would further block the sightline of pedestrians and increase accidents. The existing crossings should be improved to enhance pedestrian safety;
- (b) the existing narrow footpath at Hong Fai Road was substandard. Improvement to the footpath was required to cater for the needs of existing local residents, even without the IRSC and proposed DQs redevelopments; and
- (c) the IRSC with about 1,150 beds, 1,700 places for day care services and 1,000 staff who worked on shifts together with the large number of visitors would overload the existing road network. The proposed increase in mini-van services would have traffic noise impacts. Increased traffic congestion was anticipated with the proposed DQs redevelopment. She did not agree with the findings of the TIA which indicated that there would be no adverse traffic impact; and
- (d) only 90 additional DQ units would be provided. CSD should develop DQs on more suitable alternative sites.

[Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung joined the meeting at this point.]

R293 – Cheung Cho Kit (張祖傑)

R352 – Yuen Yee Fan

R389 – Cheung Yat Tung

R391 – Cheung Ho Tung

R390 – Chan Hang Sheung

33. Ms Yuen Yee Fan made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Palatial Coast and she had been living there for about 20 years. Although the area was not very accessible, she enjoyed the natural setting and tranquil character of the environment. The proposed DQs redevelopment would generate significant impacts on the harmony of the local community. There would also be adverse environmental impacts during the construction period;
- (b) she was disturbed by the aircraft noise problem since the third runway came into operation. There were aircrafts passing through the area even after midnight, at two to three-minute intervals;
- (c) there was a lack of supporting facilities for residents in the area;
- (d) she doubted the Site was suitable for the proposed DQs redevelopment. CSD should consider alternative sites for developing the DQs or develop a low-rise DQs building on the Site; and
- (e) the Government should not proceed with implementing the proposal which was against the views of 840 representers.

[The meeting was adjourned for a ten-minute break.]

R380 – Kuk Yi Tan Glory (曲怡丹)

R415 – Chow Jin (周靜)

R503 – Kuk Yi Kwan Spring (曲怡琿)

R504 – Kuk Pui David (曲渤)

R800 – 張冬菇

R802 – 張馬騰

34. Ms Chow Jin made the following main points:

- (a) there were about 850 households and 3,000 people living in Palatial Coast. The proposed DQs redevelopment would affect the local community. The Site was located at the junction of Siu Lam Road and Hong Fai Road which were sloping and narrow roads. The proposed 21-storey development would block the sightline of drivers at the junction and make traffic accidents more frequent. The proposal might also aggravate existing problems such as traffic and footpath capacities;
- (b) the aircraft noise problem had been underestimated by the Government. The data collected by residents indicated that the aircraft noise level was much higher than that of the previous forecast; and
- (c) CSD should reconsider suitability of the Site for the proposed DQs redevelopment.

R46/C2 – Pui Lan Lee (李佩蘭)

R112 – Andrada Amalia Sibal

R113 – 林燕

R116 – Kong Chun Ming Kevin

R117 – Kong Choi

R133 – Kwok Fat Cheong

R134 – Kwok Lam Yin Ming

R170 – Kwok Shek Yeung Aaron



R171 – Kwok Shek Hung Jerome

R172 – Lolita Suyat Reyes

R418 – Chan Choi Ching

R551 – Lee Pui Lin

R577 – Kwok Siu Lan (郭兆蘭)

R578 – Lai Ming Chung (黎明頌)

R651 – Cheng Pok Yan

R730 – Wong Yin

R733 – Ho Wai Kuen Betty

R834 – Wong Lung Nui

R835 – Chan Tim Lam

35. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lee Pui Lan made the following main points:

- (a) CSD only consulted TMDC and Tuen Mun Rural Committee, but local people and the public at large had not been consulted on the proposed DQs redevelopment;
- (b) the Site was not suitable for the proposed DQs redevelopment and there were other more suitable sites. CSD could explore three alternative sites in the vicinity that were under-utilised: (i) the Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre senior officers' quarters; (ii) vacant Government site in Tai Lam which was currently occupied by an open-air carpark; and (iii) staff quarters of Tai Lam Centre for Women;
- (c) there were various kinds of civil service housing benefits to substitute DQs development. For example, allocation of public housing units to CSD officers could encourage them to live within the community. Besides, housing allowance could be offered to eligible CSD staff;
- (d) although it was stated in the Paper that there were 274 CSD eligible staff waiting to be allocated quarters, not all of them would be interested in

living at the Site. The information provided by CSD was therefore misleading. According to information released by the Government in 2020, the vacancy rate of CSD staff quarters was 6% as compared with 0.3% for the Hong Kong Police Force staff quarters. CSD should provide updated information on vacancy rate of their DQs to justify the need for developing additional DQs;

- (e) the existing footpath on Hong Fai Road was narrow (0.6m-wide) which could not meet the relevant minimum width (2.75m) according to Government standard. The clear width of the footpath was further reduced by the abutting rugged slope surface and railing. In addition, she did not agree with the findings of the pedestrian impact assessment that users/visitors/staff of the IRSC would take vehicular transport for accessing the IRSC. The number of pedestrians using Hong Fai Road had been underestimated. There would be problems in pedestrian safety and footpath capacity when the IRSC commenced operation;
- (f) although the Paper indicated that the Site was about 60m away from Palatial Coast, the actual distance between the two developments were only 30m;
- (g) based on her working experience in Kwai Chung Hospital, the noise impact during the construction period would affect patients of the IRSC and Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre who were mentally vulnerable and in need of quiet environment for recovery. The heavy vehicle trips during construction would increase the chance of land subsidence and maintenance cost of the Access Road. Major traffic accidents on the Access Road might block emergency access to the IRSC; and
- (h) the Site would be affected by the aircraft noise problem. It was not suitable for the proposed DQs redevelopment.

R648 – To Kok Yin

R650 – Kan Man Wai Betty

36. Mr To Kok Yin made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to the proposed DQs redevelopment;
- (b) he had been living in Palatial Coast for 23 years. There were concerns on pedestrian safety and footpath capacity in the area. The surface of the existing footpath at Hong Fai Road was uneven. There were risk of stones falling down from the slope and flooding problem along the footpath during rainy seasons. Pedestrians were often forced to walk on the road way. Besides, there was no proper pedestrian crossing facility and vehicles often travelled downhill at Hong Fai Road at high speed. In view of the problems associated with design of the roads and footpaths in the area, the proposed DQs redevelopment would make accidents more frequent;
- (c) increase in traffic flow generated by new residential developments along Castle Peak Road had caused more traffic accidents in recent years. The existing road network would be further overloaded with more developments in the area. Moreover, traffic in Siu Lam was suspended from time to time to meet the operational needs of the Government institutions nearby; and
- (d) CSD should consider alternative sites for the proposed DQs redevelopment which were more cost-effective.

R688 – Quan Ho

R689 – Anthony Wong

37. Mr Wong Cheung Chu Anthony made the following main points:

- (a) there were concerns on pedestrian safety and footpath capacity in the area.

The existing footpaths were substandard. He was advised by CSD and PlanD that the width of the existing footpath was about 1.0m. However, the clear width of the footpath along the slopes was only about 0.5 - 0.6m due to the abutting rugged slope surface and railing. There was water runoff from the slope onto the footpath during rainy seasons. The proposed DQs redevelopment and IRSC would substantially increase pedestrian flow in the area. The pedestrian facilities of the area should be widened and improved, e.g. shifting the footpath to the other side of the road that aligned with Tuen Mun Highway; and

- (b) the cumulative impacts of all technical aspects, including construction and aircraft noises should be properly addressed by relevant Government departments in the assessments.

R736 – Lee Yin Ling Stevie

38. Ms Lee Yin Ling Stevie made the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in Palatial Coast for 23 years;
- (b) the piling works of the proposed DQs redevelopment might cause leakage in the two swimming pools in Palatial Coast which would lead to increase in maintenance costs and deprive residents' right of using the pools. Relevant Government departments had responded in the Paper that they would closely monitor the impact of piling works, which meant the Government was fully aware that there was potentially high risk of damages, including those to the swimming pools in Palatial Coast. The Government should be responsible for the increase in maintenance costs of the swimming pools caused by piling works at the Site;
- (c) the Access Road leading to the Site was maintained by Palatial Coast. CSD should liaise with residents of Palatial Coast, Lands Department and relevant departments on the costs and maintenance responsibilities before commencement of works for the proposed DQs redevelopment. The

Government should take over the maintenance responsibility of the Access Road since it would no longer be for the exclusive use of Palatial Coast residents;

- (d) the proposed high-rise DQs redevelopment would have adverse visual impact on Palatial Coast and cause psychological impact on its residents. CSD should consider alternative sites or develop a low-rise DQs building on the Site; and
- (e) there was no proper cost estimate for the proposed DQs redevelopment. It was not worthy using huge public funds to redevelop on the Site. The residents of Palatial Coast were prepared to instigate legal action if the Board did not uphold their adverse representations.

R737 – Li Pui Sang (李培生)

39. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Li Pui Sang made the following main points:

- (a) PlanD's responses to the representations and comments in relation to visual impact arising from the proposed DQs redevelopment in the Paper were misleading. It stated that from the six key public viewing points within the area of visual influence identified for assessment, there would be some negative visual impacts but the proposed DQs redevelopment was considered to be generally compatible and acceptable within the existing visual context of Siu Lam. He also did not agree to the responses that it was far more important to protect public views and not practical to protect private views. When viewing from his own apartment, half of the existing view would be blocked by the proposed DQs redevelopment. He questioned why protecting views for some unknown public would be more important than protecting the views for those nearby residents who would directly suffer from the visual impact;
- (b) So Kwun Wat was a rural area which was not suitable for high-density

development and the BH of the proposed DQs redevelopment (90mPD) should not be referenced to the BH of Palatial Coast (102mPD). Palatial Coast was previously a brownfield site for storage of containers prior to its development. With the residential development, the visual quality, surrounding environment, drainage facilities, accessibility and supporting facilities for residents of Siu Lam Village nearby were improved. The proposed DQs redevelopment would not provide social benefits to residents in Siu Lam;

- (c) some alternative sites proposed by representers were existing DQs of CSD, that were similar to the Site. The response in the Paper that those alternative sites were being occupied/planned for other uses and not suitable for the proposed DQs redevelopment was doubted; and
- (d) he urged the Board not to agree to the amendment to the OZP and the public's view opposing the proposed DQs redevelopment should not be ignored.

R751 – Tam Chun Hin (譚駿軒)

R754 - Wong Sui Yee Catherine (黃瑞儀)

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and visualiser, Ms Wong Sui Yee Catherine, made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Palatial Coast;
- (b) it was understood that to provide DQs to disciplined services staff was the Government's established policy. However, residents of Palatial Coast, So Kwun Wat and future residents of the proposed DQs redevelopment would have to face traffic congestion and pedestrian safety problems. The existing footpaths along Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road were narrow and a portion of Siu Lam Road did not have footpath and people had to walk on the road way. The increased pedestrians from

the proposed DQs redevelopment, the IRSC as well as visitors to Tai Lam Country Park would overload the nearby pedestrian network. In addition, there was no proper pedestrian crossing facility along Hong Fai Road and closure of footpath/road during the construction period would pose danger to residents in the area;

- (c) the proposed vehicular access to the proposed DQs redevelopment would be located at Siu Lam Road which was also the access road to Palatial Coast. Siu Lam Road, Hong Fai Road and Castle Peak Road were the only vehicular accesses for residents travelling to Tuen Mun, Tsuen Wan and Kowloon. Since the access to Castle Peak Road -Tai Lam via Hong Fai Road was close to the roundabout of Castle Peak Road – New Tai Lam section, when there was traffic accident along Hong Fai Road near the roundabout, the vehicular access to Palatial Coast, the IRSC and the proposed DQs redevelopment would be completely blocked. Besides, traffic volume in the area would increase substantially with the proposed DQs redevelopment, the IRSC as well as other residential developments nearby, e.g. Le Pont, OMA by the Sea, etc. Noting the response that the IRSC would only generate an average of two car trips per hour, the accuracy of the assessment was questionable as there was designated time for visitors to the IRSC and the average figure could not reflect the actual situation;
- (d) it was suspected that the Government might also redevelop those nearby DQs of disciplinary services in future, i.e. the two CSD DQs to the north of the Site and the one located opposite the roundabout of Castle Peak Road – New Tai Lam section. Residents of Siu Lam area would suffer from traffic congestion arising from those redevelopment proposals for years. The traffic problem would also adversely affect the value of Government land along Castle Peak Road planned for disposal; and
- (e) she urged the Board to take into account the cumulative traffic impacts of the proposed DQs redevelopment and all other developments in the area.

The traffic conditions along Hong Fai Road and Castle Peak Road should be improved prior to considering the proposed DQs redevelopment.

R832/C1 – Mary Mulvihill

41. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:
- (a) she objected to the proposed DQs redevelopment;
  - (b) since June 2000, a new housing allowance scheme had been offered to eligible civil servants so that government staff quarters could be gradually vacated and the sites could be sold for redevelopment. Under a quota scheme, junior civil servants could also enjoy a better opportunity to be allocated a public housing unit. As such, the proposed DQs redevelopment was contrary to the policy to phase out the provision of accommodation for civil servants. The housing benefits policy for civil servant should be reviewed so to encourage staffs to purchase their own home. The staff and family members of disciplined services should live within and integrate with the community;
  - (c) the felling of 40 trees would affect the habitats for birds, butterflies and wild animals. Tree compensation should not be provided only in quantitative terms. The size and age of affected trees should also be taken in account;
  - (d) the Site could be redeveloped to address some of the deficits in community services, such as provision of residential care home for the elderly, other Government, institution and community facilities that were compatible with the IRSC or open space;
  - (e) the provision of car parking facilities for the proposed DQs redevelopment was inadequate as it was expected that more residents there would have their own cars due to the need to work on shifts; and



- (f) noting from other representers' presentations, the footpaths in the area were narrow and substandard. Pedestrian safety was a key concern that Members should consider as there would be further increase in pedestrians from the proposed DQs redevelopment as well as users of the IRSC.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:15 p.m.]

42. The meeting was resumed at 2:15 p.m.

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

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

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

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

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

Director of Lands  
Lands Department  
Ms Sophia C.W. Chiang

Director of Planning Department  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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

Secretary

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

**Government Representatives**

***PlanD***

Mr Raymond H.F. Au - DPO/TMYLW

Ms Janet K.K. Cheung - STP/TMYLW

***CSD***

Mr Lawrence C.K. Chow - Senior Superintendent

Mr Wilson S.W. Yeung - Principal Officer

Mr Kendrick K.T. Liu - Principal Officer

***Urbis Limited***

Ms Winona S.M. Ip ]

]

***OZZO*** ]

Ms Oliver L.Y. Cheung ] consultants

]

*SMEC* ]  
Mr Fred K.K. Ng ]  
Mr Charls C.F. Liang ]

**Representers, Commenters and their Representatives**

R4 – Tang Kwai Chuen Alan

R261 – Koh Soo Lee

R262 – Tang Yue Him Nicholas

R606 – Anna Bogushevskaya

R605 – Alexey Shumkov

Mr Tang Kwai Chuen Alan - Representer and  
Representers' Representative

R7 – Chak Mo Ling (翟慕玲)

R286 – Ho Ming Wai

R292 – Winocean Development Ltd

R299 – Chung Kwok Wa (鍾國華)

R300 – So Kit Ching

R312 – Chan Choi Wan Irene

R340 – Leung Wai Man

R345 – Chu Tak Ming (朱德明)

R385 – Mak Pik Shan Nancy (麥碧珊)

R359 – 李澤光

R385 – Chung Pui Wah

R412 – Wong Yiu Shing (黃耀成)

R457 – 吳惠蓮

R486 – Lau Chi Leung Ricky

Mr Wong Yiu Shing - Representer and  
Representers' Representatives

R8 – Ho Kin San (何鍵榮)

R223 – Yeung Po Yee (楊寶儀)

Ms Yeung Po Yee - Representer and Representer's Representative

R69 – Wong Kwok Cheung Michael

R99 – Kong Tommy Ming Fung

R315 – Ling Ching (凌靜)

R316 – Chau Mui (周梅)

R317 – Sri Lestari

R405 – Wong Kwok Ho (黃國豪)

R479 – Li Fai (李輝)

Ms Li Fai - Representer and Representers' Representative

R231 – Lam Wai Fun (林慧芬)

Ms Lam Wai Fun - Representer

R253 – Chau Tak Lam (周德林)

R256 – Chau Pui Chi

R257 – Chau Chun Hei

Mr Chau Tak Lam - Representer and Representers' Representative

R274 – Yeung King Chung Spencer

Mr Yeung King Chung Spencer - Representer

R291 – Leung Ching Kwan Grace

Ms Leung Ching Kwan Grace - Representer

R589 Yu Yee Hung

R591 Tuniah

Ms Yu Yee Hung - Representer and Representer's Representative

R736 – Lee Yin Ling Stevie (李燕玲)

Ms Lee Yin Ling Stevie - Representer

R737 – Li Pui Sang (李培生)

Mr Li Pui Sang - Representer

R751 – Tam Chun Hin (譚駿軒)

R754 – Wong Sui Yee Catherine (黃瑞儀)

Ms Wong Sui Yee Catherine - Representer and Representers' Representative

R832/C1 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

45. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome to the government representatives and the consultant, representers, commenters and their representatives. As the presentations of government representatives, the representers, commenters, and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Vice-chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to 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 question to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Vice-chairperson then invited questions from Members.

*Pedestrian Safety along Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road*

46. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the details of major pedestrian route in the area and whether the footpaths and pedestrian crossing facilities therein were adequate to serve the locals with the proposed departmental quarters (DQs) redevelopment;
- (b) whether there were any alternative pedestrian route(s) and/or pedestrian crossing(s) apart from Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road;

- (c) whether there were any recommendations on improving pedestrian safety and how the implementation of the improvement plans, if any, could be ensured; and
- (d) whether there was potential risk of debris/water flow to the pedestrian footpaths of Hong Fai Road from adjacent slopes during rainy season.

47. In response, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, made the following main points:

- (a) pedestrians in the area, including mostly the residents of Palatial Coast and the existing DQs, would use a section of Siu Lam Road abutting the Palatial Coast and the Siu Lam Road/Hong Fai Road junction abutting the Item A Site (the Site) to Hong Fai Road which led to Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam and then the Tuen Mun Road Bus-bus Interchange (Kowloon Bound). The walk would take about 10 minutes. The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) carried out by the consultants of CSD indicated that all concerned footpaths and crossings would perform satisfactorily with sufficient capacities even with the proposed DQs redevelopment;
- (b) the footpaths and crossing of Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road were the most convenient route for the pedestrians to access the bus/green minibus stops along Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam and/or the Tuen Mun Road Bus-bus Interchange. While there was an alternative route, i.e. connection from Siu Lam Tsuen Road via Ching Lam Road (partly under Tuen Mun Road) across Tuen Mun Road to the bus stops at Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam, and the pedestrian flow along which was observed to be low;
- (c) while improvement to the surrounding pedestrian environment fell outside the scope of the proposed DQs redevelopment, CSD had committed to explore any possible improvement to the pedestrian crossing condition with appropriate traffic safety measures, e.g. provision of signalised crossing, with relevant stakeholders including residents of Palatial Coast and relevant

government departments such as TD, Highways Department (HyD) and Lands Department (LandsD) at the detailed design stage. The Site would be allocated by LandsD to CSD for the proposed DQs redevelopment, and relevant condition(s) could be incorporated in the future land document to ensure the implementation of any proposal to improve pedestrian safety. In any case, the proposed DQs redevelopment was a government project and CSD and relevant government departments would duly follow up on implementation of any improvement measure; and

- (d) PlanD would convey the concerns to relevant government department(s) who was responsible for slope safety to follow up if there was any potential risk caused to the pedestrians along the footpaths.

48. Some Members raised the following questions to CSD's Consultant:

- (a) details of pedestrian usage of the footpaths of Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road and whether the existing conditions of these footpaths, including the widths and the design of the catch pits thereon, complied with the standard under relevant ordinance(s)/regulation(s);
- (b) whether there were any narrow point(s) along the footpaths of Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road;
- (c) whether there were any proposal to improve the pedestrian environment and safety along the concerned footpaths;
- (d) whether there was any standard on footpath provision, such as minimum width, for any proposed new development; and
- (e) whether the proposed DQs redevelopment would block the vehicular sightline of Siu Lam Tsuen Road/Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road, and if the vehicular access to the proposed DQs redevelopment could be relocated from Siu Lam Road, as proposed in the current development scheme, to Hong Fai Road so as to minimise the conflict between pedestrian and vehicular traffic.



49. In response, Ms Oliver L.Y. Cheung, Consultant, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the pedestrian impact assessment of the TIA, it was observed in the pedestrian surveys that there were 34 pedestrians in the peak 5 minutes during the morning peak hours, based on which the level of service (LOS) of the concerned footpaths along the key pedestrian routes had been assessed. As the existing pedestrian flows were small and the pedestrians generated by the proposed DQs redevelopment were minimal, the results of the TIA concluded that all the concerned footpaths and crossings would perform satisfactorily with sufficient capacities even with the proposed DQs redevelopment;
- (b) while the LOS was considered to be adequate, two localized narrow points along Hong Fai Road next to the existing catch pits were observed. As the footpaths at the localised narrow points were only about 0.8m to 1m only in width, when there were two-way pedestrian flows or pedestrians on wheelchair passing through, the pedestrians would need to slow down or give way to each other to avoid conflicts. Nevertheless, the pedestrian flows along the concerned footpaths were observed to be mainly in one direction (i.e. travelling from the west to the east towards Tuen Mun Road Bus-bus Interchange (Kowloon Bound) in morning session and from the east to the west towards Palatial Coast and nearby areas in the evening session) and hence, pedestrian conflicts were expected to be minimal. Regarding the design of catch pit, there was no information in hand and yet, any suggestions to change the location and/or design of the catch pits could be further explored with relevant government department(s) with a view to improving pedestrian safety;
- (c) while there was no proposal for footpath widening or improvement to the pavement condition along Hong Fai Road under the proposed DQs redevelopment as the footpaths fell outside the project site, the TIA had recommended improvement measure on pedestrian safety, i.e. provision of signalised crossing at the junction of Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road for the consideration of CSD and relevant government departments;

- (d) depending on the anticipated pedestrian flow, the minimum width of a new footpath for rural and residential land use with low pedestrian volume was 2m according to the current standards; and
- (e) the proposed DQs redevelopment would unlikely block the sightlines of the concerned roads. Relocating the proposed vehicular access for the proposed DQs redevelopment to Hong Fai Road was not supported by TD as the vehicular access would be situated at a sloping road with a bend which was not desirable from traffic safety point of view.

50. In respect of the existing pedestrian environment of Hong Fai Road and the long-standing pedestrian safety issue, Ms Carrie K. Y. Leung, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West (CE/NTW), TD, supplemented the following main points:

- (a) the single footpath of Hong Fai Road was narrow, with the narrowest section of about 0.8m in width due to the catch pit. Widening of the footpath, however, was difficult as there were slopes on both sides of Hong Fai Road;
- (b) TD had received complaints from the residents of Palatial Coast on pedestrian safety at and crossing the footpaths of Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road, and had been following up the issues. In August 2022, TD conducted a site visit with the management office of Palatial Coast and proposed that provision of signalised crossing at the junction of Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road would be an appropriate and feasible measure to enhance pedestrian safety. The proposal, however, would require the owners of Palatial Coast to demolish an existing planter on Siu Lam Road so as to allow room for provision of passageway beside the signalized crossing. Response from the owners of the Palatial Coast was being awaited; and
- (c) it was noted that similar pedestrian crossing was recommended in the TIA. Upon the agreement to TD's proposal by the owners of Palatial Coast, TD would arrange relevant works department to proceed with the provision of the proposed pedestrian crossing and hence, the pedestrian safety concern could

be enhanced.

51. Ms Li Fai, R479, the representative of Palatial Coast Owners' Committee, said that the pedestrian safety issue had been a concern of the residents of Palatial Coast for more than 20 years. On and off residents were injured when using the footpaths along Hong Fai Road, especially at the localized narrow point where a catch pit was located. With the assistance of Hon Michael Tien Puk-sun, there were discussions with certain government departments concerning the pedestrian safety issue. While she understood that improvement measures involving works at Tuen Mun Road would hardly be pursued due to possible impact on the traffic of the North West New Territory as a whole, some short-term measures such as replacement of or improvement to the concerned catch pit cover were not followed up by relevant government departments. The residents of Palatial Coast were aware of TD's latest traffic improvement proposal in 2022 and would continue to liaise with TD on the matter. She was glad that the residents' concerns on pedestrian safety were heard by the Board, and the residents of Palatial Coast would continue to pursue any possible measures to improve pedestrian safety in the area.

52. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the pedestrian footpaths at Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road which were narrow without proper pedestrian crossing was made known to the potential buyers of Palatial Coast back in 1999, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, replied that while he did not have such information in hand, he would anticipate that such information was unlikely shown on the relevant land documents as the concerned footpath was at some distance from Palatial Coast.

*Traffic Implications of Siu Lam Integrated Rehabilitation Services Complex (IRSC)*

53. Noting some representers' concern that the soon-to-be-opened IRSC in the vicinity of the Site would induce additional traffic and hence burden on the road network, two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the facilities or services to be provided for persons with disabilities at IRSC and their nature from traffic demand perspective, and whether there would be any staff quarters; and

- (b) whether the traffic induced by the IRSC had been assessed in the TIA, and whether relevant traffic data would be updated and mitigation measures suggested, if required, upon full operation of the IRSC.

54. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, made the following main points:

- (a) the buildings of ex-Siu Lam Hospital had been demolished upon its relocation to Castle Peak Hospital in 2012. The vacated site was proposed for the development of IRSC to provide residential and day rehabilitation services for persons with disabilities, with 1,150 places for residential care service and 550 places for day training and vocational rehabilitation services. These services included Long Stay Care Home, Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled Persons, Hostel for Severely Mentally Handicapped Persons and Hostel for Moderately Mentally Handicapped Persons, Day Activity Centre and Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Services Centre. The provision of one-stop day and residential services for persons with disabilities would enhance the continuum of care and training for service users within IRSC. Hence, the 550 places of day training and vocational rehabilitation service would mainly serve the residential care users at IRSC, while the non-residential care users from other areas traveling to/from the IRSC in using the day services was expected to be insignificant. There would be about 1,000 staff working on shift at the IRSC and shuttle bus services to/from the IRSC would be provided to serve the staff and visitors. There would be no staff quarters at the IRSC; and
- (b) the TIA conducted for the proposed DQs redevelopment had already taken into account the traffic impact of the IRSC. The trip generation per bed per hour of Kwai Chung Hospital had been adopted for estimating the peak hour trip generation induced by the IRSC in the TIA. While the mobility of the users of residential care services was relatively small, the day and residential services provided at IRSC were mainly for the residential services users, thus outside users visiting IRSC on daily basis was expected to be minimal. The 1,000 staff at IRSC would be on shift which meant that they would not travel

to/from IRSC at the same time and with the provision of shuttle bus services, it was anticipated that the traffic generated would not be substantial. Regarding pedestrian traffic, as the IRSC was situated at a higher level, majority of the users/visitors/staff were expected to use vehicular transport to access the IRSC and hence, the number of pedestrians using the footpath of Hong Fai Road was expected to be insignificant. CSD and its consultant would monitor the traffic condition to see if there were any significant changes upon full operation of the IRSC and would review and follow up with TD if any action was required.

#### *Maintenance Responsibility of Siu Lam Road*

55. Noting that the Palatial Coast held the maintenance responsibility of Siu Lam Road, a Member asked if it should remain the status quo given that Siu Lam Road would be the sole access for the proposed DQs redevelopment and the traffic impacts induced by the proposed DQs redevelopment would increase the maintenance cost of Siu Lam Road. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that the existing CSD DQs at the Site had been in place since 1977 before the development of Palatial Coast. According to the land lease of the private lot where Palatial Coast was erected, the grantee of the private lot was responsible for upholding, maintaining and repairing the vehicular access to/from Siu Lam Road and the Government reserved the right to grant right-of-way to other users. That said, the repair and maintenance issues were land administrative matters and the future maintenance responsibility of Siu Lam Road should be subject to the relevant lease conditions as well as negotiation among the residents of Palatial Coast, LandsD and relevant government departments, which would be handled separately.

#### *Aircraft and Traffic Noise*

56. Some Members noted R81's concern on aircraft noise and asked whether the assessment tool of Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) 25 contour in assessing the noise impact arising from the Three-Runway System (3RS) was out of date or internationally adopted, whether the aircraft noise level in Siu Lam area complied with the statutory controls on noise nuisance, and whether the noise level would be at an acceptable level in general for the future occupants of the proposed DQs redevelopment, and if not, whether any mitigation measures

had been proposed.

57. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, advised that NEF 25 contour was the prevailing standard adopted for assessing aircraft noise impact in Hong Kong. According to the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the Expansion of Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA) into a 3RS, the NEF 25 contour predicted for different operation scenarios of the 3RS were about 1km away from the proposed DQs redevelopment. In other words, the Site fell outside the coverage of the NEF 25 contour and hence direct or indirect noise mitigation measure would not be required for the proposed DQs redevelopment.

58. Mr Terence S.W. Tsang, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department (EPD), supplemented that in planning the new airport at Chek Lap Kok, the Airport Authority (AA) in conjunction with the government had adopted NEF 25 contour to assess the aircraft noise impact arising from aircraft operation. The criterion of NEF 25 contour was comparable to, or even more stringent than, the international standards adopted by developed countries like the United States, Canada and Australia, for planning of airport and noise sensitive land uses. NEF 25 contour was the prevailing assessment tools adopted under the current Government policy. While the NEF 25 contour might be subject to review in future, it was outside the scope of the OZP amendment for the proposed DQs redevelopment at the Site. It should also be noted that where a site fell outside the coverage of the NEF 25 contour, such as the Site, it did not mean that there would be no aircraft noise at all at that site. The same principle applied for traffic noise control in that even if the noise criterion of 70dB(A) for a particular site was met, that site would still be subject to a certain level of traffic noise.

59. Mr Charls C.F. Liang, Consultant, supplemented that according to the Preliminary Environmental Review (PER) conducted by them, the aircraft and traffic noise levels at the Site, which were assessed with NEF 25 contour and the traffic noise criterion of 70dB(A) respectively, would both comply with the relevant statutory noise control standards and were thus considered acceptable for the proposed DQs redevelopment. Notwithstanding that, a review of the use of acoustic insulation in the form of well-gasketed window in the detailed design stage had been recommended in the PER with a view to enhancing the indoor living environment.

60. At the request of the Vice-chairperson with regard to the criterion of NEF 25 contour, Mr Choi Mow Sang, R81, stated that although such assessment model was adopted in Hong Kong and Canada, it would be subject to revalidation with reference to the performance upon full operation of the 3RS project. According to the Environmental Permit for the 3RS, the Airport Authority as the permit holder should review and update the NEF 25 contour with actual operational data after a full year operation if there were major deviations from the assumptions adopted in the approved EIA report. The monitoring system of aircraft noise comprised multiple outdoor noise monitoring terminals (NMTs) located along or close to the flight paths to collect noise data. In view of the commencement of operation familiarisation of the North Runway of the HKIA from July 2022, additional NMTs at locations (including Siu Lam area) close to the flight paths of the North Runway were installed. He said that taking the average figure of the annual data of NEF 25 contour was not an accurate or reliable means to assess the aircraft noise level. Item A for the proposed DQs redevelopment should not be approved until July 2023 when the data collected at NMTs in Siu Lam area since July 2022 was available for EPD to validate the NEF 25 contour and for CSD to reconsider if the Site was suitable for the proposed DQs redevelopment.

61. In response to a Member's question on whether the occupants at the existing quarters at the Site had complained about aircraft noise, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that CSD had not consulted the occupants in respect of disturbance from aircraft noise. Yet, there were no known complaints from occupants about aircraft noise nuisance throughout the years.

62. A Member enquired whether the increase in building height (BH) for the proposed DQs redevelopment at the Site would have any impact on the surrounding areas in respect of exposure to aircraft noise. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, advised that the increase in BH for development at Item A Site would not have any implication on the exposure to aircraft noise level of the surrounding areas. Rather, a taller building in general would imply a higher development intensity which might give rise to more vehicular traffic and hence, more traffic noise. In this regard, the TIA and PER carried out by the consultants of CSD concluded that as the proposed DQs redevelopment was relatively small in scale, significant increase in traffic flow and the resulted traffic noise was not anticipated.

*Site Selection and Public Consultation*

63. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the site selection criteria and process for the proposed DQs redevelopment;
- (b) whether the development intensity of the proposed DQs redevelopment was compatible with the rural context where the Site was situated;
- (c) noting R46's comment that Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) had not consulted the residents of Palatial Coast, whether PlanD had consulted Tuen Mun Rural Committee (TMRC) and if TMDC and TMRC had consulted relevant stakeholders in Siu Lam area, including residents of Palatial Coast; and
- (d) whether the Board would be consulted on the detailed design of the proposed DQs redevelopment, if Item A was agreed by the Board, and whether there would be any means for the locals, including residents of Palatial Coast, to comment on the detailed design in future.

64. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, made the following main points:

- (a) in identifying a suitable site for DQs development, CSD in consultation with relevant government departments had considered a number of factors, including security concern, accessibility and convenience of sites, optimisation of existing under-utilised CSD sites, land use and BH compatibility, as well as technical feasibility. In particular, the existing CSD's quarters at the Site were buildings of over 40 years and in dilapidated condition, and the proposed BH of 90mPD for the DQs redevelopment was compatible with the surrounding developments including Palatial Coast with a maximum BH of 102mPD. Considerations had also been given to several alternative sites of existing CSD facilities and staff quarter sites located in the vicinity of the Site, including (i) CSD Officers' Married Quarters and Tai



Lam Centre for Women Staff Mess located in the uphill area to the northeast of the Site which were close to Tai Lam Chung Reservoir and Tai Lam Country Park where high-rise buildings would be incompatible with the natural settings and the accessibility of the sites was low; (ii) Tai Lam Correctional Institution Junior Staff Married Quarters which was located in close proximity to Tai Lam Correctional Institution where there would be security and safety concerns for a high-rise DQs development; and (iii) CSD's Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre Senior Officers'/Officers' Married Quarters which were at a higher platform to the east that accessibility to public transport was relatively low. To the south of the Site across Tuen Mun Road, CSD's Married Staff Quarters and Tai Lam Marine Police Base Inspectorate Quarters were located near the seafront and hence high-rise DQs development would not be preferred;

- (b) the proposed DQs redevelopment with a plot ratio (PR) of about 3.6 was in line with the maximum PR for residential use in rural area in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. The proposed maximum BH of 90mPD was considered compatible with the neighbouring medium-density residential development, Palatial Coast, with a PR of about 2.2 and a maximum BH of 102mPD;
- (c) on 21.6.2022, PlanD issued letters to TMRC inviting the TMRC chairman, vice-chairmen and members to provide comments on the proposed DQs redevelopment at the Site. No comment had been received from TMRC. On 4.7.2022, CSD and PlanD consulted TMDC regarding the OZP amendment for the proposed DQs redevelopment. TMDC Members generally had no objection to the proposed OZP amendment but urged the relevant government departments to minimise the potential traffic and visual impacts of the proposed DQs redevelopment. The district council (DC) meetings as well as the relevant papers and meeting minutes were open to the general public. It would be the functions of DC and RC to consult the concerned local stakeholders and advise the Government on matters related to their well-beings; and

- (d) should the Board agree to the amended “Government, Institution or Community(1)” (“G/IC(1)”) zoning covering the Site, ‘Flat (Government Staff Quarters only)(on land designated “G/IC(1)” only)’ would be always permitted, submission of the detailed design scheme for the proposed DQs redevelopment to the Board was not required. Nevertheless, the proposed DQs redevelopment was a government project and CSD and the relevant government departments would implement the proposed DQs redevelopment and related measures in accordance with the established practice. For improvement of pedestrian safety along Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road, relevant government departments would consult the locals including the residents of Palatial Coast as appropriate.

### *Right of Private Views*

65. A Member enquired if there was any statutory provision on protection of private views. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYL, said that there was no such statutory provision. As specified in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41 on ‘Submissions of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board’ (TPB PG-No. 41), which had been adopted for undertaking the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for the proposed DQs redevelopment, visual impact of the proposed redevelopment had been assessed taking into account the views from a number of key strategic and popular local vantage points. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Au explained that according to the VIA, the proposed DQs redevelopment would inevitably result in some negative visual impacts on close-range views from certain key public viewing points. Notwithstanding that, the VIA concluded that the proposed DQs redevelopment was considered generally compatible with the existing visual context of Siu Lam area.

66. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Vice-chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A session had been completed. He thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in closed meeting and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board’s decision in due course. The representers, commenters, their representatives and government representatives left the meeting at this point.

[Messrs Terence S.W. Tsang, Daniel Lau and K.L. Wong, and Ms Lilian S.K. Law rejoined the meeting during the Q&A Session.]

### Deliberation Session

67. The Vice-chairperson reminded that those Members who had not attended the full presentation and Q&A sessions should refrain from participating in the deliberation session.

68. Members generally supported or had no objection to Item A amendment for the proposed DQs redevelopment, and expressed the views as summarized in the following paragraphs.

#### *Suitability of the Site for DQs*

69. Members generally considered that the Site was suitable for DQs given its convenient location as well as appropriate size and configuration. The proposed development intensity with a BH not higher than that of the Palatial Coast was compatible with the context of surrounding areas. Item A amendment did not involve any change in land use of the Site, but merely to facilitate redevelopment of the existing low-rise CSD's staff quarters blocks for better site utilisation.

#### *Technical Acceptability of the Proposed DQs Redevelopment*

70. Some Members considered that the proposed DQs redevelopment was relatively small in scale and would not cause significant adverse impacts on the surrounding areas, in particular respect of traffic impact. Also, the traffic generated from the neighbouring IRSC would not be as significant as what the representers/commenters had claimed that the traffic condition would become unacceptable if both the proposed DQs redevelopment and IRSC were in place.

71. Some Members considered that the pedestrian safety concern raised by the representers was a long-standing unresolved issue that had affected their daily lives. Such long-standing concern which could be traced back to some 20 years back reflected that there

were inadequate responses from the Government to the needs of the representers. With the development of IRSC and the proposed DQs redevelopment, grievances of the residents of Palatial Coast on pedestrian safety were intensified. It was often the case that when Government put forward new development proposals, the representers/commenters would raise long-standing concerns at the hearing. Nevertheless, the grounds of adverse representations in relation to the OZP amendment were not directly relevant to the proposed DQs redevelopment and there were no strong justifications to uphold the representations. Notwithstanding this decision, the current pedestrian environment and safety concerns at Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road as raised by the representers/commenters were critical and required urgent attention by the Government in order to avoid any further occurrence of accidents or even casualties. The relevant government departments should continue to liaise with and follow up the concerns of the residents of Palatial Coast, and accord priority to resolving the pedestrian safety issues.

72. A Member opined that the existing condition of the footpath of Hong Fai Road, with localized narrow points of about 1m wide only and presence of catch pit cover, had posed significant constraints on pedestrian movements and put the well-being of pedestrians at risk. The width of the concerned footpaths was far below the acceptable level. Some Members expressed that it was important to improve the footpath conditions of Hong Fai Road and to create an inclusive environment for all pedestrians. Various measures had been suggested to help improving the pedestrian safety of Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road, such as widening of footpaths, removal of the concerned catch pit covers, installation of pedestrian-activated traffic signals, posting of safety signs near the crossing, provision of zebra crossings or crosswalk markings/bumps to alert the drivers about the crossing, enhancing adjacent slope safety, and construction of alternative routes of subway/footbridge to allow the pedestrians to reach the key destinations conveniently and safely.

73. A Member asked if the level of details required in TIA would be different between government and private projects. Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung, CE/NTW, TD, clarified that the requirements of assessing the vehicular traffic and pedestrian flow/connectivity were the same for any development project, be it a government or private project, in large or small scale. The assessments aimed to identify and evaluate the traffic impacts that a development might bring to the area immediately surrounding the site as well as the vehicular/pedestrian connectivities with key destinations (e.g. public transport interchange, bus stops etc.) in the locality and to

propose remedial measures. TD would also rigorously review and vet the TIA submitted by any project proponent. The proposed DQs redevelopment was a small-scale development which would have minimal traffic impacts along Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road according to the findings of TIA. The pedestrian safety concern of Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road was a long-standing problem, rather than a new problem triggered by the proposed DQs redevelopment. TD stood ready to liaise with relevant government departments, such as HyD, in following up the proposal of signalized signals at the crossing of Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road upon the agreement of the residents of Palatial Coast to demolish the existing planter to make way for the passageway beside the proposed signalized crossing. Regarding the standard requirement for footpath, normally the width for rural or residential zone with low pedestrian volume was required to be at least 2m and the width for other use or new development area was much wider. Due to site constraints at Hong Fai Road, the existing footpath was 1m in width. If Hong Fai Road had to be widened towards the Tuen Mun Road side, it was envisaged that closure of a bus-only lane of Tuen Mun Road and one lane of Hong Fai Road would be required during the construction, and such temporary closure would bring significant disturbance/nuisance to the vehicular/pedestrian traffic, affecting not only the residents of Palatial Coast but also users of a wider area. Regarding improvement of the catch pit design, TD would convey the concern to HyD. If the improvement was confirmed feasible, it was envisaged that temporary closure of Hong Fai Road footpath, which was the key pedestrian route to the nearby public transport services, might cause inconvenience and not be welcomed by the residents of Palatial Coast. The Vice-chairperson suggested TD to explore the provision of alternative pedestrian route(s) via the underpass to Castle Peak Road – Tam Lam under Tuen Mun Road, if such works would be carried out. All Members agreed that TD should continue to follow up the pedestrian safety issue with the relevant stakeholders.

74. The Vice-chairperson supplemented that the level of details required in technical assessments might vary depending on the scale of the development. Small-scale projects might require assessments that were more straightforward and less complex. However, larger-scale projects might demand a more comprehensive and detailed evaluation as the impacts of such projects could be more far-reaching and significant, affecting the local environment over a broader area.

*Maintenance Responsibility of Siu Lam Road*

75. A Member said that it was not uncommon for the Government to assign the maintenance responsibility to developer under lease. Notwithstanding that, it was natural for the residents of Palatial Coast to worry about the resources needed for continuous maintenance of Siu Lam Road after some 20 years. Some Members queried if Palatial Coast should still hold the maintenance responsibility of Siu Lam Road, given that the road would also serve as the sole access to the proposed DQs redevelopment, especially that the traffic impacts induced by the proposed DQs redevelopment might have implication on the increased maintenance cost of Siu Lam Road. In this connection, a Member enquired if LandsD would take the initiative to modify the lease for Palatial Coast by transferring back the maintenance responsibility of Siu Lam Road to the Government.

76. In response, with the aid of the visualizer, Ms Sophia C.W. Chiang, Director of Lands (atg.), advised that, according to the land lease of Tuen Mun Town Lot No. 400 (TMTL 400) where Palatial Coast was erected, the Grantee of TMTL 400 was responsible for upholding, maintaining and repairing a right-of-way for vehicular and pedestrian traffic as shown as coloured brown (Brown Area) on the lease plan and portion of it was now known as Siu Lam Road. Government reserved the right to grant right-of-way over the Brown Area to other lots in the vicinity. In addition, the Government reserved rights to take over the whole or any portion of the Brown Area for maintenance and repair. If there was government department(s), e.g. CSD or TD and HyD, willing to take up such responsibilities and initiated such take-over e.g. the potential pedestrian crossing at Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road, LandsD could make necessary arrangements under land lease upon request.

77. Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, said that the road planning for the concerned sections of Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road was first included in the planning scheme area of the So Kwun Wat Development Permission Area Plan approved in 1996, and before the completion of Palatial Coast in 1999. The long-standing concern of pedestrian safety at Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road stemmed from some 20 years ago, which was not directly relevant to the proposed DQs redevelopment. Noting that TD had been following up the pedestrian safety issues with a preliminary proposal and would continue to liaise with the residents of Palatial Coast and relevant government departments, including HyD and CSD, Mr. Chung suggested and Members agreed that the Secretariat would convey the Board's concerns and advice to

relevant government departments for necessary follow up works. Besides, ArchSD and CSD would still need to seek funding from the Legislative Council for the detailed design and construction of the proposed DQs redevelopment and CSD's commitment to resolve the pedestrian safety issues would also be reflected in the relevant public documents.

#### *Aircraft Noise*

78. Some Members pointed out that while there had been concerns on aircraft noise arising from 3RS in the area surrounding Palatial Coast since the commencement of operation of the 3RS, the Site for the proposed DQs redevelopment fell outside the NEF 25 contour and the potential aircraft noise impact should comply with the prevailing statutory control on aircraft noise. Notwithstanding that, a few Members suggested that mitigation measures, e.g. well-gasketed window, innovative design of openable soundproof window etc. could be adopted to alleviate the noise nuisance, if any, for the proposed DQs redevelopment.

#### *Others*

79. A Member raised concern that after the Q&A session, some representers were seen being impolite to the government representatives which was considered inappropriate and unfair to the government representatives, who were at the hearing to fulfil the duty to facilitate the Board's consideration of representations/comments. Mutual respect and understanding as well as the order of meeting were of utmost importance and should be properly maintained to ensure the meeting could run smoothly and safely. The Vice-chairperson noted the concern and emphasised that the order of the meeting should be properly upheld.

80. The Vice-chairperson recapitulated Members' main points of decision and made the following remarks:

- (a) the major concerns of the representers/comments were related to vehicular and pedestrian safety, nuisance of aircrafts noise and potential blockage of private views. It was apparent that there was no statutory provision to protect private views and the proposed DQs redevelopment fell outside the NEF 25 contour under the prevailing noise control criterion. While the vehicular and pedestrian safety concerns were long-standing, the proposed

DQs redevelopment of relatively small scale would not impose significant adverse impacts in this regard. Therefore, the grounds of adverse representations opposing amendment Item A for the proposed DQs redevelopment were not justified; and

- (b) the pedestrian safety at Hong Fai Road and Siu Lam Road had not been properly dealt with for many years. Such old problem required urgent attention and the relevant government departments were advised to accord priority to follow up. In particular, it was noted that TD would continue to liaise with the residents of the Palatial Coast and relevant government departments, including CSD and HyD, on the proposed pedestrian crossing facilities at Hong Fai Road/Siu Lam Road, as well as to explore the alternative crossings or pedestrian routes.

81. Members considered that the OZP amendments were appropriate. Members also agreed that there was no need to amend the draft OZP to meet the adverse representations and that all grounds and proposals of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

82. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of **R841** and decided not to uphold R1 to R840, and agreed that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- “(a) it is the Government’s established policy to provide departmental quarters (DQs) for married disciplined services staff in order to maintain morale and facilitate retention in the disciplined services departments. There is a continuous demand for provision of more DQs in Correctional Services Department (CSD). The site is currently occupied by CSD’s low-rise DQs blocks with car parking area and vehicular access. It is suitable for high-rise DQs development for meeting CSD’s demand for DQs and better utilising the Site;
- (b) in view of the adjoining high-rise residential development with building



height (BH) of 102mPD, the “Government, Institution or Community(1)” zone with a BH restriction of 90mPD for redevelopment of a 21-storey DQs block is considered suitable in terms of land use and BH compatibility taking into consideration the planning context of the area and findings of the relevant technical assessments;

- (c) a rezoning study with technical assessments on the potential impacts of various aspects, including traffic and transport, environmental, landscape, visual, drainage, sewerage and geotechnical, have been carried out for the proposed redevelopment and confirmed that there is no insurmountable technical problem of the proposed redevelopment at the Site. Relevant mitigation measures have also been proposed in the study to minimise the possible impacts of the proposed redevelopment. Regarding the concern on ecological impact, as the Site is already formed and disturbed and the proposal involves only redevelopment of the existing DQs blocks, significant adverse ecological impact due to the proposed redevelopment is not anticipated;
- (d) some government, institution and community facilities do not meet the provision requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines in the So Kwun Wat Planning Scheme Area. For kindergartens/nurseries and primary schools, the demand can be met by the surplus provision in Tuen Mun District. Regarding the provision of concerned social welfare facilities, Social Welfare Department has all along been adopting a multi-pronged approach with long-, medium- and short-term strategies and maintaining a close contact with relevant departments to identify suitable sites or premises in different types of development projects for the provision of welfare facilities to meet the needs of the community. For the provision of open space, there is a surplus of district open space and local open space in the Tuen Mun District as a whole; and
- (e) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the zoning amendment have been duly followed. The views received have been duly considered and responded by concerned bureaux/departments.”

83. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

**Agenda Item 4**

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

84. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:50 p.m.