

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO
THE APPROVED TUNG CHUNG TOWN CENTRE AREA
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/I-TCTC/22
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

- Item A1 – Rezoning of a site currently occupied by the Tung Chung Traction Substation from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Traction Substation cum Portal” (“OU (Traction Substation cum Portal)”) to “Residential (Group A)8” (“R(A)8”) with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item A2 – Rezoning of two strips of land adjacent to the Tung Chung Traction Substation from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “R(A)8” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item A3 – Rezoning of two pieces of land abutting Man Tung Road and adjacent to Mass Transit Railway Tung Chung Line from areas shown as ‘Road’ to “R(A)8” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item B – Rezoning of a strip of land along Man Tung Road from “OU (Traction Substation cum Portal)” to an area shown as ‘Road’.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Revision to the Notes for the “R(A)” zone to incorporate ‘Mass Transit Railway Vent Shaft and/or Other Structure above Ground Level other than Entrances (on land designated “R(A)8” only)’ use in Column 1 and revise ‘Mass Transit Railway Vent Shaft and/or Other Structure above Ground Level other than Entrances’ to ‘Mass Transit Railway Vent Shaft and/or Other Structure above Ground Level other than Entrances (except on land designated “R(A)8” only)’ use in Column 2.
- (b) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone to incorporate development restrictions for the “R(A)8” sub-area.
- (c) Deletion of the Notes for “OU (Traction Substation cum Portal)” zone.
- (d) Deletion of ‘Market’ from Column 2 of the Notes for the “Residential (Group B)” and “Village Type Development” zones, revision of ‘Shop and Services’ to ‘Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)’ in Column 2 of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone, and incorporation of ‘Residential Institution’ use in Column 2 of the Notes of “G/IC” zone.

Town Planning Board
19 June 2020

Sai Kung and Islands District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan
No. S/I-TCTC/22

(RNTPC Paper No. 1/20)

8. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the approved Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) were to allow proposed residential development on a MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) site. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had collaborated with the MTRCL on a number of arts projects; and

Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with MTRCL.

9. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed residential development by MTRCL in relation to the rezoning site was the subject of amendments to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of the Members in relation to the proposed amendments would only need to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Y.S. Wong and Conrad T.C. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Amy M.Y. Wu, STP/SKIs, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Background

- (a) the proposed amendments were mainly to allow residential development atop the MTR Tung Chung Traction Substation, which was in line with the initiative to explore the development potential of railway stations and their related sites along existing and future rail lines, with the objective to increase housing supply as announced in the 2015 Policy Address;

Proposed Amendments

- (b) Amendment Items A1-A3: rezoning of a site (about 1.44 ha) currently occupied by the MTR Tung Chung Traction Substation and its adjoining government land from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Traction

Substation cum Portal” (“OU(Traction Substation cum Portal)”), “Government Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and areas shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A)8” (“R(A)8”) with a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 6 and a maximum building height (BH) of 185mPD;

- (c) Amendment Item B: rezoning of a strip of land (about 0.01 ha) along Man Tung Road from “OU(Traction Substation cum Portal)” to an area shown as ‘Road’ to reflect the existing roadside amenity area;

Technical Assessments

- (d) to ascertain the technical feasibility of the proposed residential development, various technical assessments had been conducted by MTRCL, which confirmed that the proposed development would not cause insurmountable problems on visual, air ventilation, traffic, environmental, landscape and other aspects with implementation of appropriate mitigation measures as identified in the technical assessments at Attachment V of the Paper. Relevant government bureaux/departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed development;

GIC Facilities and Open Space

- (e) based on the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the planned population, the planned provision for open space and government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in the Tung Chung area was generally sufficient except for educational facilities, child care centres, hospital beds and elderly facilities. PlanD and concerned departments would work closely together to ensure that additional GIC facilities would be included in new and redevelopment proposals from both public and private sectors. As requested by the Social Welfare Department (SWD), five social welfare facilities would be provided in the proposed development;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (f) corresponding revisions to the Notes were made in respect of the “R(A)8” zone to specify the development restrictions, to delete the User Schedule of “OU(Traction Substation cum Portal)” zone and to incorporate the revised Master Schedule of Notes; and

Consultation

- (g) on 27.4.2020, the Island District Council (IsDC) was consulted on the proposed OZP amendments. The IsDC Members mainly raised concerns on matters including the provision of GIC facilities in Tung Chung, traffic and transport, air ventilation, public consultation and implementation programme of the proposed development.

Building Height

11. Two Members enquired about the proposed BH of the residential development and its compatibility with the surrounding environment. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, said that the proposed BH of 185mPD and PR of 6 were considered compatible with the surrounding high-rise high-density residential developments with BHs ranging from 140mPD to 184mPD and PRs ranging from about 5 to 6. To the west of the site across Man Tung Road was a high-density private residential development, Caribbean Coast, with a PR of 6 and a BH of 184mPD. To its further north across Ying Hei Road was a public housing estate, Ying Tung Estate, with a lower BH of 120-125mPD, taking into account its waterfront location, and the concept of stepped BH profile from inland area to the waterfront. Similar to other development sites in Tung Chung, the BH of the proposed development would be subject to airport height restrictions. A Member further enquired the BH of proposed development as compared with those in other districts. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam explained that the proposed BH had been formulated having regard to the site constraints (e.g. the existing traction substation and portal within the site), the mountain backdrop to the south and optimisation of development potential. The proposed floor height and the resultant BH of the conceptual scheme were generally comparable to residential developments in other districts. A Member suggested that a higher PR and BH could be considered for new

housing developments to increase housing supply in future.

Infrastructural Capacity and GIC Facilities

12. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the infrastructural capacity was sufficient to cater for the existing and planned population in Tung Chung, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam said that the technical assessments conducted by MTRCL had taken into account the proposed developments and the planned population of the whole Tung Chung New Town (TCNT) and its extension, and no insurmountable technical problem had been identified on traffic, infrastructural, visual, environmental and other aspects. Relevant government bureaux/departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed development.

13. Another Member was concerned about the provision of GIC facilities. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam said that as requested by SWD, five social welfare facilities (i.e. Integrated Home Care Service Team Sub-base, Social and Recreational Centre for the Disabled, On-site Pre-school Rehabilitation Services, Parents/Relatives Resource Centre and Home Care Service for Persons with Severe Disabilities) would be provided in the proposed development to serve the community. Based on the HKPSG requirements and the planned population, the planned provision for GIC facilities in the area was generally sufficient except for educational facilities, child care centres, hospital beds and elderly facilities. In TCNT Extension, some GIC sites had been reserved for the future development of GIC facilities. PlanD and the concerned departments would work closely together to ensure that additional GIC facilities would be provided in new and redevelopment proposals from both public and private sectors in Tung Chung.

Traffic and Transport

14. A Member asked about the vehicular access to the proposed development. With reference to Plans 2, 5c, 5d and the floor plans of the conceptual scheme shown on the PowerPoint presentation, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam said that the ingress of the traction substation would remain on Man Tung Road while the vehicular entrance to the proposed residential development would be on Hei Tung Street, with carparks located on UG1/F, UG2/F and UG3/F. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the transportation network in the area, Ms

Donna Y.P. Tam said that the proposed development was located between the existing Tung Chung MTR Station and the proposed Tung Chung East MTR Station. There were currently bus feeder services along Man Tung Road from Tung Chung MTR Station, and the relevant government department would monitor closely if additional bus services would be required.

Air Ventilation

15. A Member enquired about the prevailing wind direction at the site. With reference to the Air Ventilation Assessment Report, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam said that under the annual and summer prevailing wind conditions, North Lantau Highway and Man Tung Road running in NE-SW direction served as major wind corridors for wind penetration through the area. As the site was elongated and lying parallel to the major wind flow direction, it was anticipated that the proposed development would not have significant impact on the overall wind environment of the area.

Implementation

16. In response to a Member's enquiry on the completion year of the proposed development, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam said that according to the development programme provided by MTRCL, the proposed development would be completed in 2029 tentatively, taking into account the time required for OZP amendments and land administration process.

Consultation

17. In response to a Member's enquiry on the OZP amendment procedure, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam explained that the draft OZP and its Notes would be exhibited for public inspection and the IsDC Members would also be notified of the OZP exhibition. Members of the public including IsDC Members could submit representations and comments on the OZP to the Board during the statutory publication period. The representations and comments received would be considered by the Board.

18. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and that the draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area OZP No. S/I-TCTC/22A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/I-TCTC/23 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for public exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area OZP No. S/I-TCTC/22A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

19. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

**List of Representer in respect of
Draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan (OZP)
No. S/I-TCTC/23**

| Representation No. TPB/R/S/I-TCTC/23- | Name of Representer |
|--|----------------------------|
| R1 | 梁美珊 |
| R2 | Kong Ho Ting |
| R3 | Chan Kar Ming |
| R4 | Siu Mei Ling Wesley |
| R5 | 周肇聰 |
| R6 | Chow Lee Sang |
| R7 | Chow Wai Kwan |
| R8 | Chow Wai Sze |
| R9 | Tang Kwok Cheong |
| R10 | Tai Mei Po |
| R11 | Lee Pui Chung |
| R12 | Wat Yiu Man Kermit |
| R13 | Kanchhal Sunil Kumar |
| R14 | Lee Chi Kai |
| R15 | 錢紀芸 |
| R16 | Ng Kong To David |
| R17 | Liu Wai Hung |
| R18 | Kwok Chun Ting |
| R19 | Lam Oi Chu |
| R20 | Wong Pui Man |
| R21 | Tang Chi Hin |
| R22 | Fong Muen Hoo |
| R23 | Li Hon Pong Gower |
| R24 | Leung Sze Man |
| R25 | Chan Ching Yi |
| R26 | Yu Kit Ling |
| R27 | Lau Wai Hei Calvin |
| R28 | Lam Wing Lun |
| R29 | 陳国强 |
| R30 | Cheung Chi Yung Anthony |
| R31 | Lau Yin Shan Felicity |

| Representation No. TPB/R/S/I-TCTC/23- | Name of Representer |
|--|----------------------------|
| R32 | Chan Wai Man Bally |
| R33 | Chui Siu Ping |
| R34 | Lau Hing Cheung |
| R35 | Ng Sin Ting |
| R36 | 黃溢禧 |
| R37 | 黃裕森 |
| R38 | 黃栢永 |
| R39 | Li Yu I |
| R40 | Ho Yuen Wah |
| R41 | Lam In In |
| R42 | Chan Yuet Ngo |
| R43 | Lee Yuen Ha |
| R44 | Hung Lo Chung Johnny |
| R45 | 張國暉 |
| R46 | Wong Yu Ki Alex |
| R47 | Chan Edwin |
| R48 | Cheung Lin |
| R49 | 黎偉堅 |
| R50 | Lau Chun Pan |
| R51 | Wong Yuk Kwan |
| R52 | Lam Po Ching Billy |
| R53 | Mary Mulvihill |
| R54 | Tsang Kei Man |
| R55 | Tsang Tak Kwan |
| R56 | Lui Sze On |
| R57 | Wu Ming |
| R58 | Lam Cheuk Ho |
| R59 | Li Kin Lung |
| R60 | Li Hiu Nam |
| R61 | Lui Chi Ping |
| R62 | Ma Suk Fan |
| R63 | Lam Siu Fung |
| R64 | Shek Wing Lam |
| R65 | Lee Tik Pun Ben |
| R66 | Chan Shui Kwan |

| Representation No. TPB/R/S/I-TCTC/23- | Name of Representer |
|--|----------------------------|
| R67 | Wong Man Hoi Henry |
| R68 | Wong Henry |
| R69 | Fu Yuen Ting Rebecca |
| R70 | Lee Chai Lio |

List of Commenters in respect of
Draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan (OZP)
No. S/I-TCTC/23

| Commenter No. TPB/R/S/I-TCTC/23- | Name of Commenters |
|---|---------------------------|
| C1 | MTR Corporation Limited |
| C2 | Ho Wing Hang |
| C3 | 李嘉豪 |
| C4 | Li Chiu Ming |
| C5 | Leung Chun Wing |
| C6 | Ho Ho Yin |
| C7 | Mary Mulvihill |
| C8 | Wat Yiu Man Kermit |
| C9 | Au Hok Kwan |

**Summary of Representations and Comments and the Planning Department's Responses
in respect of the Draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCTC/23**

- (1) The grounds of the representers (TPB/R/I-TCTC/23-1 to 70), as well as Planning Department's responses are summarized below. All representations provided adverse comments to the proposed amendments, including 26 representations (R1 to R26) on all proposed amendments (Items A1 to A3 and Item B), 43 representations (R27 to R69) on Items A1 to A3, and one representation (R70) on Item A1. The representations have not put forward any proposed amendments to the OZP to meet their representations.

| Representation no. (TPB/R/I-TCTC/23-) | Subject of Representation | Response to Representation |
|--|--|--|
| R1 to R3 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The provision of community facilities is inadequate. | (i) In accordance with the standards stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the requirements of relevant bureaux/departments, the overall government, institution and community (GIC) facility provision in Tung Chung New Town is planned in a holistic manner and lands have been reserved for an array of GIC facilities including educational, medical and health, social welfare, public market and recreational facilities as well as open space, to serve Tung Chung New Town (TCNT) and its extension (Annex VI). The planned provision of GIC facilities of Tung Chung is generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population. As advised by EDB, no additional site is required for kindergarten, primary school and secondary school. For medical and health facilities, the provision of hospital beds would be monitored by the Hospital Authority on a regional basis while a larger scale clinic is planned within North Lantau Hospital Phase II to cater the long term need in the area. For social welfare facilities, SWD considers no additional aided places for Child Care Centre is required in Tung Chung in view of the ageing population. PlanD and SWD will work closely together to ensure that additional elderly facilities will be provided in GIC sites or new public housing development proposals. |

| Representation no. (TPB/R/I-TCTC/23-) | Subject of Representation | Response to Representation |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>In addition, as requested by SWD, five social welfare facilities (including integrated home care service team sub-base, social and recreational centre for the disabled, on-site pre-school rehabilitation services, parents/relatives resource center and home care service for persons with severe disabilities) will be provided in the future development at the representation site. Public transport interchanges (PTIs), including the one to be provided in the public housing development in Area 99 to the north of the representation site, will facilitate convenient transfer between various transport modes and enhancement of circulation within TCNT and its extension.</p> |
| | <p>(b) The proposed development is too close to Caribbean Coast which would create a sense of pressure to the residents.</p> | <p>(ii) A minimum distance of about 55m has been allowed between the residential towers and Caribbean Coast according to the Conceptual Scheme (Plan H-6c). Efforts have been made in MTRCL's proposal to reduce the visual impact, including responsive BH and mass in keeping the scale and bulk of the proposed development in tune with its adjacent high-rise developments (including Caribbean Coast). Proposed mitigation measures including provision of voids, vertical greening and planting at the podium could also help soften the podium bulk when viewed from close-range viewpoints at Man Tung Road and Hei Tung Street (Plans H-7a and 7b). Besides, two 15m-wide building separations between towers are proposed to serve as wind corridors and also visual corridors towards the mountain backdrop which will improve visual permeability of the proposed development (Plan H-6a). The visual amenity provided by the landscape features on the lower levels of the proposed development will also promote visual interests and connections between pedestrian/users of the social welfare facilities and residents of the proposed development. In view of the above, CTP/UD&L advises that the proposed development would not</p> |

| Representation no. (TPB/R/I-TCTC/23-) | Subject of Representation | Response to Representation |
|--|---|---|
| | | cause significant adverse visual impact on the surroundings. |
| | (c) The proposed development would generate adverse air ventilation impact. (d) Proposed developments would create and/or exacerbate the 'walled effect'. | (iii) Under the annual and summer prevailing wind conditions, North Lantau Highway and Man Tung Road running in NE-SW direction serve as effective wind corridors for wind penetration through the area. As the site is elongated and parallel to the major wind flow direction, CTP/UD&L advises that the proposed development is not expected to have significant impact on the overall wind environment of the area (including Caribbean Coast). |
| | (e) Transport facilities/services are inadequate to support the proposed development and the recently completed developments (e.g. Ying Tung Estate, The Visionary and Century Link). | (iv) The site is accessible via Man Tung Road and served by public transport. In view of the population growth due to the new housing development projects, TD will examine the bus routes, bus stops and service level of the bus services in the area under the annual Bus Route Planning Programme and implement appropriate measures timely including introduction of new franchised bus routes and service enhancement of the existing franchised bus services etc. in order to cater for the demand for bus services from residents of Tung Chung. Besides, MTRCL has conducted assessment on impact on public transport provision including railway services to estimate pedestrian generation/attraction and the modal split of proposed development and the spare capacity of TCL. According to CE/RD2-2, HyD, Tung Chung Line (TCL) is expected to be capable of handling additional patronage generated by the proposed development and the existing railway network will not be overloaded. He also has no comment on MTRCL's technical reports from railway network point of view. The TCL Extension project comprising Tung Chung East (TCE) and Tung Chung West stations aims to commence construction in 2023 for the completion in 2029 (same as the anticipated completion year of the proposed development). |

| Representation no. (TPB/R/I-TCTC/23-) | Subject of Representation | Response to Representation |
|--|---|---|
| | (f) The need for proposed 'infill' development is questionable/unnecessary as the reclamation in Tung Chung East should have provided sufficient land for residential development. | (v) As stated in 2020 Policy Address, meeting Hong Kong people's housing needs is a goal to be accomplished. The Government has been increasing land supply through a multi-pronged approach and addressing the supply-demand imbalance by formulating short, medium and long-term measures. The rezoning of the Tung Chung Traction Substation site for residential use (Amendment Items A1 to A3) is in line with the government's initiative to explore the development potential of railway stations and their related sites along existing and future rail lines, with the objective to increase housing supply. |
| R4 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Community facilities in Tung Chung are inadequate. The Government should make use of the large-scale reclamation project in the area for holistic planning and development of Tung Chung, including tourism, transport, residential and community facilities. | (i) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed high-rise development would create 'walled effect' and lead to heat island effect. | (ii) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. (iii) The AVA report provided by MTRCL has followed the 'Technical Guide for AVA for Developments in Hong Kong' in Technical Circular No. 1/06. The AVA assessment area covers the surrounding area within 500m radius from the site and the winter wind environment has also been assessed under the annual wind condition. According to the AVA report, some localized impacts on the "G/IC" site to its immediate southwest under annual and summer conditions and the Tung Chung North Park under annual condition are observed. On the other hand, some enhancement on the ventilation performance along Hei Tung Street under annual |

| Representation no. (TPB/R/I-TCTC/23-) | Subject of Representation | Response to Representation |
|--|---|--|
| | | condition is also observed. Nonetheless, given the development site constraints and limited developable space, the air ventilation impact of the proposed development has been minimized with the provision of mitigation measures (e.g. two proposed 15m-wide building separations between towers) under the conceptual scheme (Plans H-6a and 6-b), CTP/UD&L advises that the proposed development is not expected to have significant impact on the overall wind environment of the area. In finalizing the future development scheme at detailed design stage, the future developer should take into account these proposed mitigation measures in the AVA report to alleviate the potential impact of the development. |
| | (c) Capacity of existing MTR services has been saturated and the new railway station would not be commenced before the completion of the proposed development. (d) Existing bus services cannot accommodate increasing demand, in particular for the external bus routes | (iv) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R5 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development would generate adverse air ventilation impact to Caribbean Coast. | (i) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development would worsen local traffic. | (ii) In MTRCL's Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), junction capacity assessment has been conducted for five major junctions (Plan H-8) in the area for the design year of 2032 (3 years after the population intake of the proposed development) and it is revealed that all the concerned junctions will operate with spare capacity in the future scenario. As such, the traffic generated by the proposed development is not anticipated to induce significant traffic impact |

| Representation no. (TPB/R/I-TCTC/23-) | Subject of Representation | Response to Representation |
|--|--|---|
| | | onto the adjacent junctions and the road network in the vicinity of the site would be able to cope with the proposed development. C for T is satisfied with the TIA and has no adverse comment from traffic engineering perspective. |
| R6 to R8 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development would adversely affect air ventilation. (b) The proposed development would exacerbate 'walled effect', which would adversely impact wind circulation and pose risk to surrounding environment during typhoon. | (i) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) Public transportation network of Tung Chung is not properly planned, the proposed development would result in serious transport problem. | (ii) Responses (iv) to R1 to R3 and (ii) to R5 above are relevant. |
| | (d) Reclamation in Tung Chung will provide sufficient land for residential development and the rezoning is not justified. (e) For the insignificant amount of residential units to be provided in the proposed development, the demolition of the existing structures within the site is not environmentally-friendly and is short-sighted. | (iii) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. (iv) According to the proposed scheme submitted by MTRCL to support the rezoning, the proposed residential development will be constructed atop the existing Tung Chung Traction Substation, providing about 1,300 flats in three residential blocks. The existing traction substation will be retained and modified to ensure the compatibility with the proposed residential development. No major demolition work within the representation site is envisaged. |
| | | |

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| R9 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The view and air ventilation will be adversely affected by the proposed development. | (i) Responses (ii) and (iii) to R1 to R3 above are relevant. |
| | (b) Transport facilities are inadequate in support of the proposed development. | (ii) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R10 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed high-rise development would create 'walled effect'. | (i) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 and response (iii) to R4 above are relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development would worsen the air quality in the locality and no corresponding mitigation measures have been proposed. | (ii) According to the environmental assessment (EA) report prepared by MTRCL, the fugitive dust impact and gaseous emission during the construction phase is expected to be insignificant with the implementation of dust suppression measures as well as good site practice as stipulated under the relevant regulations. Sufficient buffer distance between North Lantau Highway, Hei Tung Street and Man Tung Road to the proposed development is proposed in accordance with the recommendation under HKPSG. As such, no adverse air quality impact due to vehicular emission is anticipated in the operation phase. DEP has no adverse comment on the EA report. |
| | (c) Bus services cannot accommodate current demand, in particular for the external bus route during peak hours, which would result in serious congestion. | (iii) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| R11 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed amendments would take up the existing open area which could serve the seniors and children in the area. | (i) The existing open area to the south of the traction substation is partly fenced off and partly occupied by roadside amenity planting and a drainage reserve. There are a number of existing open spaces in the nearby areas, including Tung Chung North Park (Plan H-3) and Bermuda Park, and planned open spaces in Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE) for public enjoyment. The planned provision of open space in Tung Chung is generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population. |
| | (b) View will be obstructed by the proposed development. | (ii) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) The proposed development will adversely impact air ventilation, which would potentially increase localized air pollution. | (iii) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 and response (iii) to R4 above are relevant. |
| R12 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development would create 'walled effect'. (b) The close distance from proposed development to the Caribbean Coast would adversely affect the privacy of the residents. The interests of the residents in Caribbean Coast have been disregarded. | (i) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. (ii) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. As a minimum distance of about 55m has been allowed between the residential towers within the representation site and Caribbean Coast according to the conceptual scheme, no privacy and security issues are envisaged. |
| R13 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The built environment of the area will be overcrowded and not suitable for living. | (i) The site is located at the fringe of the existing TCNT which is a neighbourhood comprising mainly high-rise high-density residential developments, a "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") site reserved for religious use, petrol-cum-liquefied petroleum gas filling stations and undesignated "G/IC" sites. The proposed building height (BH) restriction of 185mPD and plot ratio (PR) of 6 for the representation site are considered compatible with the surrounding high-rise high-density residential |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| | | <p>developments with BHs ranging from 140mPD to 184mPD and PRs ranging from about 5 to 6. Adequate existing and planned open spaces are provided/reserved in TCNT and its extension to provide recreation spaces and to allow the penetration of sunlight and air movement, as well as for planting areas for visual relief. Technical assessments have been conducted on visual, air ventilation, traffic, environmental, landscape and other aspects and no insurmountable technical problem is envisaged by relevant government bureaux/departments.</p> <p>(ii) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.</p> |
| R14 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> | |
| | (a) The proposed high-rise development will adversely affect air ventilation and exacerbate 'walled effect'. | (i) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) There would be excessive private housing supply by the time the proposed development is completed in 2029. The proposed 'infill' development is unnecessary. | (ii) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) The site should be used for community facilities, e.g. school or clinic. | (iii) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| R15 | <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) View from Tung Chung North Park is not covered in the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) report.</p> | <p>(i) The potential visual impact on the public views from ten key local viewpoints including Man Tung Road, Hei Tung Street, Ying Tung Road, Bermuda Park and Tung Chung North Park (Plans H-7a to 7e) have been assessed and corresponding mitigation measures have been proposed in the VIA report provided by MTRCL. According to the VIA report, the proposed development would not cause any major visual obstruction to its surrounding visual context and would not generate unacceptable visual impact on various selected viewpoints. CTP/UD&L has no adverse comment on the VIA report.</p> |
| | <p>(b) The proposed development would adversely affect the air ventilation and wind circulation and pose risk to the surrounding environment during typhoon.</p> | <p>(ii) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant.</p> |
| | <p>(c) The proposed development would obstruct the prevailing wind under annual condition from the east:</p> <p>(d) The Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) report does not provide sufficient information on wind velocity in other parts of Tung Chung and the relation between wind velocity and air quality in winter.</p> | <p>(iii) Response (iii) to R4 above is relevant.</p> |
| | <p>(e) The need and urgency for proposed development is questionable/unnecessary as the reclamation in Tung Chung East should have provided sufficient land for residential development.</p> | <p>(iv) Response (v) to R3 above is relevant.</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| R16 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development would obstruct view and natural sunlight of Caribbean Coast. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development would generate adverse air ventilation impact to Caribbean Coast. | (ii) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) The need for the proposed development is unnecessary as reclamation in Tung Chung should have provided sufficient land. | (iii) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R17 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Additional recreational, transportation, educational and other supporting facilities should be provided in the area. | (i) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The built environment of the area will be overcrowded. | (ii) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |
| R18 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Provision of community facilities in Tung Chung is inadequate. | (i) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development would overload the transport network in the area. | (ii) Response (ii) to R5 above is relevant. |
| R19 and R20 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Provision of community facilities in Tung Chung is inadequate. | (i) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The density in Tung Chung is already high. | (ii) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |
| R21 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Provision of community facilities in Tung Chung is inadequate. | (i) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| R22 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development will overload the railway capacity of MTR services. | (i) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) As the proposed development is only accessible by one major road, traffic congestion/accident would be resulted. | (ii) Response (ii) to R5 above is relevant. |
| R23 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development will obstruct the view and natural sunlight of Caribbean Coast. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The existing transport services are inadequate to support the current and future demand. | (ii) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) The close distance from proposed development to the Caribbean Coast would adversely affect the privacy and sense of security of the residents. | (iii) Response (ii) to R12 above is relevant. |
| R24 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development will obstruct the natural sunlight and the view of Caribbean Coast. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development will increase the density of the built environment of Tung Chung. | (ii) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |
| | (c) The first population intake of Tung Chung New Town Extension will be taken place in 2024. The need for a residential development in the representation site is questionable. | (iii) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R25 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development will create 'walled effect' and increase the density of | (i) Responses (iii) and (v) to R1 to R3 above are relevant. |

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| | the area. Instead, the reclaimed land in the vicinity should be fully utilized. | |
| | (b) There would be potential safety risk for the proposed development in close proximity to Petrol-cum-LPG filling stations. | (ii) A Quantitative Risk Assessment has been conducted by MTRCL which concludes that the overall risk in terms of individual risk and societal risk as a result of an increase of population from the proposed development is within the acceptable region and satisfies the criteria set out in the HKPSG. EMSD has no adverse comment in this regard. |
| R26 | <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The adverse impacts to nearby residential developments are permanent, and detrimental to well-being of the nearby residents and the community.</p> | (i) Technical assessments have been conducted on visual, air ventilation, traffic, environmental, landscape and other aspects and no insurmountable technical problem is envisaged by relevant government bureaux/departments |
| | (b) The amendments to the OZP fails to achieve the purpose of urban design as stipulated in paragraph 2.1 of HKPSG Chapter 11, which concerns about ‘the total visual effect of building masses, connections with people and places, creation of spaces and movements’. | (ii) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) The claim that the proposed development causes negligible impact to the public’s view is misleading. The blockage of mountain view from Caribbean Coast has not been taken into account. | <p>(iii) Response (i) to R15 above is relevant.</p> <p>(iv) As for private views, according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41 on “Submissions of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board”, in the</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| | | highly developed context of Hong Kong, it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations. |
| R27 to R39 and R57 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> | |
| | (a) View and natural lighting of Caribbean Coast will be obstructed. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development will increase the density of the built environment in Tung Chung. | (ii) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |
| | (c) Capacity of existing bus services is overloaded, especially during peak hours. Requests for additional bus services have been made, but are not yet approved by the Transport Department. (d) The transport services cannot meet future demand. | (iii) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (e) Reclamation in Tung Chung East should provide sufficient land for residential development. The need for proposed development is questionable. | (iv) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R40 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> | |
| | (a) View and natural lighting of Caribbean Coast will be obstructed. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development will increase the density of the built environment in Tung Chung. | (ii) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |
| | (c) Capacity of existing bus services has already been overloaded, in particular for the external bus routes during peak hours. The requests for additional bus services have not been addressed. | (iii) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| R41 to R44 and R69 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) View and natural lighting of Caribbean Coast will be obstructed. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R45 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Community facilities are inadequate | (i) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) View and natural lighting of Caribbean Coast will be obstructed. | (ii) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) Air ventilation would be adversely affected. | (iii) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (d) Capacity of existing bus services is overloaded, especially during peak hours. Requests for additional bus services have been made, but are not yet approved by the Transport Department. | (iv) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (e) The transport services cannot meet future demand. | |
| | (f) "The 'infill development' would lead to resentment as the reclamation project should have provided sufficient land for development. | (v) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R46 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The density in Tung Chung is already too high. | (i) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development would result in adverse impact on "walled" effect, traffic, air quality, view and natural sunlight. | (ii) Responses (ii) to (iv) to R1 to R3 , response (ii) of R10 and response (ii) to R12 above are relevant. |
| R47 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Community and transport facilities in Tung Chung are inadequate. | (i) Responses (i) and (iv) to R1 to R3 above are relevant. |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| | (b) The proposed development will create 'walled effect'. | (ii) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) The density in Tung Chung is too high. | (iii) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |
| R48 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Existing community and transport facilities are inadequate to support the increasing demand. | (i) Responses (i) and (iv) to R1 to R3 above are relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development would adversely impacts to air ventilation and natural sunlight of the area. | (ii) Responses (ii) and (iii) to R1 to R3 above are relevant. |
| R49 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development will obstruct the view of Caribbean Coast. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development will generate 'walled effect'. | (ii) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) Existing transport facilities failed to meet the needs of Tung Chung. | (iii) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R50 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development will generate 'walled effect'. | (i) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) Transport services are inadequate | (ii) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R51 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The conceptual scheme is misleading as the blockage of mountain view from Caribbean Coast has not been taken into account. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development will adversely affect air ventilation performance, especially during winter. | (ii) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | (c) The proposed development will increase traffic flow on Man Tung Road, which has already exceeded its capacity. | (iii) Response (ii) to R5 above is relevant. |
| | (d) Given the Tung Chung New Town Extension is under implementation, the proposed development is unnecessary. | (iv) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R52 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development would exacerbate 'walled effect', which would adversely impact wind circulation. | (i) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development would result in transport problem. | (ii) Response (ii) to R5 above is relevant. |
| | (c) The demolition of the existing structures within the site is not environmentally-friendly and is short-sighted. | (iii) Response (iv) to R6 to R8 above is relevant. |
| | (d) The amendment to the OZP is not justified. The planning proposal should be implemented in the area of Yat Tung Estate. | (iv) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R53 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Tung Chung has more than 50% deficit in community care, residential care beds for elderly and child care places. (b) The Island District Council (IsDC) members had raised concerns about inadequate provision of GIC facilities but were dismissed. | (i) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. (ii) The amendments to the OZP were presented to the IsDC on 27.4.2020 and IsDC members' comments on GIC provision were responded by PlanD's representatives at the meeting. On 29.5.2020, after considering the comments of IsDC and relevant government bureaux/departments, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the TPB agreed that the proposed amendments were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance for public inspection. With the concerted effort of relevant bureaux/departments, additional GIC facilities, such as |

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| | | Child Care Centre, Day Care Centre for the Elderly and Residential Care Homes for the Elderly have subsequently been planned to serve the population of TCNT and its extension. The planned provision of GIC facilities in Tung Chung is generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population. |
| | (c) Mountain view of the nearby residents would be obstructed. | (iii) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (d) The proposed development will have a significant impact on air ventilation, especially to the community outdoor facilities. Localized air ventilation impact to the "G/IC" site to its immediate southwest under annual and summer conditions and the Tung Chung North Park under annual condition is observed from the AVA report. | (iv) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 and response (iii) to R4 above are relevant. |
| | (e) The findings of Quantitative Risk Assessment are questionable. There would be potential safety risks for the future residents living in close proximity to two Petrol-cum-LPG filling stations. | (v) Response (ii) to R25 above is relevant. |
| R54 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development would obstruct the view and generate 'walled effect'. | (i) Responses (ii) and (iii) to R1 to R3 above are relevant. |
| R55 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development would generate adversely air ventilation impact. | (i) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | (b) The proposed development would further increase the density of the built environment in Tung Chung | (ii) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |
| R56 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development would negatively affect the view. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development would worsen "wall effect" and lead to increase in temperature of the area. | (ii) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 and response (iii) to R4 above are relevant. |
| R58 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development would obstruct the view of the environment. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development would further increase the density of the built environment of Tung Chung. There are other suitable sites in Tung Chung. | (ii) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |
| | (c) The transport facilities are inadequate, traffic congestion problem might be resulted. | (iii) Responses (iv) to R1 to R3 and (ii) to R5 above are relevant. |
| R59 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The natural sunlight of nearby residential developments would be obstructed by the proposed development. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development would negatively impact air ventilation of the area. | (ii) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) The transport facilities are inadequate and the capacity is overloaded. | (iii) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |

| | | |
|------------|--|---|
| | (d) The 'infill development' is unnecessary as the reclamation project should have provided sufficient land for residential development. | (iv) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R60 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The transport facilities of Tung Chung are inadequate and will not be able to support more intake of population. | (i) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R61 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development would result in traffic congestion on Man Tung Road and Ying Hei Road. | (i) Response (ii) to R5 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The reclamation at Tung Chung East would provide sufficient land for residential development. | (ii) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) It would be harmful to the future residents living atop a traction substation and near two Petrol-cum-LPG filling station. | (iii) Response (ii) to R25 above is relevant. (iv) According to MTRCL, Tung Chung Traction Substation mainly supplies traction power to the railway. The design and operation of the traction substation meet the relevant statutory requirements. The electromagnetic fields generated by the traction substation meet relevant international standards for railway power supply systems. The traction substation will also be modified to ensure compatibility with the residential development. Besides, the residential units will be developed atop a transfer plate decking over the traction substation and the lobby, car park, club house and electrical and mechanical facilities on UG1/F to UG4/F will provide sufficient buffer between the residential units and the traction substation (Plan H-6d). Relevant departments have no adverse comment on this aspect. |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| R62 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The community facilities are inadequate. | (i) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The proposed development would obstruct the view of area. | (ii) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) The proposed development would worsen the air quality in the locality. | (iii) Response (ii) to R10 above is relevant. |
| | (d) Bus services are inadequate to support the current demand, the proposed development would add further burden to the capacity. | (iv) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R63 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The community facilities are inadequate. | (i) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R64 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The reclamation project should have provided sufficient land for residential development. The proposed development is necessary. | (i) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R65 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development is too close to the nearby residential building. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The need of 'infill development' is questionable as the reclamation project should provide ample land for residential development. | (ii) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R66 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development is too close to Caribbean Coast. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R67 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The density in Tung Chung is already too high. | (i) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| R68 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development would increase the density of built environment of Tung Chung. | (i) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |
| R69 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) View and natural lighting of Caribbean Coast will be obstructed. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| R70 | <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The capacity of Man Tung Road and Ying Hei Road is overloaded by the traffic flow from The Visionary, Century Link, Ying Tung Estate and Caribbean Coast. The proposed development would lead to serious transport problem. | (i) Response (ii) to R5 above is relevant. |
| | (b) The reclamation is expected to be completed by 2024, which should be able to provide sufficient land for residential development. The proposed development is unnecessary. | (ii) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | (c) There would be potential health issues to the future residents living on top of the traction substation. Proposed residential development atop the existing traction substation may affect daily railway operation. | (iii) Response (iv) to R61 above is relevant. (iv) According to MTRCL's proposal, the functioning of the traction substation and the operation of TCL and Airport Express Line will not be affected by the future development at the representation site. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | (d) The site is too small and elongated in shape which is not suitable for residential development. | (v) Taken into account the site constraints, three residential blocks with about 1,300 flats are proposed under the conceptual scheme. The technical assessments on visual, air ventilation, traffic, environmental, landscape and other aspects have demonstrated the technical feasibility of the proposed development and that no insurmountable technical problem is envisaged by relevant government bureaux/departments. |
|--|---|--|

- (2) The 9 comments (TPB/R/S/I-TCTC/23-C1 to C9) are submitted by MTR Corporation Limited (C1), Islands District Council member (C3) and individuals (C2, C4 to C9). The grounds of commenters, as well as PlanD's responses are summarized below:

| Comment No. (TPB/R/S/I-TCTC/23-C) | Related Representation | Gist of Comments | Response to Comments |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|
| C1 (MTR Corporation Limited) | Nil | (a) Oppose the representations. (b) The proposed development is an initiative in response to the Policy Address to explore development potential along railways with the objective to increase housing supply. (c) A series of technical assessments confirmed that no significant adverse impact will result from the proposed development from air ventilation, environmental, traffic, sewerage, drainage, geotechnical, quantitative risk, landscape and visual aspects. Given the scale of the proposed development, it is unlikely to cause an adverse impact on existing roads, infrastructure, railway network and GIC facilities. | (i) Comments and supportive view are noted. |
| C2 | Nil | (a) Oppose the representations. (b) The conversion of idle land to residential sites is supported as it could increase housing supply to meet the pressing housing demand. | (i) Comments and supportive view are noted. |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|--|
| C3 (Island District Council Member) | R15, R45 and R70 | (a) Support the representations | (i) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | | (b) GIC facilities are inadequate. | |
| | | (c) As there is no implementation programme for the planned GIC facilities, it is doubtful whether the GIC provision can timely meet the population intake. | (ii) As part of the implementation of TCNTE, to enable relevant departments to implement the planned GIC facilities timely to tie with the population intake programme, Sustainable Lantau Office of CEDD has set up an inter-departmental working group chaired by Head of the Office. Regular meetings with relevant bureaux and departments are held to ensure that they are kept up-to-date with the progress of the development projects, so that the GIC facilities could be implemented at appropriate times. |
| | | (d) View and natural sunlight will be obstructed by the proposed development. | (iii) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | | (e) The proposed high-rise development would generate adverse impacts to air ventilation and exacerbate 'walled effect', which would lead to heat-island effect and increase of temperature. | (iv) Response (iii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | | (f) Residents in Tung Chung North had to rely on bus services for the transition of MTR services. The proposed development would add burden to road traffic and public transport services. | (v) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 and response (ii) to R5 above are relevant. |

| | | | |
|-----------|-------------------------|---|---|
| | | (g) As the train frequency of TCL cannot be increased until the completion of the overrun tunnel in 2032, even with the completion of TCE station in 2029, it is expected that TCL would be congested in short run. | (vi) MTRCL has conducted assessments on impact on public transport provision in the TIA including railway services and the spare capacity of TCL in 2029 (before the completion of the overrun tunnel) when the proposed development is to be completed. Upon reviewing the TIA report, CE/RD2-2, HyD confirms that TCL is expected to be capable of handling additional patronage generated by the proposed development and the existing railway network will not be overloaded in 2029. He also has no comment to MTRCL's technical reports from railway network point of view. |
| | | (h) The need of 'infill development' is unjustified as subsidized flats and public rental housing had been planned and in construction. | (vii) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | | (i) Building a residential development on top of a traction substation may pose risks to the health of future residents and railway operation. | (viii) Response (iv) to R61 and response (iv) to R70 above are relevant. |
| C4 | R1 to R4 and R18 | <p>(a) Support the representations.</p> <p>(b) Transport facilities are inadequate to support the population of the proposed development.</p> <p>(c) The proposed development will add burden to traffic and commercial facilities.</p> | (i) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 and response (ii) to R5 above are relevant. |
| C5 | R1 | <p>(a) Support the representations.</p> <p>(b) Oppose the proposed amendments.</p> | (i) Responses (i) to (v) to R1 to R3 above are relevant. |

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------|---|--|
| C6 | R1 | (a) Support the representations. (b) Oppose the proposed amendments. | (ii) Responses (i) to (v) to R1 to R3 above are relevant. |
| C7 | Nil | (a) Support the representations. (b) According to the Census and Statistics Department, it is estimated that by 2039, about a third of Hong Kongers, or some 2.52 million, would be retirement-aged. Therefore, community services for the aging population are in more urgent need than private housing supply. The site should be development as low-rise for elderly and child care facilities. | (iii) A multi-pronged approach, such as reserving space in public housing developments, requesting private developers to provide premises upon land disposal of residential and commercial sites, and developing welfare complex by government etc., will be adopted to provide adequate spaces for difference type of social welfare facilities, including elderly and child care facilities. The planned provision of GIC facilities in Tung Chung is generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population. Besides, the representation site is currently occupied by the existing traction substation. It would be difficult to put the site to gainful community uses on its own. The proposed development provides opportunity to allow the provision of about 1,300 flats as well as five social welfare facilities to serve the wider community. |
| | | (c) Object to the transfer of interest to the MTRCL. | (iv) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| C8 | Nil | (a) Support the representations. (b) The proposed development is too close to Caribbean Coast, which would adversely impact the living quality of residents. | (i) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | | (c) Transport facilities in Tung Chung North are inadequate. | (ii) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | | (d) Population in Tung Chung is already too high. | (iii) Response (i) to R13 above is relevant. |

| | | | |
|----|-----|--|---|
| C9 | Nil | (a) Support the representations. | (i) Response (i) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | | (b) Capacity of community facilities is saturated. | (ii) Response (ii) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | | (c) The proposed development would obstruct the view of Caribbean Coast. | (iii) Responses (ii) and (iii) to R1 to R3 above are relevant. |
| | | (d) The proposed development would generate adverse impacts to natural sunlight and air ventilation of Caribbean Coast. | (iv) Response (iv) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | | (e) Traffic facilities are inadequate, especially bus services during peak hour. | (v) Response (v) to R1 to R3 above is relevant. |
| | | (f) Reclamation in Tung Chung East would be completed by 2024, which would provide sufficient land for development. The need of 'infilled development' is unjustified. | |

Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Tung Chung New Town

| Type of Facilities | Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) | HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population ^{1,2}) | Provision | | Surplus / Shortfall (against planned provision) |
|---|--|---|--------------------|--|---|
| | | | Existing Provision | Planned Provision (including Existing Provision) | |
| District Open Space | 10 ha per 100,000 persons [#] | 32.81 ha | 17.54 ha | 32.81 ha | +0 ha |
| Local Open Space | 10 ha per 100,000 persons [#] | 32.81 ha | 26.01 ha | 44.52 ha | +11.71 ha |
| Secondary School | 1 whole day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17 [*] | 268 classrooms | 209 classrooms | 299 classrooms | +31 classrooms |
| Primary School | 1 whole day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11 [*] | 579 classrooms | 210 classrooms | 420 classrooms | -159 classrooms ³ |
| Kindergarten/ Nursery | 34 classrooms for 1,000 persons aged 3 to under 6 [*] | 333 classrooms | 89 classrooms | 191 classrooms | -142 classrooms ⁴ |
| District Police Station | 1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons | 0 | 0 | 1 | +1 |
| Divisional Police Station | 1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Hospital | 5.5 beds/1000 persons | 1,875 beds | 130 beds | 500 beds | -1,375 beds ⁵ |
| Clinic/Health Centre | 1 per 100,000 persons | 3 | 1 | 2 | -1 ⁶ |
| Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms) | 1 per 660,000 persons | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Child Care Centre | 100 aided places per 25,000 persons | 1,312 places | 162 places | 1,062 places | -250 places ⁷ |
| Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre | 1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 [#] | 3 | 2 | 5 | +2 |

| Type of Facilities | Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) | HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population ^{1,2}) | Provision | | Surplus / Shortfall (against planned provision) |
|---|---|---|--------------------|--|---|
| | | | Existing Provision | Planned Provision (including Existing Provision) | |
| District Elderly Community Centers | One in each new development area with a population of around 170,000 or above [#] | 1 | 1 | 2 | +1 |
| Neighbourhood Elderly Centres | One in a cluster of new and redeveloped housing areas with a population of 15,000 to 20,000 persons, including both public and private housing [#] | 16 | 1 | 7 | -9 ^{8,9} |
| Day Care Centres/Units for the Elderly | 17.2 subsidised places per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above [#] (40% will be provided by centre-based services) | 360 places | 20 places | 390 places | +29 places |
| Home-based Community Care Services (CCS) Team | 17.2 subsidised places per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above [#] (60% will be provided by home-based services) | 540 places | 110 places | 540 places | +0 place ⁸ |
| Residential Care Homes for the Elderly | 21.3 subsidised beds per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above [#] | 1,115 places | 185 places | 1,155 places | +39 places |
| Integrated Family Services Centre | 1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons [#] | 2 | 2 | 3 | +1 |

| Type of Facilities | Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) | HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population ^{1,2}) | Provision | | Surplus / Shortfall (against planned provision) |
|------------------------------|---|---|--------------------|--|---|
| | | | Existing Provision | Planned Provision (including Existing Provision) | |
| Library | 1 branch library for 200,000 persons | 1 | 2 | 2 | +1 |
| Sports Centre | 1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons [#] | 5 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Sports Ground/ Sport Complex | 1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons [#] | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Swimming Pool – Standard | 1 complex per 287,000 persons [#] | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

Remarks:

1. The planned population of Tung Chung New Town would be about 320,500 persons.
2. Depending on the nature of the community facilities, different population categories will be used for estimating GIC requirements ("Planned Population" may include Usual Residents and/or Mobile Residents and/or Transients).
3. The planned provision of school is based on EDB's advice. As advised, no additional site for primary and secondary school is required to be earmark at this stage. In case there is additional demand in the future, EDB will consider to convert other sites reserved for other educational uses to primary and secondary school use.
4. For public housing developments, adequate spaces have been reserved in for kindergarten classrooms to cater the demand for public housing population. For kindergarten education for private housing residents, the demand will be responded by the private sector with flexibility and responsiveness to parents' needs.
5. The provision of hospital beds would be monitored and addressed by Hospital Authority on a regional basis. Additional 2,300 hospital beds will be provided in the West Kowloon Cluster after the implementation of two 10-year hospital plans. As advised by FHB, no additional site is required for hospital/extension of hospital.
6. No additional requirement by FHB. As advised by FHB, the planned clinic within NLH Phase II in Area 22 will be of large scale to cater the long term need in the area.
7. In view of the ageing population, SWD considers it not necessary to fill up the deficit of 250 places with aided CCCs located in nearly the same area. As such, no additional site is required for CCCs.
8. As the revised standards reflect the long-term target towards which the provision of elderly services and facilities would be adjusted progressively subject to the consideration of the SWD in the planning and development process, it may not be appropriate to compare the standards with the provision of elderly services and facilities for the existing population. PlanD and SWD will work closely together to ensure that additional GIC facilities will be provided in GIC sites or new public housing development proposal.
9. As advised by SWD, the proposed DECC at Area 113 can cover the population of 170,000. Therefore, the provision requirement of 9 NECs is not required.

The requirements exclude transients.

* The requirements exclude mobile residents and transients (i.e. usual residents only).

January 2021