Legislative Council

Western Island Line ("WIL") Railway Group Hearing

31st March 2009

Dear Sirs/Madams

Objection and Concerns raised by the Parents Teachers Association ("PTA"), Bonham Road Government Primary School ("School") about the proposed site ("Site") of a ventilation shaft at David Trench Rehabilitation Centre ("DT Centre") opposite the School

For almost 3 years, we have engaged the Administration and the MTRC in a few protracted but fruitless discussions. We are concerned and worried that locating a ventilation shaft opposite the School will cause physical hazards during the construction stage and more importantly, potential long-term health problems when it becomes operational. The Site is only separated by a single lane of less than 8 metres from the School.

The Transport and Housing Bureau, in its email correspondences with the PTA of 24th February and 17th March 2009, informed us that the location of the ventilation shaft opposite our School "will not jeopardise public health", and that the Bureau have assessed the King George V Memorial Park ("Park") as an alternative site, and found the site "not being a better alternative".

In the PTA's responses of 27th February and 17th March 2009, we asked the Bureau to show us the relevant assessment report. In particular we would like to know if the Bureau has addressed critical issues such as:

- safety issues for small children during construction stage on a narrow street;
- school bus arrangements during construction stage on a narrow street; and
- the school and school children between 6 and 12 years of age as **"sensitive receivers" of pollutants**.

This is most important as all the parents and children affected have the right to know. They are after all the taxpayers and future taxpayers who finance the construction of the WIL project.

Unfortunately, the Bureau has not responded to the PTA's request for a copy of the assessment report. We are therefore at a loss to understand how a decision can possibly be taken to move the proposed site from the Park (the original plan) to the DT Centre opposite our School. To our mind, this decision is fundamentally flawed: there is no justification to expose small children (who are at their critical stage of growth) to pollutants from the shaft so that transient park-goers may enjoy a couple of hours of unobstructed view in the Park.

In the absence of a response from the Bureau, we set out below **the PTA's own assessment** of the Park and the DT Centre as a potential site of a ventilation shaft:

	Original proposal: King George V Memorial Park as the ventilation shaft site	*Current Proposal: David Trench Rehabilitation Centre (opposite Bonham Road Government Primary School) as the ventilation shaft site*
Size of site	Enormous: hence the vent shaft will take up only a small portion of the open space in the Park.	Small; hence the vent shaft will be emitting pollutions from less than 15 metres (wall to wall) towards the School.
Impact during construction stage (the time required for constructing the shaft is much longer than just building an entrance/exit)	Transient park-goers will lose the use of a small part of the Park	(1) 420 students (aged between 6 and 12) will be exposed to the physical safety issues arising from construction works carried out less than 8 metres from the school. (2) School buses will have difficulty accessing the School if the single lane that separates the School from the DT Centre is occupied by construction trucks. (3) Students going to school on foot will be exposed to greater hazard. **Questions**: (1) What is the relevant traffic impact assessment? (2) What are the relevant safety

		measures to protect the small children?
Impact after the vent shaft becomes operational	Transient park-goers will lose the use of a small part of the Park. However, they and the general public will be rewarded with (1) a leading school (i.e. our School) in a better environment for generations of young children including their own; (2) a heritage building (i.e. our School) in a better environment for the public to cherish the history of HK; and (3) strengthened community spirit knowing that a small sacrifice (i.e. losing a small part of the Park) has brought about an improved environment for the children and the community of HK.	(1) 420 children will be exposed to pollutants emitted from the vent shaft for 8 hours daily for 5 days weekly; (2) under extreme condition (e.g. a SARS outbreak, a fire or terrorist attack by poisonous gas) the children will be exposed to harmful or poisonous fumes. **Question**: Do the MTR evacuation plan and insurance policy cover the children of the school, now that the risks, which are not imminent but possible, are highlighted and clear objection raised? (3) Parents who now gather outside the school will lose a meeting place.

The PTA wrote to Mr Yau Shing-mu, Under-Secretary for Transport and Housing on 5th February 2009, pleading to him as a policy-maker, to see above and beyond the unreliable technical data (which are based on the outdated so-called environmental protection guidelines), and review the proposal carefully, taking into account not the potential inconvenience caused to the MTRC or the WIL project, but the real and long-term interest of the Hong Kong community as a whole.

We also pleaded to Mr Yau as a decision-maker, to review and favourably consider our

"win-win" proposal:

- We suggest reverting to the Park as the preferred site for the ventilation shaft;
- We understand the Park as a proposed site was rejected during the initial consultation because some people were unwilling to lose the use of leisure facilities in the Park;
- We suggest we swap: move the basketball court or whatever area in the Park to the TB Centre opposite the School, and let the MTRC build the shaft at the Park.
- Our suggestion will likely provide the following benefits:

1. It fulfils the original purpose for the MTRC and the community (i.e. constructing the Western Island Line) without potentially damaging the health of our younger generation;
2. The location of a basketball court or other leisure facilities opposite our School, which is a heritage building, is consistent with the environment and certainly enhances the value of our heritage which is a community asset for all of Hong Kong;
3. The new leisure space opposite our School enhances the health of our young because the School will have the use of extra space, which it is lacking;
4. The parents will not lose a meeting point. Instead they together with the community will benefit from the new leisure space at the DT Centre (which will become an entrance/exit of an MTR station).

- By contrast, installing exhaust air shaft opposite a heritage building which is also a primary school will spoil the environment and potentially damage the health of our young. It is clear the current proposal should be condemned!

I hope the Council will review this matter with the **health and safety of generations and generations of small school children as your top priority**. Any short-term inconvenience (in terms of the extra finance or time required to revert to the Park as the preferred site) should not be a consideration for a responsible government.

Yours faithfully

William Fok
Chairman
Parents Teachers Association
Bonham Road Government Primary School

般咸道官立小學家長教師會

2008年**12**月**22**日聆聽會

目錄

- Appendix 1: Who is Professor Hedley?
- Appendix 2: General Feeling of Professor Hedley on our case
- Appendix 3: Study Report from Professor Hedley
- Appendix 4
- Appendix 5: PRC Ventilation Shaft Regulation
- Appendix 6: Bye-law for Ventilation Shaft of Xian On MTR
- Appendix 6a: Web site for Xian On MTR Bye Law
- Appendix 7: Tropical Letter from Parent

摘要

* 沒有溝通；
* 漠視訴求；
* 區議會沒有正式討論下決定。

1. 概況(Fundamental Error)

- 摧毀古蹟文物與集體回憶
- *般咸道官立小學爲孫中山史蹟徑的一站景點，學校的古建築風貌與門前幾棵老樹，不但見證了香港的歷史，更是香港居民的集體回憶。這些香港僅有的文物古蹟景點應該得到保持, 而不是在傍興建大型排風井, 構成相當不協調的對比， 再次摧殘香港人的集體回憶，也給外國遊客留下負面的印象。*

2. Sensitive Receiver

- 學校、醫院等敏感類建築不宜近距離興建大型通風井
- *戴麟趾康復中心現址的地理環境, 周邊都被建築物近距離密集包圍,包括住宅、學校、醫院(美沙酮診所)等，在這麼擁擠的地帶，興建地鐵通風井是相當不合理的。而**學校、醫院屬於敏感類建築(Sensitive Receiver)**，應該是被保護的，在城市規劃與環境保護的角度來看, 不宜在此等敏感類建築物近距離興建地鐵通風井。*

3. 受影響人數眾多

- 學校內持續常駐人數眾多, 受影響的情況相當長遠
- *學校持續上課的學生爲每年每天四百人(每天最少七小時), 實際受影響的人數是無限的, 所以在此興建大型通風井是完全不合理的。*

4. 數據有誤導成份

- 現有數據有誤導成份, 沒有提供學校現在的空氣質素與通風井建造完成空氣質素之比較數據
- *根據路政署與港鐵所述, 環評報告提及中環通風井空氣質素數據與其鄰近環保署路邊空氣監測站比較, 二者數據非常接近, 但沒有提供學校現在的空氣質素與通風井建造完成空氣質素之比較數據。*

5. Some technical views

- Since One Rail per One Tunnel and as per the Push and Suck effect of this Ventilation Shaft, it means Air from Sheung Wan station (More polluted) will be pumped and released in Ventilation Shaft at David Trench Rehabilitation Centre (DT) and suck in DT's more clean air to Hill Road Ventilation Shaft;
- For Train going to Sai Ying Pun from University Station will in turn suck in Hill Road Poor Air and release in David Trend Ventilation Shaft

6. Discussion at District Council

- The original site for Ventilation shaft is much closer to the Railway line which means the air exchange is much more efficient and effective than the revised or the existing gazette David Trench Ventilation Shaft;
- Immature discussion in the District Council for the original proposal (Basket Ball Court in King George V Memorial Park-KG Park);
- District Councilor did not object to using KG Park ; only objected to losing basket ball court;

7. MTRC's self-contradiction

- KG Park was technically feasible as stated in the initial proposal but without explanation now claimed to be technically incapable. Why? (Refer to Point 6 on Page 2 of the submitted Interview report held on November 28, 2008: MTR said even nowadays technical is still feasible);

8. 地理環境-盤地

- 地理環境
  - 盤地
  - 背有護土牆及般咸道上的高樓
  - 面前被西營盤社區中心包圍
- 校舍本身空氣不流通; 不可再承受額外的CO2 長期轟炸；
- 與戴麟趾復康中心只有單程路之隔 (5米);
- 其他國家環保條例要求出入風井與學校至少有20/25米距離 (例:中國西安地鐵線);
- Fan’s dust effect

9. EIA環評報告之不可信

- 港鐵所提供的微粒報告,是於建築興建期的全日平均數，而沒有針對由早上8時至下午4時半的數據，所以此數據極有可能低估真實情況，於是極不可靠；
- 港鐵EIA評估是否用Simulation Model 來評估；
- 曾否以學校作爲「Sensitive Receiver」作評估?
  (Professor Hedley: I do not see Bonham Road Primary School identified as a “Representative Air sensitive Receiver” (RASR) in Tables 11.3, 11.4 and 11.5.)
- 港鐵沒有提供針對近距離師生長期吸入由通風井噴出的空氣會否影響師生的數據。但根據基本小學生常識，CO_2 不是新鮮空氣；多量CO_2 令人精神不振，對師生的教與學及健康有不良影響；
- 現時環保署所用的環保條例已是21年前制訂，固已是過時；特首承諾引用較新的WHO水準；

9. EIA環評報告之不可信 (cont'd)

- 現時環保署要求港鐵提交的EIA評估要求遠低於WHO要求

  (香港 **Asia's World City?** vs. 發展中國家!)；
- 港鐵環評報告充滿疑點；要求根據國際適用標準重新評估；特首承諾引用較新的WHO水準;
- 本校家教會已得香港大學醫學院副院長

  文英強教授及Professor Tony Hedley, Head of Community Medicine兩位頂尖級醫學教授扶義幫忙，答允爲同學評估EIA報告及跟進新報告。

10. 雙贏方案

- 在學校附近就有一個偌大空曠的佐治五世公園，非常適合設立出入通風井；
- 可把戴麟趾復康中心轉爲休憩地方，以抵償佐治五世公園因設立通風井所損失之休憩用地。

11.「雙贏方案」= 原本的方案

- 港鐵原本的方案本來就在佐治五世公園設置出風口，不過有「社會人士」反對，認爲不應因此減少「休憩用地」；
- 「雙贏方案」: (1) 出風口放在公園人流少的地方，於是不會影响般咸道官立小學的數百師生及每天早午在校外聚集的家長；
- (2) 般咸道官立小學對面的戴麟趾復康中心改爲「休憩用地」，於是整體上公眾不會有損失; 兼且可優化「中山古蹟徑」，有助保育古蹟。

12. 長期影响及精神壓力

- 無醫學專業人員可保証小朋友長期吸入多量的CO_2不會對健康有影响；
- 鼻敏感、哮喘、眼敏感；CO_2令人精神不振，影响教學質素；
- 家長長期爲小朋友健康及成長担憂，處於高精神壓力狀態。

Thank You

般咸道官立小學家長教師會

2008年12月22日聆聽會

Appendices

Appendix 1: Who is Professor Hedley?

- Professor Ricky Man, our member of School Management committee managed to contact Professor Tonny Hedley who is the Professor of Community Medicine and is one of the expert on air quality and pollution.
- Professor Hedley expressed that there should be a report deals with the impact of the exhaust duct especially on a school not just impact in a general way.

Appendix 2: General Feeling of Professor Hedley on our case

- Professor Hedley said :”I think we need to see what the graph means; they apparently purport to have plotted ventilation shaft emissions against ambient roadside PM but I do not know if this is an actual set of data or a simulation;
- Professor Hedley is puzzled as to why they are virtually the same;

- Professor Hedley also wants to see if there is a model of the emissions from the proposed shaft and its impact on 24 hours particulates in the immediate vicinity;
- Professor Hedley need to see why and how the EIA assessment was passed first;
- It may be that they concluded that the shaft will not impact on immediately adjacent air quality but this will depend on what assumptions the consultants made.

- Professor Hedley said: "In general I find it disconcerting that we would build a shaft next to school but it may be difficult to argue that except on aesthetic grounds and the precautionary principle. It is unlikely, on grounds of probability, that the EIA report was seen and discussed by the EIA subcommittee of the Advisory Council on the Environment. Only a small proportion are because of workloads.”

Appendix 3: Study Report from Professor Hedley

- It appears to me that the EIA Report which we have access to only deals with air quality impacts during the construction phase of the project.
- It does not concern itself in any section, as far as I can see, with the ongoing impact of the ventilation shaft on the environment within a stipulated radius of the shaft. (I have just seen your last email but I can't interpret the graph of ambient and shaft particulates. It is not clear what is purports to show.)

So the main relevant question to address long term health concerns to the MTR and the Environment Bureau should focus on this.

While I know that MTR has been looking into shaft particulate levels I don't know exactly where that line enquiry or the establishment of levels has got to. Once I have discussed the situation of the school with you, in relation to the maps of the Project, I can try and talk to MTR. My contact there would probably be Dr Glenn Frommer. I don't know whether Dr Frommer will be prepared to talk to me.

- 2. The construction related pollution problems are potentially very significant if the modeled estimates of Total Suspended Particulates (TSP) in the EIA Report are compared with the WHO Guidelines.

  One point to be clarified is that I do not see Bonham Road Primary School identified as a “Representative Air sensitive Receiver” (RASR) in Tables 11.3, 11.4 and 11.5.

- As a starting point I would focus on the “Predicted Cumulative *Hourly* Average TSP” at the RASR (EIA Report Table 11.12). The lower level concentrations (1.5 metres – 5 metres) would be relevant to our at-risk population of primary school children. The range of TSP values are:

	TSP Range µg/m3
1.5M	95 – 408
5M	96 – 293

- If we assume that PM10 is 70% of TSP then PM10 levels are:

	PM10 Range µg/m3
1.5M	66.5 – 285.6
5M	67.2 – 205

These are the expected typical concentrations during the usual working hours which will overlap the primary school hours.

- The HKAQO 24 hour level for PM10 is 180 while the WHO AQG is only 50. So it is clear that during school hours children *may* be exposed to particulates (from whatever source) at a rate which exceeds both the HKAQO and WHO AQG.

  If we take the longer averaging time of 24 hours (EIA Report Table 11.13) then from a public health perspective the picture is not greatly different

	TSP Range µg/m3
1.5M	88 – 258
5M	88 – 192

	PM10 Range µg/m3
1.5M	62 – 181
5M	62 – 134

  Again, while the HKAQO 24 hr is 180 µg/m3 the WHO AQG is 50 µg/m3 and the annual is 20 µg/m3.

  One very important point to be emphasized here is that the 24 hour guideline is the 99th percentile. In other words it should not be violated on more than 3 days in the year.

  In summary there is scope to clarify what the school exposures would be during the construction phase in terms of both the outdated HKAQO and the WHO AQG. It seems inconceivable that the construction phase will not pose a threat to sensitive receivers.

- 3. A significant problem for the school, in trying to avoid increased exposures to pollutants, would be the outdated Hong Kong Air Quality Objectives. As these are embedded in the Air Pollution Control Ordinance and the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance, they are the “standard” against which any EIA would be assessed for either construction or for on-going impacts of the completed project.

  The permissible levels in the current (1987) HKAQO are so high they offer no practical health protection at all. It would even be possible for the new ventilation shaft to significantly increase pollutants (probably mainly or exclusively particulates) in the region of the school, but be legal in terms of the EIA. For example if the current average annual 24 hour level of PM10 was around the 50th centile of the 24 hr AQO, it could be pushed up to the 90th centile for most of school hours without violating the AQO. (I am not saying that it would necessarily but this has been a common occurrence in EIA reports in recent years; the net result being an increase in pollution *because* of the lax AQO.)

- 4. A further potential problem for the school is that the general levels of pollution in Hong Kong are extremely high by any international standards and during the cool season they generally exceed the World Health Organization Air Quality Guidelines by several hundred percent. Any addition to this hazard is of course highly undesirable but it is possible that modeling may indicate that any additional pollution from a shaft would be a very small proportion of the total current annual average ambient level.

  The roadside levels of pollution are extremely high and generally well above the high levels measure by general air quality monitoring stations and the school will certainly be exposed to this.

  The first question to the MTR will be to ascertain what the levels of PM10 will be within the shaft; what the mitigation procedures will be, and what the immediate impact on air quality will be in relation to the school. I see nothing so far which gives information about this.

- Professor Hedley mentioned that the MTR report mostly deals with air coming out of the shaft (ventilation system).
- The air quality in the surrounding including the school may not be addressed adequately.
- If this is case, then MTR has to provide the data on the real environment impact to the surrounding including the school (in particular to the health of school children not just the air quality).
- If MTR has the data, get the results and ask for time to study the results. Professor Hedley can help.
- If MTR does not have the results, then MTR will have to do the assessment.

- Another important point is the standard.
- Hong Kong uses a very low standard from 1987 and is even lower than WHO from my reading of Professor Hedley's message.
- If Hong Kong is going to change to another standard such as WHO, then MTR has to improve the air quality.
- Once MTR built the system, to upgrade it to a higher standard may be costly and difficult.
- The school need to press MTR to promise that the air quality has to meet not only current Hong Kong standard but future standard.
- There has been a lot of voices already about the generally poor air quality in Hong Kong, the Government is likely going to do something and using a high air quality standard in the future is a sure bet (of course we do not know when).
- MTR may argue that the ventilation meets current standard. However the school can justify the concern that air quality will not be able to meet what we consider acceptable standard used elsewhere including the WHO standard.

- More technical aspect can be on MTR uses average values etc.
- In our case we should focus on school hours only, that is from about 8 am to 3 or 4 pm in the afternoon.
- This will be the peak time for MTR and air particles and pollutants will also be highest.
- School children will be exposed during this period. Average value should therefore not be used in our case.
- For this point, you should ask them to clarify what the values mean first. If MTR says the values are average values, then the school will have valid reasons to object to the use of MTR results

Appendix 4

- Co2 Test and Air quality taken from Central outside the Ventilation shaft is not sufficient and should not be valid;
- We need a Air Quality taken now i.e.. With the Ventilation shaft and against the Air Quality taken with a Ventilation shaft;
- Inconsistent with that Historical Area;
- Recreational area can be made up but not Child Health
- Lot of Dust will be stirred up – Fan's effect

Appendix 5: PRC Ventilation Shaft Regulation

- 四川成都地鐵環評報告的報導
- http://www.chengdu.gov.cn/live_chengdu/detail.jsp?id=85749&ClassID=020207
- 北京地鐵風亭的環境整治
- http://www.beijingww.com/273/2007/08/27/82@35564.htm
- 沈阳地铁环境影响
- http://www.gzmtr.com/xwzx/hyxw/t20060609_30421.htm
- http://news.liao1.com/newspages/200612/137736.html
- 南京地铁二号线
- http://www.longhoo.net/gb/longhoo/news/special/2008/njjs/node26005/node26010/userobject1ai669117.html
- 重慶地鐵
- http://cqsb.cqnews.net/Get/News/Chongqing/Yaowen/0681002250064.shtml
- 上海地鐵
- http://www.envir.gov.cn/eia/2008/02202/200802202.pdf
-

Appendix 6: By-law for Ventilation Shaft of Xian On MTR

- 西安市城市快速軌道交通線網規劃及建設規劃
- 環境影響報告書簡本公示
- ……
- 5.5 環境空氣影響評價結論與建議
- ……
- （2）軌道交通運營對圍觀區域空氣環境質量的影響主要體現在地鐵車站設置與地面的風亭排風對周邊空氣環境的影響。
- 爲了減緩地鐵風亭排風異味對周圍空氣環境質量及居民生活的影響，在地鐵設計、建設和運營期可采取如下減緩措施：
- ◎風亭選址距離學校、醫院和集中居民住宅區等敏感點盡可能在20m以遠，風亭與敏感點的最小控制距離爲15m。如條件限制，無法達到上述控制距離要求，則應將風亭排風口設置在居民區的下風向，且排放口背向環境敏感點。若有條件許可，可在風亭四周種植密集型綠化林帶。
- ◎對于車站附近尤其是風亭附近已規劃的居住用地、文教用地等尚未進行建設的用地，風亭附近20m內嚴格控制建設住宅、學校、醫院等敏感目標。擬建建築盡可能與風亭相結合建設，以最大程度減輕風亭異味影響。
- ◎地鐵建成後，應督促施工單位對隧道及站台進行徹底清掃，減少隧道內部的積塵，降低地鐵運營初期風亭排風中的顆粒物。
- ◎地鐵運營期間，加強對地鐵隧道內部及站台的保潔工作，排除積水，定期對地鐵進風和排風系統管道及過濾裝置進行清潔，確保地被內部及風亭周邊的空氣環境質量。
- ……

Appendix 6a: Web site for Xian On MTR By Law

- http://www.xametro.gov.cn/docc/docc/product_tabbrow.asp?id=2245&classid=27

Appendix 7: Typical Letter from Parent

- 反 對 信
- 本人作爲般咸道官立小學的家長，強烈反對在學校對面的戴麟趾復康中心設置地鐵通風口，理由如下：
- 〈一〉對通風口的選址理由提出質疑
- 1. 法律法規方面
- 學校、醫院等建築物屬於敏感類建築，應該是被保護的，這在世界各國的法律法規和城市規劃設計規範中，均有體現，如安全距離，風向的影響等。爲甚麼地鐵通風口可以設置在這麼擁擠的地帶，而且可以貼近學校建？我不知道香港有沒有城市規劃設計規範，如果有，我希望看到它得到有力的執行；如果沒有，而香港作爲一個國際大都市，我只能表示深深的遺憾和痛心了。

- 2.<u>港鐵公司欺軟怕硬，社會公道沒有得到尊重</u>
- 在查閱了歷次學校和港鐵公司交涉的紀錄，並參加了9月27日的調景嶺站的參觀討論會後，我發現港鐵公司對通風口的選址理由，似乎只有一個解釋：因爲附近居民強烈反對在佐治五世公園內建通風口，所以才選擇了戴麟趾復康中心。即是說我們這些家長和老師的反對太理性、太溫柔，不夠火爆了？是不是需要在某些議員的帶領下走上街頭，才是這個城市能說清道理的唯一途徑呢？我只想指出：港鐵公司最初的選址並不是現址，戴麟趾復康中心也並不是唯一的選址，他們的做法無非是欺軟怕硬和做縮頭烏龜罷了。

- 大型基建項目關係到全體市民的福利，有最優化的方案，就不要怕得罪人，要堅持正確的原則。有人會說：港島西區已經是擁擠得“香爐盆裡插蠟燭”了，通風口放在哪兒都會有人反對，我也同意這個說法，但也請這些人撇開腦海中的商業利潤、選票或者權力想一想，有甚麼比孩子們的健康更重要？如果我們必須要犧牲一些利益，難道首先要犧牲下一代的健康嗎？

- 這些政治討論我不想在這封信裡多提了，我是兩個孩子的母親，他們都將在般咸道官立小學完成他們的小學學業，他們能否過上一個幸福的童年，對我而言尤其重要。我只想懇請政府部門，特別是環境保護署能本著對市民的責任心，運用你們的專業知識和理性頭腦，實地考察，認真執行法規，重新審視通風口的選址問題。也懇請各位議員及社會各界關注這個問題。

- 〈二〉對港鐵公司“通風口無空氣污染”說法的質疑
- 親身體驗最有說服力
- 港鐵公司曾經給我們展示過一些空氣質量的檢測數據，說地鐵通風口的空氣質量和路邊的相近，爲了消除我們的疑慮，於2008年9月27日邀請我們家長代表和老師參觀調景嶺站的通風口構築物。但是當我們站在通風井的底部時，聽到列車急馳而去，強大的地鐵風撲面而來，灌入我們鼻腔的是濃烈的機油味、金屬氣味和不知名的怪味；而頭頂上方通風井的內壁則滿佈黑色塵土和蜘蛛網，蜘蛛網還在地鐵風的吹動下晃來晃去，此番景象令人震撼。

- 空氣檢測數據不能代表一切
- 我們知道通風口的作用是借助活塞效應來交換地鐵隧道內外的空氣，以保持地鐵隧道內的空氣清新，港鐵公司說他們已經採用干淨的能源和先進的工藝設備，所排廢氣主要只是乘客呼出的二氧化碳等等，經過檢測已經符合標準了。
- 可事實果真如此嗎？我想說說我個人的看法：
- 〈1〉地鐵需要日常運行和檢修，不能完全杜絕所有液體和氣體的排放；
- 〈2〉車輪與軌道摩擦，會不會釋放一些有害的微粒？有沒有科學定論呢？
- 〈3〉地下開挖有可能造成未知有害物質的釋放；
- 〈4〉廢氣是擠壓出來的，空氣質量檢測考慮了這種情況下的濃度嗎？
- 〈5〉施工階段的大量粉尘會隱藏在隧道的各個角落，地鐵開通初期會集中排放，會不會造成污染事故？
- 〈6〉二氧化碳是新鮮空氣嗎？

- 基於以上想法，想到學校幾百名師生將受到這些廢氣的“吹拂”，真是讓人不寒而慄！香港小學生中敏感體質的百分比逐年上升，試想一想地鐵開通後，萬一發生污染或其他安全事故，面對孩子們健康被損害的無情現實時，我們情何以堪啊！到了那個時候，哪一位政府官員可以問起這個責？哪一位港鐵公司高層可以負起這個罪？金錢的賠償、高官的“落馬”根本不可能平息社會的怒氣，更不能補償孩子
- 和家長所承受的痛苦，政府倡導的環保政策只會淪爲笑柄，政府的威信又何在呢？

- 三〉文物古蹟保護只是一句空話

- 我的一些朋友從海外或內地來港，常常問我：如果只有半天時間，應該遊覽甚麼景點？我總是回答：港島，當然是港島，香港的特色盡在港島。很讓我們家長引以爲豪的是：般咸道官立小學是中山史跡徑的一站，學校的建築盡顯古樸典雅的風格，配上門口的幾棵老樹，真是稱得上是喧囂都市中的一片綠洲。

- 本來，隨著地鐵的興建，對舊城區進行改造，應該給市民一個更優美、更舒適的生活環境。爲了方便附近居民，在戴麟趾復康中心原址上興建地鐵出口，我們並不反對；而從保護古蹟的角度看，就應該對地鐵出口和校園之間進行合理規劃，如綠化設計或其它的點綴，而不是安置幾個煙囪式的通風口來妨礙觀瞻。
- 香港的古蹟是多了？還是少了？我想每位官員、每位議員、每位市民都心中有數。我希望政府部門和議員們，在保護文物古蹟方面真正實現承諾，而不是喊喊空洞的口號；我希望我們的孩子和遊客們，是在幽雅的氛圍中，體驗香港中西合璧的魅力，而不是在噴著廢氣的“煙囪”下，去探尋孫中山先生的足跡。

- 再次懇請政府部門、社會各界關注這個問題，否決港鐵公司在戴麟趾復康中心建造通風口的方案，還孩子們一個沒有污染的學習環境。
- 般咸道官立小學一家長　　楊 眉
- 2008年11月12日