

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. A/SK-SKT/14

- Applicant** : Conley Investment Limited represented by Dudley Surveyors Limited
- Application Site** : Lots 963 (Part), Ext. (Part) and 991 (Part) in D.D. 215, 7-9 Hong Ting Road, Sai Kung, New Territories
- Site Area** : 3,731 m²
- Land Status** : Lot 963 (Part) and Ext. (Part) New Grant No. 6503 (restricted to industrial and/or godown uses excluding any offensive trades)
- Lot 991 (Part) New Grant No. 7294 (restricted to industrial and/or godown purposes excluding manufacture/storage of paint products, related products and other dangerous goods and any offensive trades)
- Plan** : Approved Sai Kung Town Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-SKT/6
- Zonings** : “Residential (Group E)1” (“R(E)1”) (about 3,663 m² or 98%)
- restricted to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 2, a maximum site coverage (SC) of 40% and a maximum building height (BH) of 8 storeys (excluding basements)
- Area shown as ‘Road’ (about 68 m² or 2%)
- Application** : Proposed Flat and Shop and Services and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction (from 2 to 2.036)

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for redevelopment of the application site (the Site) from industrial use to residential use with shops and minor relaxation of PR restriction as stipulated on the OZP. The Site falls within an area largely zoned “R(E)1” with minor portion shown as ‘Road’ on the approved Sai Kung Town OZP

No. S/SK-SKT/6 (**Plan A-1**). According to the Notes of the OZP, ‘Flat’ and ‘Shop and Services’ uses within the “R(E)” zone and area shown as ‘Road’ require planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). Besides, developments within the “R(E)1” zone are subject to a maximum PR of 2, a maximum SC of 40% and a maximum BH of 8 storeys (excluding basements) or the PR, SC and BH of the existing building, whichever is the greater. Based on the individual merits of a development or redevelopment proposal, minor relaxation of the maximum PR, SC and BH may be considered by the Board.

1.2 The proposed development comprises two 8-storey residential blocks at the Site with total PR and SC of 2 and 40% respectively. Car parking facilities, E&M plant rooms, clubhouse and retail shops are to be provided at the ground floor (**Drawing A-2**). According to the applicant, building structures are proposed only within the “R(E)1” portion of the site. The site portion shown as ‘Road’ on the OZP is under the applicant’s private landholding and proposed for landscaping without any structure. By excluding the ‘Road’ portion from the site area, the proposed PR within the “R(E)1” zone becomes 2.036, which exceeds the maximum PR for the “R(E)1” zone under the OZP. Hence, permission is also required for minor relaxation of PR restriction.

1.3 The major development parameters of the proposal are summarized as follows:

Development Parameters	OZP Restrictions (a)	Current Application (b)	Difference (b) - (a)
Site Area	-	about 3,731 m ² (whole site) about 3,663 m ² ("R(E)1" portion)	-
Total GFA	-	7,459 m ²	-
Plot Ratio	- 2	about 2 (whole site) about 2.036 ("R(E)1" portion)	- 0.036 (+ 1.8%)
Site Coverage	40%	Maximum 40%	0
Building Height	8 storeys (excluding basements)	Maximum 30m / 8 storeys	0
No. of Blocks	-	2	-
No. of Units	-	178	-
No. of Car Parking Spaces	-	Private car: 14 (including 2 for accessible parking and 1 visitor parking) Motorcycle: 2	-
No. of Loading/ Unloading Bays	-	2	-

- 1.4 According to the Visual Impact Assessment submitted by the applicant, the proposal has included visual mitigation measures including compact development form, building separation, setbacks and tree planting along major road (**Drawing A-9**). To address the possible vehicular emission and traffic noise from Hiram's Highway, setback and full-height vertical architectural fin with sound absorption material are proposed (**Drawings A-10 to A-12**).
- 1.5 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:
- (a) Application form received on 7.6.2016 and supplementary information (**Appendix I**)
 - (b) Supplementary Planning Statement (**Appendix Ia**)
 - (c) Further Information (FI) dated 26.9.2016 providing response to departmental comments, revised Environmental Assessment (EA), Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) and Quantitative Risk Assessments (QRAs) (*not exempted from publication*) (**Appendix Ib**)
 - (d) FI dated 17.11.2016 providing response to departmental comments, revised SIA, VIA and TIA (*not exempted from publication*) (**Appendix Ic**)
 - (e) FI dated 8.2.2017 providing response to departmental comments, revised SIA, VIA, EA and QRAs (*not exempted from publication*) (**Appendix Id**)
 - (f) FI dated 6.3.2017 providing response to departmental comments and revised TIA (*not exempted from publication*) (**Appendix Ie**)
 - (g) FI dated 24.4.2017 providing response to departmental comments, revised EA and QRA (*not exempted from publication*) (**Appendix If**)
 - (h) FI dated 16.5.2017 providing response to departmental comments, revised TIA, SIA and QRA (*not exempted from publication*) (**Appendix Ig**)
 - (i) FI dated 4.7.2017 providing response to departmental comments, revised pages of TIA, a revised figure of QRA and an undertaking letter for Environmental Protection Department (EPD) on implementation of noise mitigation measures (*not exempted from publication*) (**Appendix Ih**)
 - (j) FI dated 27.10.2017 providing responses to comments from Transport Department (TD) and a revised TIA (*not exempted from publication*) (**Appendix Ii**)
 - (k) FI dated 4.12.2017 providing responses to comments from TD and a revised TIA (*not exempted from publication*) (**Appendix Ij**)
 - (l) FI dated 9.1.2018 providing responses to comments from TD and a revised TIA (*not exempted from publication*) (**Appendix Ik**)
 - (m) FI dated 1.2.2018 providing responses to comments from TD (*exempted from publication*) (**Appendix Il**)
- 1.6 The plans and photomontages submitted by the applicant are at **Drawings A-1 to A-12**.

- 1.7 On 29.7.2016, 13.1.2017 and 25.8.2017, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) agreed to defer making decisions on the application for 2 months each, as requested by the applicant, to allow time for preparation of FIs to address the comments of relevant government departments. The applicant submitted FIs as detailed in paragraph 1.5 above. The application is scheduled for consideration by the Committee at this meeting.

2. **Justifications from the Applicant**

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed in part 5 of the supplementary planning statement at **Appendix Ia**. They can be summarized as follows:

- (a) The proposal echoes with the Government's incentive to increase the overall supply of housing in Hong Kong by providing an additional 178 units to meet the imminent demand of private housing.
- (b) The planning intention of the "R(E)" zone is for phasing out existing industrial uses through redevelopment for residential use. The proposed residential development therefore conforms to the planning intention.
- (c) As the existing industrial buildings on the Site only consist of a minority of paint production and storage, it would be more beneficial to redevelop the Site into other uses given its prime location in Sai Kung. Moreover, there is a lack of Government's support in wholesale conversion of these industrial buildings under the current zonings. The current proposal is therefore essential to maximize the redevelopment potential of the Site and making efficient use of the scarce land resource.
- (d) As the phasing out process in the "R(E)" zone has been slow after the area has been zoned "R(E)" since the first draft of the Sai Kung Town OZP in 2005, the applicant has taken the initiative to redevelop the Site for housing use. The proposal will act as a catalyst to induce similar redevelopment nearby and thereby inducing regeneration of the local area.
- (e) The applicant proposed different ways to improve the overall appearance and openness of the development, such as landscape treatment, open space and green vertical walls on some elevations. Besides, a VIA has been conducted to make sure no significant visual impacts are anticipated and the development is visually compatible with the nearby medium rise development.
- (f) Since the Site is in close proximity to a high pressure town gas pipeline, a petrol cum LPG filling station and the Pak Kong Water Treatment Works (PKWTW), several QRAs have to be conducted to assess the risks impact for the proposed development. According to the QRAs submitted together with the application, the results fall within the "acceptable" region. Therefore the proposed development would not pose unacceptable risk or hazard to the area.
- (g) The Site is highly accessible by various types of public transport modes. The TIA submitted by the applicant demonstrates that the proposed development would not

cause detrimental traffic impact on the surrounding road network and is considered acceptable from traffic point of view.

- (h) An EA has been conducted to assess and evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding areas. The assessment reviews the potential air quality and noise impacts of the proposed development and recommends appropriate measures to tackle any negative environmental impacts. There are several mitigation measures proposed by the applicant such as building set back from Hiram's Highway. Centralised air conditioning would be provided to the shop and clubhouse so as to minimize potential air quality impact or traffic noise impact from road source. Moreover, the assessments reveal that the proposed development would not be subject to unacceptable industrial noise impact.
- (i) The SIA conducted reveals that the existing sewerage system in the area would have spare capacity to cope with the sewage generated from the proposed development. Therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of sewerage and no mitigation measures are required.

3. Compliance with the Owner's "Consent/Notification" Requirement

The applicant is the sole "current land owner". Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members' inspection.

4. Previous Application

There is no previous application in respect of the Site.

5. Similar Application

There is one similar application (No. A/SK-SKT/10) for proposed redevelopment of the Pricerite Group Building into residential use within the same "R(E)1" zone, which was approved with conditions by the Committee on 22.1.2016 on the grounds of general compliance with the planning intention of "R(E)1" zone, not susceptible to adverse impacts from traffic and noise emissions, and no significant impacts on sewerage, drainage, risk and environmental aspects.

6. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1 to A-4b)

6.1 The Site is:

- (a) located at the south-western part of Sai Kung Town about 400m from the town centre;
- (b) accessible from Hong Ting Road and Hong Tsuen Road;
- (c) currently occupied by two 4-storey godown buildings; and

- (d) falling within the consultation zone of PKWTW, which is a Potentially Hazardous Installation (PHI).
- 6.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:
- (a) to its immediate north is an area zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) currently covered by amenity planting and to its further north is the Hiram’s Highway;
 - (b) to its east is an area zoned “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Commercial Development (with Multi-storey Vehicle Park)” occupied by the commercial building ‘Centro’. To its southeast across Chui Tong Road is an existing 8 to 13 storeys residential development namely Lakeside Garden;
 - (c) a petrol filling station is located to its west;
 - (d) to its southwest and south across Hong Ting Road are existing industrial buildings (Four Seas Group, Four Seas Efood Centre and Pricerite Group Building) falling within the same “R(E)1” zone. Planning permission has been granted for redevelopment of Pricerite Group Building into residential use under Application No. A/SK-SKT/10;
 - (e) a “R(B)4” site under construction subject to a maximum BH of 8 storeys and “Government, Institution or Community” (“GIC”) facilities including fire station, pump house and electricity substation are located to the further southwest; and
 - (f) to its south across Hong Tsuen Road is the “G/IC(2)” site currently occupied by some temporary vehicle repair workshops and open car parks. The “G/IC(2)” site is subject to a maximum BH of 3 storey under the OZP. To its further south is the “GB” zone mainly covered by vegetated slopes.

7. Planning Intention

The “R(E)1” zone is intended primarily for phasing out of existing industrial uses through redevelopment (or conversion) for residential use on application to the Board. Whilst existing industrial uses will be tolerated, new industrial developments are not permitted in order to avoid perpetuation of industrial/residential interface problem.

8. Comments from Relevant Government Bureaux / Departments

8.1 The following government departments have been consulted and their views on the application are summarised as follows:

Land Administration

8.1.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Sai Kung, Lands Department (DLO/SK, LandsD):

- (a) the Site comprises 2 separate land parcels: (i) the southwest parcel falls within portion of Lot 963 and extension thereto in D.D. 215; (ii) the

northeast parcel falls within Lot 991 in D.D. 215. The lease restrictions of these lots are as follows:

- (i) Lot 963 and Extension in D.D. 215 has a total site area of 2,861.3m² and is held under Grant No. 6503 dated 25.3.1981 and Extension Letter dated 25.5.1984, as modified by 2 Modification Letters dated 16.10.1985 and 13.8.1991. The Lot is restricted to industrial and/or godown uses excluding any offensive trades and subject to a maximum permitted plot ratio of 4 and building height not exceeding 16.7m (or 55 feet) above the mean level of the lowest street adjoining the Site;
 - (ii) Lot 991 in D.D. 215 has a site area of 1,410m² and is held under New Grant No. 7294 dated 15.1.1988. The Lot is restricted to be used for industrial and/or godown purposes excluding manufacturing/storage of paint products, related products and other dangerous goods and any offensive trades and subject to a total gross floor area not exceeding 5,640m² and building height not exceeding 16.7m above the mean formation level of the land plus permitted roof structures not exceeding 4.5m; and
- (b) if the application is approved by the Board, the owner of the subject lots will need to apply to his office for a lease modification to effect the proposed residential development and the area shown as 'Road' on the OZP, if required. However, there is no guarantee that such lease modification application would be approved by the Government. Such application, if eventually approved, would be subject to such terms and conditions including payment of a premium and an administrative fee as the Government considers appropriate.

Traffic

8.1.2 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) he has no further comment on the applicant's responses to comments and the revised TIA from traffic engineering viewpoint. Notwithstanding, in view of planning status of the Hiram's Highway Improvement Stage 2, he considers the following planning condition should be imposed if the application is approved:

'the submission of traffic review before population intake for the proposed development'

- (b) his office has no plan to provide a layby at Hong Ting Road as shown on the OZP (**Plan A-2**).

Environment

8.1.3 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) the applicant has submitted an EA covering air quality and noise aspects to address the environmental issues. DEP has no further comment on EA;

and

- (b) as proposed and agreed by the applicant, it is recommended to conduct a land contamination assessment in view that the subject site has been designed for industrial and godown use (i.e. storage and manufacturing of dangerous goods including paints and coatings). It is suggested to include an approval condition “the submission of a land contamination assessment and the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed therein prior to the commencement of the foundation works for the proposed development to the satisfaction of Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board”.

Urban Design and Visual

8.1.4 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD):

according to the applicant’s submission, the proposal has several design merits including a 16m building separation and building setbacks. With reference to the photomontages provided in the VIA, the design features are effective in breaking up the building bulk and alleviating its potential shadowing on the surrounding street environment. The proposed development is considered not incompatible with the surroundings in terms of BH and scale. Significant adverse visual impact resulting from the proposal is not envisaged with mitigation measures.

Landscape

8.1.5 Comments of the CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application;
- (b) the proposed use is considered not incompatible with the existing landscape character. However, on the proposed Landscape Master Plan, it is observed that some landscape elements are proposed outside the Site boundary, such as proposed trees and shrubs in “GB” between Hiram’s Highway and the Site as green buffer to the development;
- (c) the applicant confirms the “GB” area with proposed landscape treatment falling outside the application boundary is under the owner’s landholding, and the implementation and associated maintenance will rest by the future I-O or the Property Management Company. The applicant agrees to state this responsibility and liability in the future Deed of Mutual Covenant (DMC). Since such landscape work is outside the planning application boundary, subject to the relevant authorities’ agreement, the proposed tree planting within the “GB” area should be considered as lease condition for the assurance of maximizing greening opportunity; and
- (d) should the Board approve this application, the following approval condition is recommended to be included in the planning permission:

‘submission and implementation of landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board’.

Sewerage

8.1.6 Comments of DEP:

- (a) the applicant has submitted a SIA to address the sewerage issue. DEP has no further comment on the SIA submitted; and
- (b) the applicant should provide sewerage upgrading works as identified in the SIA, including the upgrading works to be constructed by other proposed developments if there is any programme mismatch.

8.1.7 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department (CE/MS, DSD):

- (a) no further comment on sewerage design; and
- (b) the SIA for the planning application needs to meet the full satisfaction of EPD, the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure.

Drainage

8.1.8 Comments of the CE/MS, DSD:

he has no adverse comment on the application from drainage maintenance viewpoint.

Building Matters

8.1.9 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories East 2 and Rail, Buildings Department (CBS/NTE2 & Rail, BD):

- (a) no in-principle objection under the Buildings Ordinance (BO);
- (b) presumably the Site abuts on specified street under Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) 18A (3) of not less than 4.5m wide, otherwise, its development intensity should be determined by the Building Authority under B(P)R 19(3);
- (c) the means of obtaining access to the Site from a street including the land status of the existing access road (i.e. Hong Tin Road) should be clarified to demonstrate compliance of B(P)R5;
- (d) it is noted that the development is divided into two sites with two site areas for GFA and SC calculations. The site areas and such computation of GFA and SC calculations should be substantiated with documental proof at the building plan submission stage;
- (e) applicant’s attention is drawn to the policy on GFA concession under PNAP APP-151, in particular, the 10% overall cap on GFA concession

and where appropriate, the SBD requirements including building setback and building separation under PNAP APP-152;

- (f) it is noted that carparking spaces are excluded from GFA calculations. PNAP APP-2, Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the advice of C for T will be referred to when determining exemption of GFA calculations for aboveground and underground carparking spaces;
- (g) clubhouse area should be GFA accountable under the BO unless GFA concession is granted under the BO. Attention is drawn to PNAP APP-42, APP-104, APP-151 and APP-152;
- (h) emergency vehicular access complying with B(P)R 41D shall be provided for all buildings in each site; and
- (i) detailed comments will be given during general building plans submission stage.

Fire Safety

8.1.10 Comments of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS):

- (a) no objection in principle to the application subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of his department. Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans;
- (b) no detail of Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA) has been provided, comments could not be offered by his office at the present stage. Nevertheless, the applicant is advised to observe the requirements of EVA as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 which is administered by BD; and
- (c) according to the “Design, Construction, Modification and Maintenance of Filling Stations, of APEA/EI”, separation distance of 12m (i.e. from filling points of petroleum product tanks to nearby residential buildings) is recommended.

Water Supply

8.1.11 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/Construction, WSD):

- (a) no objection to the application; and
- (b) the Site falls within the consultation zone of PKWTW, which is a PHI. Comments from Environment Protection Department should be sought on this aspect.

Risk Aspect

8.1.12 Comments of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS):

no comment on the QRA reports for High Pressure Town Gas Pipeline and Petrol cum LPG Filling Station submitted by the applicant. There is no objection to the recommendation of the reports that there is no insurmountable problem on risk aspect.

8.1.13 Comments of DEP:

no further comment from the chlorine risk viewpoint on the revised QRA related to PKWTW, which is a designated PHI.

Geotechnical

8.1.14 Comments of the Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD):

- (a) no geotechnical objection to the application; and
- (b) the applicant is reminded to submit necessary statutory plans to BD in accordance with the provisions of the BO.

8.2 The following government departments have no objection to/no comment on the application:

- (a) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department (CHE/NTE, HyD);
- (b) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC);
- (c) District Officer/Sai Kung, Home Affairs Department (DO/SK, HAD); and
- (d) Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department (CE(Works), HAD).

9. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Periods

9.1 The application, and the 1st FI to the 10th FI were published for public inspection on 17.6.2016, 4.10.2016, 29.11.2016 17.2.2017, 14.3.2017, 5.5.2017, 26.5.2017, 14.7.2017, 7.11.2017, 15.12.2017 and 19.1.2018 respectively. During the three weeks of the statutory public inspection periods, a total of 274 public comments were received. A full set of the public comments will be deposited at the meeting for Members' inspection.

	Application	1 st FI	2 nd FI	3 rd FI	4 th FI	5 th FI	6 th FI	7 th FI	8 th FI	9 th FI	10 th FI
No. of comments	8	73	70	4	3	6	7	56	42	3	2

9.2 266 commenters including the Chairman and members of Sai Kung District Council (**Appendix IIa**), Sai Kung Rural Committee (**Appendix IIb**), Sai Kung Planning Concern Front (one of the comments with letter jointly signed by 77 individuals) (**Appendix IIc**) and individuals of the public (some in standard forms (**Appendix II d**)) object to/raise concern on the application on the following grounds:

- (a) the proposed development will worsen the traffic condition in Sai Kung. The implementation of improvement works for Hiram's Highway is still uncertain;
 - (b) the proposed development will generate adverse noise impacts to surrounding residents during construction stage;
 - (c) adverse environmental impacts are anticipated;
 - (d) there is lack of supporting facilities to meet increasing population;
 - (e) there is problem in road access and provision of parking facilities with the continuous increase in population and number of flats;
 - (f) insufficient community facilities and parking spaces; and
 - (g) incompatible with the rural character of Sai Kung.
- 9.3 8 commenters (**Appendix IIe**) support/have no objection to the proposed development mainly on grounds that it could remove the current industrial use and the scale and building height are acceptable; it provides more housing supply; and residential development is more environmentally friendly than industrial use, which is unlikely to create nuisance to the community.

10. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 10.1 The application is for redevelopment of the Site zoned "R(E)1" on the OZP from industrial to residential use with ground floor shops. The planning intention of the "R(E)1" zone is primarily for phasing out of existing industrial uses through redevelopment for residential use. The proposed development generally complies with the planning intention of the "R(E)1" zone. It will facilitate the phasing out of existing industrial uses for improvement of the overall environment in the area. Within the same "R(E)1" zone on the OZP, planning permission has been granted for redevelopment of an existing industrial building to residential use under application No. A/SK-SKT/10 (**Plan A-2**).
- 10.2 The "R(E)1" zone is so designated to ensure that effective mitigation measures would be implemented to resolve the interface problem with the remaining industrial buildings in the vicinity and possible environmental impacts. The applicant has demonstrated in the EA that nuisances from the existing industrial operations are limited as there is no active chimney within 500m from the proposed development. To address the possible problems in relation to vehicular emission and traffic noise mainly from Hiram's Highway, the applicant has proposed a number of mitigation measures including setback and full-height vertical architectural fin with sound absorption material (**Drawings A-10 to A-12**). The proposal is acceptable by DEP who has no adverse comment on the application from environmental viewpoint, subject to an approval condition on land contamination assessment.
- 10.3 Under the Notes of the OZP, the "R(E)1" zone is restricted to a maximum PR of 2, SC of 40% and BH of 8 storeys (excluding basements). In the current application, building structures are proposed only within the "R(E)1" portion of the site. The 'Road' portion would be used as landscaping without any structure. The overall PR of 2 and SC of 40% are based on the applicant's proposal to include the 'Road' portion as part of the site for calculation of development potential. By excluding the 'Road' portion from the site, the PR within the "R(E)1" portion is 2.036, which exceeds the restrictions as stipulated under the OZP by about 1.8%. C for T advises that there is

no plan to provide a layby at Hong Ting Road as shown on the OZP (**Plan A-2**). The proposed minor relaxation in PR is considered to be minor and technical in nature.

- 10.4 The proposed 8-storey development is considered not incompatible with the surroundings in terms of BH and scale. CTP/UD&L advises that there are design merits in the proposed scheme including a 16m building separation and building setbacks (**Drawing A-9**). The design features are effective in breaking up the building bulk and alleviate its potential shadowing on the surrounding street environment. Significant adverse visual impact resulting from the proposal is not envisaged with mitigation measures. For the proposed trees and shrubs in “GB” between Hiram’s Highway and the Site as green buffer to the development, they can be implemented by incorporating lease conditions in the lease modification stage.
- 10.5 The applicant has submitted revised TIA, SIA and QRAs to demonstrate that the proposal is not anticipated to create adverse impacts on traffic, sewerage, drainage and risk aspects. Relevant government departments including C for T, CE/MS, DSD, DEP and DEMS have no objection to / adverse comment on the application.
- 10.6 The public comments received express mainly concerns on traffic, infrastructure and environmental impacts on the site and the surrounding areas. In this regard, planning assessments in paragraphs 10.1 to 10.5 above are relevant.

11. Planning Department’s Views

- 11.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 10 and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 9, the Planning Department has no objection to the application.
- 11.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until **2.3.2022**, and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members’ consideration:

Approval Conditions

- (a) the submission of traffic review before population intake for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the submission and implementation of landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (d) the submission of a land contamination assessment and the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed therein prior to the commencement of the foundation works for the proposed development to the satisfaction of Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory Clause

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Appendix III**.

11.3 There is no strong reason to reject the application.

12. Decision Sought

- 12.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant permission.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, Members are invited to consider the approval conditions and advisory clauses, if any, to be attached to the permission, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.
- 12.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant.

13. Attachments

Appendix I	Application form received on 7.6.2016 and supplementary information
Appendix Ia	Supplementary Planning Statement
Appendix Ib	FI dated 26.9.2016
Appendix Ic	FI dated 17.11.2016
Appendix Id	FI dated 8.2.2017
Appendix Ie	FI dated 6.3.2017
Appendix If	FI dated 24.4.2017
Appendix Ig	FI dated 16.5.2017
Appendix Ih	FI dated 4.7.2017
Appendix Ii	FI dated 27.10.2017
Appendix Ij	FI dated 4.12.2017
Appendix Ik	FI dated 9.1.2018
Appendix II	FI dated 1.2.2018
Appendices IIa to IIe	Public Comments
Appendix III	Advisory Clauses
Drawing A-1	Location Plan
Drawing A-2	Section Plan
Drawings A-3 to A-5	Floor Plans
Drawing A-6	Master Layout Plan
Drawings A-7 and A-8	Photomontages
Drawing A-9	Proposed Visual Mitigation Measures
Drawings A-10 to A-12	Proposed Noise Mitigation Measures
Plan A-1	Location Plan
Plan A-2	Site Plan
Plan A-3	Aerial Photo
Plans A-4a and A-4b	Site Photos