

**TPB Paper No. 10085  
For Consideration by the  
Town Planning Board on 21.4.2016**

城市規劃委員會文件第 10085 號  
考慮日期：2016 年 4 月 21 日

**CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS  
IN RESPECT OF THE DRAFT TSING YI  
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/TY/27**

《青衣分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/TY/27》  
考慮申述及意見

**CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS  
IN RESPECT OF THE DRAFT TSING YI  
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/TY/27**

Subject of Representations	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/TY/27-)	Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/TY/27-)
<p><b><u>Amendment Item A1</u></b> Rezoning of a site between Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Hung Road from “Open Space” ( “O”) to “Residential (Group A)4” (“R(A)4”) with stipulation of building height restriction (BHR)</p> <p><b><u>Amendment Item A2</u></b> Rezoning of two pieces of land abutting Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Sha Highway from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(A)4” with stipulation of BHR</p> <p><b><u>Amendment Item B1</u></b> Rezoning of a piece of land at the southern tip of Tsing Yi Road from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to an area shown as ‘Road’</p> <p><b><u>Amendment Item B2</u></b> Rezoning of a piece of land to the immediate south of the site under Item A1 from “O” to an area shown as ‘Road’</p> <p><b><u>Amendment Item C</u></b> Rezoning of a site in the southern part of Technological and Higher Education Institute of Hong Kong (THEi) from an area</p>	<b><u>Amendment Items A1 and A2</u></b>	
	<b><u>Total : 1</u></b>  <b><u>Support (1)</u></b> <b>R1:</b> individual	
	<b><u>Amendment Items A1, A2, B1, B2 and/or C</u></b>	
	<p><b><u>Total: 960</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Oppose (960)</u></b> <i>DC member:</i> <b>R394:</b> Poon Chi Shing <b>R640:</b> Lam Lap Chi <b>R921:</b> Lee Chi Keung</p> <p><i>Owners’ Committee</i> <b>R171:</b> Owners’ Committee of Rambler Crest</p> <p><i>Property Management Office</i> <b>R800:</b> Cheung Ching Estate Property Services Management Office</p> <p><i>Other Group</i> <b>R901:</b> Youngspiration</p> <p><b>R2 to R170, R172 to R393, R395 to R639, R641 to R799, R801 to R900 and R902 to R961:</b> individuals<sup>1</sup></p>	<p><b><u>Total : 350</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Support the following corresponding representations:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>(R171)</u></b> <i>DC member:</i> <b>C1:</b> Poon Chi Shing</p> <p><b>C3 to C345 (Part):</b> individuals</p> <p><b><u>(R2 to R961)</u></b> <i>Owners’ Committee</i> <b>C2:</b> Owners’ Committee of Rambler Crest</p> <p><b><u>(R748)</u></b> <b>C345 (Part):</b> individual</p> <p><b><u>(R734, R735 and R737)</u></b> <b>C346:</b> individual</p> <p><b><u>(R734, R740 and R746)</u></b> <b>C347:</b> individual</p> <p><b><u>(R907, R910 and R941)</u></b> <b>C348:</b> individual</p> <p><b><u>(R800 to R802):</u></b> <b>C349:</b> individual</p>

<sup>1</sup> Representers **R748 to R758** also oppose the Amendment Items (a) and (b) to the Notes of the draft OZP.

shown as 'Road' to "G/IC"		<b><u>(R944, R949 and R959):</u></b> <b>C350: individual</b>
---------------------------	--	---

Note : A CD-ROM containing names of all representers and commenters as well as their submissions is enclosed at **Appendix XII** [for TPB Members only]. The names of all representers and commenters can be found at the Board's website at [http://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/plan\\_making/S\\_TY\\_27.html](http://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/plan_making/S_TY_27.html).

## 1. **Introduction**

- 1.1 On 7.8.2015, the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY/27 (the Plan) (**Appendix Ia**) incorporating amendments to various zones was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The amendments are set out in the Schedule of Amendments at **Appendix Ib**. During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 961 representations were received. On 20.11.2015, the Town Planning Board (the Board) published the representations for 3 weeks for public comments. A total of 350 comments were received.
- 1.2 The major amendments involve the rezoning of a site between Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Hung Road from "O" to "R(A)4" with stipulation of BHR (**Item A1**) and two pieces of land abutting Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Sha Highway from area shown as 'Road' to "R(A)4" with stipulation of BHR (**Item A2**) (**Plans H-1 and H-2**) (hereinafter referring the site under Items A1 and A2 for the proposed public rental housing (PRH) development (PRH) as 'the Site').
- 1.3 The other amendments involve the rezoning of a piece of land at the southern tip of Tsing Yi Road from "G/IC" to an area shown as 'Road' (**Item B1**), a piece of land to the immediate south of the site under Item A1 from "O" to an area shown as 'Road' (**Item B2**) and a site in the southern part of THEi from an area shown as 'Road' to "G/IC" (**Item C**) (**Plans H-1 and H-2**). The amendment **Items B1, B2 and C** are mainly to reflect the existing as-built situation.
- 1.4 There are also two amendments to the Note of the Plan including:
  - (a) Incorporation of 'Art Studio (excluding those involving direct provision of services or goods)' as a Column 1 use under the Schedule II of the "Other Specified Use" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") zone.
  - (b) Replacement of 'Place of Recreation, Sports, or Culture' use under Column 2 under the Schedule II of the "OU(B)" zone by 'Place of Recreation, Sports, or Culture (not elsewhere specified)'.
- 1.5 On 29.1.2016, the Board agreed to consider the representations and comments collectively since all the representations and comments are related to the major amendments under Items A1 and A2 for a proposed public rental housing (PRH) development at the Site with various combinations of other items.
- 1.6 This paper is to provide the Board with information for the consideration the representations and comments and a summary of the representations and comments is attached at **Appendix II**. The representation sites are shown on **Plans H1 to H7**.

- 1.7 The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

## **2. Background**

- 2.1 It was stated in the 2013 Policy Address that the Government would adopt a multi-pronged approach to build up land reserve with a view to meeting housing and other development needs. The 2014 Policy Address announced that except for the north of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon Peninsula, which are more densely populated, the Government considers it feasible to generally increase the maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) currently permitted for the other “density zones” in the territory by around 20% as appropriate. In implementing these measures, the Government will duly consider factors such as traffic and infrastructural capacities, local characteristics, existing development intensity and the various possible impacts of the proposed development on the areas concerned. In the 2015 Policy Address, it was announced that the housing target in the next decade is 480,000 units. On 18.12.2015, the Government announced that the 10 year housing supply target will be lowered from 480,000 to 460,000 units.
- 2.2 In general, the maximum domestic PR for Tsing Yi is 5. To maximise the development potential of housing land as announced in the 2014 Policy Address, a domestic PR of 6 (i.e. a 20% increase) is proposed for new housing sites in Tsing Yi. To ascertain the increase in PR in planning terms, relevant technical assessments (i.e. Broad Environmental Assessment (BEA), Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA), Visual Appraisal (VA) and Preliminary Tree Survey) based on the maximum domestic PR of 6 or non-domestic PR of 9.5 or the composite formula of 6/9.5 for mixed residential and commercial developments and the BH restriction of 140mPD have been conducted.
- 2.3 The proposed zoning amendments on the Plan are mainly to facilitate a proposed PRH at Tsing Hung Road which covers an area of about 4.29ha. The proposed PRH development will be subject to a maximum domestic PR of 6 or non-domestic PR of 9.5 and a maximum BHR of 140mPD as stipulated under the “R(A)4” zone. The proposed amendments together with the technical assessments and the views of Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC) were submitted to the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) for consideration on 17.7.2015. The MPC members noted that the proposed zoning amendments would not have insurmountable impacts on environment, traffic, visual, air ventilation and landscape aspects. The adequacy of provision of open space and GIC facilities in the area had also been assessed. As such, MPC considered that the Plan was suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance.
- 2.4 Subsequent to the gazettal of the Plan, the proposed preliminary layout of the PRH and the technical assessments have been refined to address the concerns of the locals raised at the local forum on 18.9.2015 (see paragraph 3.5 below).
- 2.5 The proposed PRH will produce about 4,000 flats and will have some retail and community facilities as well as about 1.18ha of local open space to serve the future population and the locals in the area.

### 3. Public Consultation

- 3.1 Prior to the submission of the proposed amendments to the MPC of the Board for consideration, K&TDC was consulted on the rezoning proposal of the Site on 14.5.2015. During the meeting, K&TDC members expressed concern on the potential traffic, air ventilation and visual impacts brought by the proposed development and the insufficient provision of community facilities. Furthermore, they were concerned about the environmental impacts (i.e. traffic noise and glare impacts) from the adjacent Tsing Sha Highway, Container Terminal No. 9 (CT9) and port back up facilities on the future residents. K&TDC passed a motion requesting the re-planning of the Site and the proposed PRH development should be shelved until there is comprehensive planning for supporting transport, environmental and community facilities (see paragraphs 94 to 96 of the minutes of the K&TDC meeting at **Appendix IIIa**).
- 3.2 K&TDC members' views were incorporated into the MPC Paper No. 9/15 to facilitate the MPC's consideration of the proposed amendments at its meeting on 17.7.2015.
- 3.3 K&TDC was further consulted on the gazetted amendments by circulation of K&TDC Paper No. 30/2015 on 18.9.2015 before the end of the 2015 DC session. There was no comment received from K&TDC.
- 3.4 Some K&TDC members have submitted representations during the 2-month public inspection period which forms part of the statutory public consultation process under the Ordinance (Attachment A of **Appendix II**). Their representations are incorporated in paragraph 4.2 below.
- 3.5 Subsequent to the proposed zoning amendments and upon the request of the local, with the coordination of the Kwai Tsing District Office, the Home Affairs Department (K&TDO, HAD), the Planning Department (PlanD) and the Housing Department (HD) attended a local forum on 18.9.2015 to solicit local views. In gist, their concerns are mainly the same as those in the 960 adverse representations and 350 adverse comments. A summary of the local views expressed in the local forum is at **Appendix IIIb**. In particular, the local expressed strong views on the site suitability, the impacts of the proposed housing development at a site originally for open space development and questioned the results of the technical assessments.

### 4. The Representations

#### 4.1 Subject of Representations (Plans H-1 and H-2)

A total of 961 valid representations were received. They include:

- (a) **R1** supports Items A1 and A2;
- (b) **R2** to **R773** and **R955** object to all items (i.e. Items A1, A2, B1, B2 and C), of which **R748** to **R758** also oppose Amendment Items (a) and (b) to the Notes of the draft OZP without providing grounds;
- (c) **R774** to **R948** object to Items A1 and/or A2; and

- (d) **R949 to R954** and **R956 to R961** object to Item A1 with various combinations with other items.

Representations made by K&TDC members (**R394**, **R640** and **R921**), Owners' Committee of Rambler Crest (**R171**), Cheung Ching Estate Property Services Management Office (**R800**), Youngspiration (**R901**) and some individuals as well as a sample of a standard letter submitted by 96 individuals are at **Appendix IV**. A full set of hard copy is deposited at the Secretariat of the Board for Members' reference and copies are deposited at the PlanD's public enquiry counters for public inspection.

#### 4.2 Major Grounds of Representations

##### *Supportive Representation*

4.2.1 **R1** supports Items A1 and A2 to the OZP. The grounds are summarised below:

- (a) The proposed PRH development at the Site could be used as re-housing site for the residents of Cheung Ching Estate which should be re-developed to provide more public housing. Cheung Ching Estate should be redeveloped in 2 phases and the floor area of the public rental housing, parking, wet market and commercial use should be efficiently increased.
- (b) In view of the demand of car parking at Cheung Ching Estate resulted from the private residential developments nearby, the provision of parking spaces, commercial use and wet market in the proposed public housing development at the Site should be increased.
- (c) Mini-bus routes should be increased, frequency and routes of bus service should be increased.
- (d) Elevated road connecting Tsing Hung Road/Rambler Crest and Tsing Yi Bridge/Kwai Tsing Bridge to and from Kowloon should be built, and Tsing Yi Road should be widened.

##### *Adverse Representations*

4.2.2 All the 960 adverse representations are mainly related to the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road under Items A1 and A2 including **R2 to R773** and **R955** which object to all items (i.e. Items A1, A2, B1, B2 and C), **R774 to R948** object to Items A1 and/or A2, and **R949 to R954** and **R956 to R961** object to Item A1 with various combinations with other items. The major grounds of the adverse representations are summarised below:

##### *Land Use*

- (a) The "O" zone between Tsing Yi Road and Tsing Hung Road should not be rezoned for residential use as it is the open space reserved for residents

nearby and was compensated to serve the residents of Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Tsing Estate due to the construction of CT9. There is inadequate open space in Tsing Yi according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG).

#### *Site Suitability*

- (b) The Site is not suitable for a massive scale housing development or any other developments. The proposed PRH development would be affected by the pollutions from CT9 and the sewage treatment works nearby. The Government should find other suitable sites such as the Northern, Southern and Southwestern of Tsing Yi, the temporary car park sites in Tsing Yi, etc.

#### *Layout*

- (c) The building gaps between the proposed housing blocks are narrow.

#### *Technical Assessments*

- (d) The Government should re-assess the impacts of the proposed public housing development including traffic, environmental and ecological impacts, provide sufficient information or data and propose mitigation measures.

#### *Environment*

- (e) The proposed PRH development would impose adverse environmental impacts on noise and air quality due to construction works, cause loss of trees in the original "O" zone, and affect the ecology of the natural stream.

#### *Traffic*

- (f) The proposed PRH development would impose adverse traffic impacts on the public transport services including bus, minibus and taxi which are already insufficient; and the journey time, road capacity, parking spaces and traffic safety due to more road traffic to be generated. Moreover, the TIA has underestimated the traffic demand which was based on insufficient days of traffic surveys and inappropriate survey locations of the public transport services for the assessment. There was nil consultation with the public transport providers for their services to meet the future demand.

#### *Visual*

- (g) The proposed PRH development would impose adverse visual impact by blocking the views of Rambler Crest, Mayfair Gardens and the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Tsing Yi) (the Tsing Yi IVE). Besides, there is no photomontage provided in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment from the viewpoint of the Rambler Crest's frontage direct towards the proposed PRH development.

### *Air Ventilation*

- (h) The proposed PRH development would impose adverse impacts on air flow due to the denser environment and wall effect caused by the proposed development. Rambler Crest would be located between the existing hotels and the proposed development suffering from poor ventilation performance resulted from the five 45-storey buildings with limited distance between blocks.

### *Tree Felling*

- (i) The landscaping of about 1,800 trees within the Site of the proposed PRH development will be removed.

### *Potential Risk*

- (j) The Site would be at potential risks including the potential hazard induced from the Esso petrol filling station (PFS) located to the north of the Site; large amount of water flowing down from the slope at the Site during the rainy season; and the construction works on the drainage reserve within the Site. According to the HKPSG, PFS should preferably be located in relatively open areas and not surrounded by developments. Where such requirement cannot be met, it is desirable that the surrounding buildings of the PFS are only low-rise and structures of any kind should not be permitted on drainage reserves.

### *Building on Slope*

- (k) There is a sloppy terrain at the Site. It is not suitable for a massive scale housing development or any other developments. Also, the proposed public housing development would impose potential adverse impact on the foundations of or slope works supporting Cheung Ching Estate and Mayfair Gardens. The Government should identify other suitable sites for the proposed PRH development.
- (l) High construction, maintenance and management cost would be expected due to the special design and construction materials to mitigate the pollutions from CT9 and the slope safety issue of the Site.

### *Supporting Facilities*

- (m) There are no large retail facility and sufficient community facilities to support the future population increase. The existing retail facility is being operated at capacity and the community facilities namely educational, elderly and medical facilities, wet market, and transport and parking are insufficient. The proposed community facilities at the proposed PRH development could not meet the demand in Tsing Yi South. There is a lack of comprehensive planning on the provision of community facilities.
- (n) Sufficient transport, recreational and community facilities should be provided at the proposed PRH development.



*Public Consultation*

- (o) The Government had disregarded the objection of K&TDC. There was insufficient consultation and insufficient information on traffic, visual and air ventilation aspects. In addition, there were advance site investigation works conducted by HD and resulted in suspected tree felling.
- (p) More time should be allowed for public consultation and should adopt a more effective approach for public engagement.

*Proposed Amendment to the Plan<sup>2</sup>*

- (q) The zoning should remain unchanged. [**R171-R179, R181-R213, R215-R470, R472-R481, R487, R495-R496, R508-R639, R641-R652, R661-R666, R677-R689, R705-707, R732-R735, R751, R757-R758, R763, R777, R793, R795, R802, R834, R904, R906, R908-R912, R919, R928, R945-R946, R950 and R956**]
- (r) The development intensity and building height should be reduced. [**R3, R5-R6, R8, R17, R19, R41, R47, R75, R85, R98, R106-108, R120, R124, R132, R136, R141, R165-R166, R171, R178, R190, R223, R227-R228, R240, R258, R260, R268, R272, R299, R301-R302, R318, R323-R324, R333, R340, R362, R364, R373, R386, R394, R426, R432, R461, R464, R479, R486, R493, R511, R529, R532, R551-554, R557, R561, R565, R567, R598, R603, R633, R651, R677, R686, R697, R721, R742, R748, R753-R756, R758, R773, R796, R802-R803, R834, R903, R950, R956 and R961**]

4.2.3 Some minor grounds of representations in relation to Items B1, B2 and C are at **Appendix II** for Members' reference.

## **5. Comments on Representations**

5.1 A total of 350 comments were received. All of them are in relation to the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road under Items A1 and A2 and support the adverse representations. They include:

- (a) **C1 and C3 to C345 (Part)** support **R171** which opposes all items;
- (b) **C2** supports **R2 to R961** which oppose all items;
- (c) **C345 (Part)** supports **R748** which opposes all items;
- (d) **C346** supports **R734, R735 and R737** which oppose all items;
- (e) **C347** supports **R734, R740 and R746** which oppose all items;

---

<sup>2</sup> Specific representation proposals for each representation can be found at **Attachments B and C of Appendix II**

- (f) **C348** supports **R907, R910 and R941** which oppose Items A1 and A2;
- (g) **C349** supports **R800 to R802** which oppose Items A1 and A2; and
- (h) **C350** supports **R944, R949 and R959** which oppose Items A1, A2, B1 and/or C.

Comments made by a K&TDC member (**C1**), Owners' Committee of Rambler Crest (**C2**) and some individuals are at **Appendix V**. A full set of hard copy is deposited at the Secretariat of the Board for Members' reference and copies are deposited at the PlanD's public enquiry counters for public inspection.

## 5.2 Grounds of Comments

The comments are very similar to those of the adverse representations. The major grounds of the adverse comments are summarised below:

### *Adverse Comments*

- (a) Abandon or review the proposal of the PRH development. The zoning should remain unchanged.
- (b) Find other suitable sites for the proposed PRH development.
- (c) Reduce the development density of the proposed PRH development such as deleting Block Nos. 3 to 5 and including environmentally friendly design in the building.
- (d) Enhance the provision and quality of supporting facilities including retail, recreational, community facilities.
- (e) The Government should provide comprehensive and effective traffic proposal and re-do the TIA.
- (f) Preserve the trees at the Site. The Government should study whether the open space is an important buffer area in the area.
- (g) Re-consultation and enhancement of consultation are required.

## 6. Planning Considerations and Assessment

### Items A1, A2, B1, B2 and C (Plans H-1 to H-7)

#### 6.1 The Site and Its Surrounding Area

6.1.1 The Site is on government land and is currently vacant. It comprises sloping area covered with vegetation and two platforms (**Plans H-2 and H-3**). A nullah (drainage reserve) currently under a permanent government land allocation to the Drainage Services Department (DSD) lies in the middle of the Site (**Plan H-2**).

6.1.2 The surrounding areas of the Site (**Plans H-1 and H-2**) are:

- (a) to the immediate north is a PFS and to the further north and west across Tsing Yi Road is Mei King Playground, two high-density residential developments namely Mayfair Gardens and Cheung Ching Estate and two educational institutions namely the Tsing Yi IVE and THEi. A proposed high-density private residential development located to the west of Mayfair Gardens was rezoned in 2014 from “Green Belt” to “R(A)4” with the same development restrictions as the Site, i.e. maximum domestic/non-domestic PR of 6/9.5 and maximum BHR of 140mPD;
- (b) to the immediate northeast is the Tsing Yi Preliminary Treatment Works (TYPTW);
- (c) to the immediate east is a high-density commercial and residential developments comprising Rambler Crest which comprises a service apartment and three hotels;
- (d) to the immediate south is the Tsing Sha Highway and further south across Tsing Sha Highway is CT9 and a cluster of land zoned “OU (Container-Related Uses)” with temporary car parks, logistics centres and storage of containers to support CT9; and
- (e) the BH of the existing surrounding residential developments ranges from about 83mPD at Cheung Ching Estate to 143mPD at Rambler Crest (**Plan H-2**).

## 6.2 Planning Intention

- 6.2.1 The “R(A)4” zone under Items A1 and A2 is intended primarily for high-density residential developments. Commercial uses are always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building. The “R(A)4” zone is subject to a maximum domestic PR of 6 or a maximum non-domestic PR of 9.5 or the composite formula of 6/9.5 for mixed residential and commercial developments and the maximum building BHR of 140mPD.
- 6.2.2 The “G/IC” zone under Item C is intended primarily for the provision of Government, institution or community facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organizations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments. Item C reflects the existing situation of the site which is part of the Tsing Yi IVE Campus and thus in line with the planning intention.
- 6.2.3 Items B1 and B2 is to reflect the existing situation of the sites which are part of the existing Tsing Yi Road.

6.3 Responses to Grounds of Representations and Representers' Proposals  
(Attachment C of Appendix II)

*Supportive Representation*

- 6.3.1 The supportive view of **R1** on Items A1 and A2 is noted.
- 6.3.2 While redevelopment may increase public housing supply over the long term, the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) does not have redevelopment plan for Cheung Ching Estate at this moment.
- 6.3.3 The number of parking spaces within the Site will be provided in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG as agreed by the Transport Department (TD). In order to meet changes of demand for public transport services in relation to population increase due to the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road, TD will closely monitor the public transport services in the area before and after population in-take, and will include necessary bus service enhancement measures in annual bus route planning for public consultation in due course. If required, TD will strengthen the existing Green Minibus Bus (GMB) services.
- 6.3.4 Tsing Hung Road and Rambler Crest are already connected to Tsing Yi South Bridge via Tsing Yi Road with a bypassing lane (underpass). There is no planning for constructing a separate flyover.

*Adverse Representations*

*Land Use*

- 6.3.5 The Site of the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road is previously zoned "O" on the OZP. The Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS) advises that they have no development programme for the subject "O" site. The Site is identified as having potential to be rezoned for residential use, taking into account that the Site is vacant and that Tsing Yi has surplus existing and planned provision of open space. Based on the requirement of HKPSG, there is a surplus of existing/planned district and local open space of 1.45ha and 26.47ha respectively in Tsing Yi district (**Appendix XI**), including 1.18ha of local open space to be provided within the Site. There are Tsing Hung Road Playground, Mei King Playground, Ching Hong Road Playground and other local open spaces serving the vicinity (**Plans H1 and H-2**). In view of the pressing housing needs and the suitability of the Site for residential use, the Site is proposed for public housing.

*Site Suitability*

- 6.3.6 Given the Site is surrounded by residential, commercial and educational developments (**Plan H-2**), the proposed PRH development is considered

compatible with the surrounding developments. Although the Site is in close proximity to CT9 and port back up land, residential development at the Site is considered technically feasible and environmentally acceptable with the adoption of appropriate mitigation measures (see technical assessments in paragraph 6.3.9 to 6.3.31 below). In order to meet housing needs, other sites will also be considered for housing purpose, if they are found suitable and technically feasible.

### *Layout*

- 6.3.7 For the layout design, relevant regulations and guidelines such as ‘Sustainable Building Design Guidelines’ in relation to the key building design elements including building separation, building setback and site coverage of greenery will be observed. The AVA (Figures 2.15 and 2.20 of **Appendix IX**) illustrates that wider building separation ranging from 15m to 60m and set-back distance of the domestic blocks of the Site from the residential blocks nearby ranging from 60m to 140m could be provided to improve the air ventilation.

### *Technical Assessments*

- 6.3.8 Technical assessments have been conducted to ascertain the proposed PRH development under the proposed zoning amendments and confirmed that there would be no insurmountable technical problems. As the design of the proposed PRH is progressing and taking into account concerns of the locals, representers and commenters, refined technical assessments have been conducted to ascertain the technical feasibility of the proposed PRH development (**Appendices VI to X**). The refined technical assessments re-confirmed that there would be no insurmountable environmental, traffic, visual, air ventilation and landscape impacts on the surrounding developments. The concerns on various impacts are detailed in paragraphs 6.3.9 to 6.3.31 below.

### *Environment*

- 6.3.9 According to the BEA (**Appendix VII**), the proposed PRH development with suitable mitigation measures will not have adverse environmental impacts. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) also advises that the proposed PRH development is not anticipated to have insurmountable environmental problem.
- 6.3.10 HD is now conducting an Environmental Assessment Study (EAS) comprising air quality and noise impact assessments with a view to identifying the necessary mitigation measures. Supplementary information on the preliminary findings on noise impact is appended in the BEA. According to the preliminary findings, the proposed PRH development would be subject to potential road traffic noise impacts from Tsing Yi Road, Tsing Hung Road and Tsing Sha Highway. Under the unmitigated scenario, the noise compliance rate is about 85%. Most of the affected flats that exceed the noise limit of 70 dB(A) have a predicted maximum

noise level of 71-72 dB(A) and a few have a predicted maximum noise level of 73 dB(A). Appropriate noise mitigation measures (Figure 2.2 of **Appendix VII**) such as noise barriers, architectural fins, acoustic windows/balconies and setback of building blocks would be explored and implemented to mitigate the noise impact. As a preliminary estimation, the mitigated noise compliance rate is at least 90% which will be further enhanced during the detailed design stage.

- 6.3.11 For fixed plant noise, the proposed PRH development would be subject to potential impacts from CT9 and TYPTW. Noise measurement results indicated that the noise from the existing fixed noise sources could comply with the relevant noise limits under the Noise Control Ordinance (NCO). However, in view of the possible deviation of the noise impact, it is preliminarily anticipated that the noise level at some flats more exposed to the CT9 operation may marginally exceed the noise limit during the night time period. Appropriate noise mitigation measures such as acoustic windows/balconies will be explored during the detailed design stage to ensure full compliance with the NCO requirement.
- 6.3.12 Regarding air quality, separation distances from the building blocks to the road kerbs will comply with the buffer distances recommended in the HKPSG and no adverse air quality impact on the building blocks due to vehicular emission is anticipated.
- 6.3.13 For industrial emission, TYPTW and a PFS at Tsing Yi Road are the two major sources. TYPTW may have an odour concern due to the presence of hydrogen sulphide in the sanitary sewer system. Given that appropriate odour treatment measures (e.g. deodorizers) have been fully adopted by its operator, no adverse odour impact will be anticipated. The main air quality issue for the PFS is the emission of petrol vapour from the storage tanks. Under the Air Pollution Control (Petrol Filling Stations) (Vapour Recovery) Regulation, the PFS is required to install the Phase II vapour recovery system. As such, no adverse air quality impact is anticipated due to the operation of the PFS.
- 6.3.14 Regarding the noise and air pollution impacts during the construction stage caused by the proposed PRH development, the duration of construction will be optimized, and the contractors have to comply with relevant pollution control ordinances such as NCO and apply for relevant permits such as Construction Noise Permit where necessary for the execution of construction works.
- 6.3.15 On the ecological aspect, according to the preliminary tree survey report (**Appendix X**), the existing trees within the site are mainly common species with low amenity value. According to the preliminary survey of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), there is no record of species of conservation importance at the Site. The Chief Engineer/Mainland South of DSD (CE/MS, DSD) advises that the water channel which bisects the Site is a nullah.

## *Traffic*

- 6.3.16 The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) comments that the TIA (**Appendix VI**) has already taken into account of the proposed PRH development at Tsing Hung Road and the planned and committed developments in the vicinity of the Site. C for T advises that the TIA has been done in accordance with Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM) and on-site surveys. In view of the above, C for T considers the TIA is acceptable in-principle. The TIA Report demonstrated that with the traffic generated by the proposed PRH development, the existing roads including junctions nearby would still perform at acceptable levels and the impact on journey time would therefore be low. The traffic impact induced by the proposed PRH development is acceptable from traffic engineering point of view.
- 6.3.17 According to Table 2.1 at page 3 of the TIA (**Appendix VI**), the current ratio of flow to capacity (V/C ratio) of the road junctions in the vicinity (including Tsing Yi Interchange, junction of Tsing Yi Road/Ching Hong Road and junction of Tsing Yi Road/Sai Shan Road) ranges from 0.435 to 0.624 in AM peak hour and from 0.357 to 0.552 in PM peak hour. The anticipated traffic flow generated from and attracted by the proposed PRH development is about 424 passenger car unit per hour (pcu/hr) in 2-way at AM peak hour and 332 pcu/hr in PM peak hour (Table 4.1 of TIA). According to Table 4.6 at page 19 of the TIA, the 2025 junction operation performance with the scenario of having the proposed PRH development in place indicates that the V/C ratio of the above mentioned road junctions will be in the range from 0.573 to 0.789 in AM peak hour and from 0.440 to 0.678 in PM peak hour, i.e. with the traffic generated by the proposed PRH development, the existing roads including junctions nearby would perform at acceptable levels with reserved capacities.
- 6.3.18 For the concern about the traffic impact on the Tsing Yi Interchange, C for T advises that it is not a traffic accident black spot according to the records of TD and the operation of the interchange is observed satisfactory. For Tsing Yi Roundabout No. 2 outside Rambler Crest, as the proposed main vehicular access for the PRH development would be at Tsing Yi Road (Figure 1.1 of **Appendix VI**), the traffic routing through the roundabout would be low. Another proposed vehicular access at Tsing Hung Road would mainly be for service vehicles.
- 6.3.19 In terms of public transport services, according to the TIA, there would be about 1,861 and 1,113 passengers generated by the proposed PRH development in the AM and the PM peak hours respectively. Currently, there are more than 20 franchised bus and scheduled minibuses routes in the vicinity of the Site (Figure 2.6 of **Appendix VI**), which could cater for the additional demand arising from the proposed PRH development. To tie in with the policy of using railway as the backbone public transport mode, a new bus or GMB feeder route between the proposed PRH development and Tsing Yi Railway Station could be considered.

Alternatively, extension of the existing KMB Route 249M (Mayfair Gardens – Tsing Yi Railway Station) to the proposed PRH development is also a viable option. Detailed arrangement should be explored at the later stage before the commencement of the proposed PRH development. C for T advises that the bus and GMB services will be reviewed and strengthened in respect of the completion and population in-take timing of the proposed development.

6.3.20 Although the existing public transport services would be able to absorb the additional demand on the road based public transport services by the proposed PRH development by adjusting the frequency of the existing routes, it is proposed to reserve an on-street lay-by for 2 numbers of 26m long bus stops/terminals and 2 numbers of 14m long minibus stops/terminals to accommodate 4 buses and 4 GMBs respectively at Tsing Yi Road abutting on the proposed PRH development for possible expansion of the bus and GMB services in future (Figure 3.1 of **Appendix VI**).

6.3.21 Moreover, improvement to Tsing Yi Road is proposed to enhance the operation of the traffic movements and pedestrian flows ( Figures 3.1 and 3.2 of **Appendix VI**):

- (a) For the section of Tsing Yi Road to the south of Sai Shan Road, (i) the existing western footpath fronting Tsing Yi IVE will remain unchanged, (ii) a single carriageway of 7.3m width with 1 northbound and 1 southbound traffic lanes will be provided, (iii) an on-street lay-by reserved for bus and GMB stops will be provided, and (iv) an eastern footpath of about 6m width will be provided; and
- (b) For the section of Tsing Yi Road to the north of Sai Shan Road, in view of the very limited traffic turning right from Sai Shan Road to Tsing Yi Road where is a cul-de-sac, the junction of Tsing Yi Road and Sai San Road will be signalised and the right turn movement will be banned at that junction to fully utilise the signal timing. Traffic will then be diverted to the roundabout of Tsing Yi Road and Ching Hong Road. The pedestrian crossing across Tsing Yi Road carriageway at the proposed signalised junction will also be widened to the standard width of 4m. Furthermore, the section of Tsing Yi Road between Sai Shan Road and Ching Hong Road will be re-aligned by removing part of the central divider in order to provide extra space for the widening of the eastern footpath to about 3m clear width. Two traffic lanes for each direction will be maintained.

#### *Visual*

6.3.22 The VA (**Appendix VIII**) revealed that there would be no substantial visual impact imposed by the proposed PRH development. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L) of PlanD considers the proposed BHR of 140mPD for the Site would not be incompatible with the surroundings.



- 6.3.23 Photomontages from various public viewpoints are prepared to illustrate the possible visual impact of the proposed PRH development. When viewed from longer distance viewpoints (Figures A and E of **Appendix VIII**) and some medium range viewpoints (Figures D and H of **Appendix VIII**), the proposed PRH development would result in insignificant visual impact on the public viewers and would generally not be incompatible with the existing built environment, local character and the surroundings in visual terms.
- 6.3.24 From some short or medium range viewpoints including viewpoint 2 at the northeastern corner of Tsing Hung Road Playground and viewpoint 7 at Mei King Playground (Figures B and G of **Appendix VIII**), the visual openness and part of the open sky view would be blocked to some extent. However, the visual impact arising from the proposed PRH development would be mitigated by providing visual corridors through visual enhancement measures such as building gaps, variation of building heights, open space, green coverage and greening measures. Noteworthy is viewpoint 3 which is at the same location at Tsing Hung Road Playground, but view to the north. Since the northern part of the Site will be used as playground, visual openness can be maintained and there will be no adverse visual impact from this viewpoint. It is concluded that the proposed PRH development will not induce insurmountable visual impact at the surrounding developments.
- 6.3.25 Regarding the criteria of choosing vantage points, the Town Planning Board Guidelines on 'Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the TPB' (TPB PG-NO.41) has been followed. Whilst paragraph 4.5 of the TPB PG-NO.41 states that it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations, and it is far more important to protect public views, visual corridors, building setbacks, and sensitive disposition of residential blocks reserved to maintain the visual permeability of the surroundings would also minimise the visual impacts to neighbouring residential blocks (see conceptual layout plan at Figure 2.20 of **Appendix IX**).

#### *Air Ventilation*

- 6.3.26 In order to recognize the ventilation impact arisen from the proposed PRH development, air ventilation assessment covering expert evaluation (AVA EE) (**Appendix IX**) and initial study (AVA IS) has been employed to evaluate the ventilation impact on the Site and the surrounding.
- 6.3.27 The AVA EE revealed that the proposed PRH development would impose negligible impact on the breezeway at the section of Tsing Yi Road between Tsing Yi Interchange and Roundabout No.2 outside Rambler Crest. Adverse impact on Rambler Crest is thus not expected under major prevailing wind directions. However, the ventilation performance of Mayfair Gardens, Mei King Playground

and Tsing Yi IVE would be partially affected due to the proposed PRH development mainly under east (E), southeast (SE) and south (S) prevailing wind directions, while Cheung Ching Estate would also be affected under SE, southwest (SW) and S wind directions. The AVA EE recommended that mitigation measures could be incorporated into the proposed development including preservation of existing breezeways/air paths by maximising the separation between the proposed PRH development and the surrounding developments (Figure 2.20 of **Appendix IX**), reduction of domestic block and optimising the building separations within the proposed PRH development to increase permeability of the Site (Figures 2.14 and 2.15 of **Appendix IX**). These features would help to alleviate the potential ventilation impact to the surrounding wind environment.

- 6.3.28 To improve the air ventilation, the total number of 5 blocks under the original proposal (i.e. the baseline scheme in the AVA EE) is proposed to be reduced to 4 blocks (i.e. the proposed scenario). In order to assess ventilation performance quantitatively and visualise wind flow pattern, an AVA initial study adopting computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulation is conducted to assess the existing situation and the proposed scenario and the findings are summarised in the Executive Summary at **Appendix IXa**.
- 6.3.29 According to the AVA IS, under the annual condition, comparing the existing and proposed Scenarios, the same ventilation performance is found at Rambler Crest, Tsing Hung Road and Mayfair Gardens. The ventilation impact of the proposed PRH development on Rambler Crest which is located at the upwind location of the Site under most of the annual prevailing wind directions would be insignificant. Although the proposed PRH development would inevitably affect the general annual wind availability at the downstream area at Tsing Hung Road, the 60m building separation between Block 3 and Block 4 of the proposed PRH development would allow the southerly winds to penetrate through the site and reach Mayfair Gardens. On the one hand, improvements in ventilation performance would be found at Tsing Hung Road Playground, Tsing Yi Road (between Tsing Yi Interchange and Roundabout No.2 outside Rambler Crest), Tsing Sha Highway, Tsing Yi IVE and Mayfair Gardens Bus Terminus. Improvement at Tsing Hung Road Playground would be significant due to the proposed high-rise buildings which would introduce downwashed wind from the north-east and south-east quadrants to the pedestrian level bringing significant localised improvements in ventilation performance. On the other hand, deterioration in ventilation performance is found at Sai Shan Road, Ching Hong Road and Tsing Yi Road (the section to the west of the Site), Cheung Ching Estate and Mei King Playground under the proposed scenario since the proposed PRH development would block the prevailing winds from the south-east quadrant.
- 6.3.30 Under the summer condition, improvements in ventilation performance at Tsing Hung Road Playground, Mayfair Gardens Bus Terminus, Tsing Yi Road (between

Tsing Yi Interchange and Roundabout No.2 outside Rambler Crest) and Tsing Yi IVE are also found for the similar rationale under the annual condition. Similar to the annual condition, deterioration in ventilation performance is found at Mei King Playground, Ching Hong Road, Cheung Ching Estate, Tsing Yi Road (the section to the west of the Site), Sai Shan Road and Cheung Fai Road under the proposed scenario. Worsened ventilation performance is also found at Mayfair Gardens. The higher frequencies of winds from the southerly quadrant under the summer condition would mean an increased impact on Mayfair Gardens by the proposed development. Under winds from the south-west quadrant, Rambler Crest would fall within the wake region of the proposed PRH development. The proposed PRH development would also reduce the general wind availability along Tsing Sha Highway and Tsing Hung Road as it would block wind penetration when compared to the existing open ground condition.

- 6.3.31 The annual site wind velocity ratio (SVR) for the existing scenario and proposed scenario are 0.21 and 0.19 respectively, while the summer SVR are 0.24 and 0.20 respectively. The annual local wind velocity ratio (LVR) for the existing scenario and proposed scenario are 0.20 and 0.19 respectively, while the summer LVR are 0.21 and 0.19 respectively. There is deterioration in ventilation performance in both annual and summer conditions comparing the existing open ground condition to the Proposed Scenario. However, the proposed PRH development would bring improvement to the wind environment of some areas including Tsing Hung Road Playground, Mayfair Gardens Bus Terminus, Tsing Yi IVE and Tsing Yi Road (between Tsing Yi Interchange and Roundabout No.2 outside Rambler Crest) under both annual and summer conditions. Considering the baseline scheme (i.e. 5 blocks) in the AVA EE and the proposed scenario (i.e. 4 blocks), substantial effort has been made to alleviate the potential ventilation impact by incorporating mitigation measures including preserving the existing breezeways/air paths and optimising building separations and the deterioration of ventilation performance can be deemed not significant in view of the effect on local air ventilation performance which is reduced from 0.21 to 0.19.

### *Tree Felling*

- 6.3.32 CTP/UD&L of PlanD considers that as there are existing residential developments in the surroundings, the proposed PRH development is not incompatible with the landscape character in the surrounding area.
- 6.3.33 The Site was previously occupied by oil depots before they were relocated to the Tsing Yi South in 1990's. The trees in the Site have grown up since then. There are about 1,800 trees on the Site based on the preliminary tree survey (**Appendix X**). The tree survey revealed that there are no Old and Valuable Tree or rare species within the Site. Existing Trees are mainly common species (*Acacia auriculiformis* (大葉相思), *Acacia confusa* (台灣相思) and *Leucaena leucocephala* (銀合歡)) with average form and low amenity. Some of the

existing trees are of poor health, including deformed, damaged or cracked trunks, leaning caused structural conditions with failure potential due to limited and competitive slope woodland growing conditions. For existing trees unavoidably to be affected by the proposed PRH developments such as building blocks and vehicular roads, tree felling will be necessary. Tree Felling Application and Compensatory Tree Proposal will be submitted to HD's Tree Preservation Committee for approval in accordance with the requirements under Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 7/2015 on Tree Preservation for Government projects. Compensatory trees and shrubs planting proposal will match and be compatible with the newly built residential environment and coherent to adjacent existing site condition.

#### *Potential Risk*

- 6.3.34 There is a PFS located to the north of the Site. The Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS) advises that there is no LPG supply at the concerned PFS. The concerned PFS is not classified as a Potential Hazard Installation (PHI). Furthermore, DEMS and DEP advised that the Site does not encroach into any Consultation Zone of the PHIs. There is no PHI within 1km of the Site.
- 6.3.35 The Director of Fire Services (DFS) advises that the operator of the PFS ought to comply with the relevant fire safety regulations. The PFS would not impose fire safety impact on the proposed PRH development.
- 6.3.36 For the concern of carrying out construction works on the drainage reserve within the Site, HD advised that the drainage reserve would not be adversely affected.
- 6.3.37 Regarding the large amount of water flowing down from the deep slope at the Site during the rainy seasons, CE/MS, DSD advises that the stormwater from the catchment area could be conveyed to the stormwater drains along Tsing Hung Road and also the existing nullah. Besides, proper drainage system will be proposed at design stage by HD. Proposed drainage connections will be submitted to DSD for approval.

#### *Building on Slope*

- 6.3.38 The Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (HGEO, CEDD) advises that a number of existing geotechnical features lie within or in the vicinity of the Site. He also comments that the Site is not subject to natural terrain hazard and the existing geotechnical features have no past instability record. He confirms that the proposed PRH development would not impose insurmountable geotechnical problem onto the surroundings and proper design could cater for the presence of the foundations and slopes in its surroundings. HD will be required to investigate and study the

stability of those geotechnical features that could affect or be affected by the proposed PRH development, and carry out any necessary slope stabilisation/modification works to ensure that the geotechnical features are up to the current safety standards.

- 6.3.39 The Director of Housing (D of H) advises the Site currently comprises two platforms with existing slopes. The slope gradient varies between 20 to 38 degrees. Housing development on the sloping terrain is not uncommon in Hong Kong. The layout of the domestic blocks and ancillary structures will be designed to optimise the land use and to achieve a cost-effective solution.
- 6.3.40 As regards the concern of high construction, maintenance and management cost in view of the site constraints, D of H advises that to meet the public housing need of the society, HA has to consider all suitable sites regardless of their sizes, for public housing development and will develop public housing projects under the principles of optimisation of the land use, maximisation of cost-effectiveness and sustainability to meet the needs of public housing.

#### *Supporting Facilities*

- 6.3.41 There will be approximate 4,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA of commercial centre within the proposed PRH development to cater for the population increase. Convenient accesses would be provided to enhance the connectivity between the commercial centre and the surroundings. There would be pedestrian linkage between the commercial centre and the public transport facilities along Tsing Yi Road (Figures 1.1 and 3.1 of **Appendix VI**). It should be noted that there are currently retail facilities in each of the housing developments in the vicinity of the Site. The commercial centre in the proposed PRH development will enhance the provision of retail facilities in the area.
- 6.3.42 Based on a planned population of about 211,950 persons for Tsing Yi area (including population of the proposed PRH development under **Items A1 and A2**), there is basically no shortfall in open space and major community facilities in the district (**Appendix XI**). Although there will be a deficit of 1,166 hospital beds, the provision of hospital beds is on a regional basis, and the Tsing Yi residents can use the hospital facilities in the adjacent districts such as Tsuen Wan and Kwai Chung. There is thus no need to provide the said community facilities at the Site.
- 6.3.43 As regards the social welfare facilities, HD and the Social Welfare Department (SWD) now propose some more new social welfare facilities which will serve not just the new population but the existing residents of the neighbourhood. The community facilities include kindergarten, Neighbourhood Elderly Centre, Integrated Support Service for Persons with Severe Physical Disabilities, Day Care Centre for the Elderly, Residential Care Home for the Elderly, Special Child Care Centre, and Early Education and Training Centre, subject to detailed design

and the confirmation on the availability of government funding.

### *Public Consultation*

- 6.3.44 To provide a full picture on the potential housing sites which will be available between 2014/15 and 2018/19, relevant DCs have been consulted on the overall planning of these sites. For K&TDC, there are 13 potential housing sites. K&TDC was consulted on 8.5.2014. The Site is one of the 13 identified housing sites. Prior to the submission of the proposed amendments for the Site to the MPC for consideration on 17.7.2015, K&TDC was consulted on 14.5.2015. The views collected at the K&TDC meeting have been incorporated into the MPC Paper No. 9/15 to facilitate the MPC's consideration of the proposed amendments. The proposed amendments were exhibited for public inspection in accordance with the provision of the Ordinance on 7.8.2015 for two months until 7.10.2015, which was a statutory public consultation process. Furthermore, K&TDC was further consulted by circulation of K&TDC Paper No. 30/2015 on 18.9.2015 on the gazette amendments. There was no comment from K&TDC received. A local forum on 18.9.2015 was also held to brief the locals of the zoning amendments. In gist, their concerns are mainly the same as those in the 960 adverse representations and 350 adverse comments. A summary of the local views expressed in the local forum is at **Appendix IIIb**. Refinement to the layout and technical assessments has been conducted to reassure that the proposed PRH development was suitable and technically feasible at the Site.
- 6.3.45 Public consultation on the amendments to the OZP was carried out in accordance with the established procedures. The exhibition of OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments on representations form part of the statutory public consultation process under the Ordinance. The public and relevant stakeholders have been given the opportunity to provide their views and counter-proposals to the proposed amendments. Besides, all representers/commenters will be invited to the meeting to present their views under section 6B(3) of the Ordinance. The statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the proposed amendments have been duly followed.
- 6.3.46 K&TDC members' comments on requesting comprehensive planning for support transport, environmental and community facilities are noted and have been taken into consideration when designing the revised scheme of the proposed PRH development. HD has liaised with the departments concerned to include appropriate welfare facilities in the development. Furthermore, PlanD and HD attended a local forum in September 2015 to solicit local views.
- 6.3.47 Regarding the advanced site investigation (SI) works, D of H clarifies that the works were for geotechnical appraisal study which is one of the preliminary technical studies conducted for all public housing developments. Advanced SI

works are not abided by the Ordinance. There would not be any tree felling while the advanced SI works are in progress.

6.3.48 For the proposal of allowing more time for public consultation and adopting a more effective approach, it should be noted that the public consultation in accordance with the provision of the Ordinance and consultations with K&TDC and the locals have been carried out, as mentioned in paragraphs 6.3.41 to 6.3.43 above.

#### *Representers' Proposals*

6.3.49 Regarding the proposal to keep the original zoning, it should be noted that the Site is vacant and Tsing Yi has surplus existing and planned provision of open space (**Appendix XI**) and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department has no programme for developing the Site for open space. Hence, the Site is identified as having potential to be used for residential purpose in order to help meet the housing needs in the next decade. Given the Site is surrounded by residential, commercial and educational developments (**Plan H-2**), the proposed PRH development is considered compatible with the surrounding developments. [R171-R179, R181-R213, R215-R470, R472-R481, R487, R495-R496, R508-R639, R641-R652, R661-R666, R677-R689, R705-707, R732-R735, R751, R757-R758, R763, R777, R793, R795, R802, R834, R904, R906, R908-R912, R919, R928, R945-R946, R950 and R956]

6.3.50 It is technically feasible and environmentally acceptable to develop the Site for PRH development with the planned intensity of domestic/non-domestic PR 6/9.5 and BHR of 140 mPD. The proposed PRH development would not generate unacceptable impacts. [R3, R5-R6, R8, R17, R19, R41, R47, R75, R85, R98, R106-108, R120, R124, R132, R136, R141, R165-R166, R171, R178, R190, R223, R227-R228, R240, R258, R260, R268, R272, R299, R301-R302, R318, R323-R324, R333, R340, R362, R364, R373, R386, R394, R426, R432, R461, R464, R479, R486, R493, R511, R529, R532, R551-554, R557, R561, R565, R567, R598, R603, R633, R651, R677, R686, R697, R721, R742, R748, R753-R756, R758, R773, R796, R802-R803, R834, R903, R950, R956 and R961]

#### 6.4 Responses to Grounds of Comments (Attachment C of Appendix II)

##### *Adverse Comments*

6.4.1 As the views of the commenters are very similar to those of the adverse representations, the responses to the respective representations made in above paragraphs are relevant. In particular, the rezoning of the Site for residential use is considered suitable in view of the pressing housing needs, the compatibility with the surroundings with residential, commercial and educational developments

and no insurmountable adverse impacts of the proposed PRH development, etc. as stated in the responses to the representations above. In processing the rezoning amendment, the Government has followed the established procedures and in accordance with the provisions of the Ordinance.

- 6.5 Detailed responses to representations and comments received are at **Appendix II** for Members' reference.

## **7. Consultation**

- 7.1 The following Government bureaux/departments have been consulted and their comments have been incorporated in the above paragraphs where appropriate:

- (a) DEP;
- (b) DEMS;
- (c) FEHD;
- (d) C for T;
- (e) DAFC;
- (f) GEO, CEDD;
- (g) SWD;
- (h) CE/MS, DSD;
- (i) DFS;
- (j) CTP/UD&L, PlanD; and
- (k) D of H

- 7.2 The following Government departments have no comment on the representations and comments:

- (a) Secretary for Development;
- (b) Secretary for Education;
- (c) Secretary for Transport and Housing;
- (d) District Lands Office, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, Lands Department;
- (e) Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department;
- (f) Chief Engineer/Development(2), Water Supplies Department;
- (g) Chief Engineer/Port Works, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD);
- (h) Commissioner of Police;
- (i) Director – General of Civil Aviation;
- (j) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (k) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD)
- (l) Chief Engineer/Railway Division, Railway Development Office, HyD;
- (m) Chief Highway Engineer/Bridges & Structures, HyD;
- (n) Government Property Administrator;
- (o) Project Manager (New Territories West), CEDD;
- (p) Chief Architect/ Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department;
- (q) Chief Architect/Advisory & Statutory Compliance Division, Architectural Services Department; and
- (r) District Officer/Kwai Tsing.



## **8. Planning Department's Views**

8.1 The supportive view of **R1** is noted.

8.2 Based on the assessment in paragraph 6 above and for the following reasons, PlanD does not support the representation Nos. **R2** to **R961**, and considers that the Plan should not be amended to meet the representations:

- (a) Land suitable for housing development in Hong Kong is scarce and there is a need for optimising the use of land available to meet the pressing demand for housing land. Rezoning of suitable sites for residential development is one of the multi-pronged approaches to meet housing and other development needs. Planning is an on-going process and the Government will continue to review various land uses and rezone sites as appropriate for residential use.
- (b) With good transport network and residential, commercial and educational developments nearby, the Site is considered suitable for residential development. The proposed development intensity and building height are technically feasible and will not have insurmountable problems. The zoning amendment of the Site will contribute to the Government's effort in meeting the pressing need for housing land supply in the short term.
- (c) The proposed public housing development under the zoning amendments would not generate unacceptable impacts in terms of traffic, environment, ecological, landscape, infrastructure, air ventilation and visual impacts on the surrounding areas.
- (d) There are no trees on the Register of Old and Valuable Trees within the Site and the existing trees are mainly common species. Tree preservation and landscaping will be required following the established procedures.
- (e) The planned provision of major GIC facilities and open space in the district including those at the Site are generally sufficient to meet the demand of the future population as well as additional demand from the new housing site.
- (f) The statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the proposed zoning amendments have been duly followed. The exhibition of OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance.

## **9. Decision Sought**

The Board is invited to give consideration to the valid representations and comments and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendment to the OZP to meet/partially meet the representations.

## **Appendices**

<b>Appendix Ia</b>	Draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/27 (reduced size)
<b>Appendix Ib</b>	Schedule of Amendments to the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TY/27
<b>Appendix II</b>	Summary of Representations and Comments and PlanD's responses
<b>Appendix IIIa</b>	Extract of Minutes of the Kwai Tsing District Council meeting on 14.5.2015 and motions passed by K&TDC
<b>Appendix IIIb</b>	Summary of the Local Views Expressed in the Local Forum in September 2015
<b>Appendix IV</b>	Representations made by individuals, K&TDC members and sample of standard letters
<b>Appendix V</b>	Comments on Representations made by individuals, K&TDC members and sample of standard letters
<b>Appendix VI</b>	Traffic Impact Assessment Report
<b>Appendix VII</b>	Broad Environmental Assessment Report
<b>Appendix VIII</b>	Visual Appraisal Report
<b>Appendix IX</b>	Air Ventilation Assessment Expert Evaluation
<b>Appendix IXa</b>	Executive Summary of Air Ventilation Assessment Initial Study
<b>Appendix X</b>	Preliminary Tree Survey Report
<b>Appendix XI</b>	Provision of Major Community Facilities in Tsing Yi Area
<b>Appendix XII</b>	CD-ROM containing names of all representers and commenters as well as submission of all representations and comments <b>(for Members only)</b>
<b>Plan H-1</b>	Location Plan of Amendment Items A1 to C
<b>Plan H-2</b>	Site Plan of Amendment Items A1 to C
<b>Plan H-3</b>	Aerial Photo of Amendment Items A1 to C
<b>Plan H-4</b>	Site Photos of Amendment Items A1 and A2
<b>Plan H-5</b>	Site Photos of Amendment Items A1 to C
<b>Plan H-6</b>	Site Photo of the Proposed Development Site Boundary
<b>Plan H-7</b>	Comparison of the approved Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/26 and the draft OZP No. S/TY/27

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**  
**APRIL 2016**