

RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-SKT/23 to 27B
 For Consideration by the
 Rural and New Town
 Planning Committee
 On 18.12.2020

**APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
 UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

APPLICATIONS NO. A/SK-SKT/23 to 27

Applicants :

A/SK-SKT/23	Well Harbour (H.K.) Limited
A/SK-SKT/24	Hung Kung Development Limited
A/SK-SKT/25	Big Stay Asia Pacific Limited
A/SK-SKT/26	Conley Investment Limited
A/SK-SKT/27	

All c/o Stan Group Project Company Limited and represented by Kenneth To and Associated Limited

Application Sites :

A/SK-SKT/23	Lot 1104 in D.D. 215, 1 Hong Ting Road
A/SK-SKT/24	Lot 1107 in D.D. 215, 2 Hong Ting Road
A/SK-SKT/25	Lot 1002 in D.D. 215, 6 Hong Ting Road
A/SK-SKT/26	Lot 963 (Part) in D.D. 215, 7 Hong Ting Road
A/SK-SKT/27	Lot 963 (Part), Ext to 963(Part) and 991 (Part) in D.D. 215 and adjoining Government land, 7 (Part) and 9 Hong Ting Road

All in Sai Kung, New Territories

Site Areas :

A/SK-SKT/23	2,850m ² (about)
A/SK-SKT/24	1,681m ² (about)
A/SK-SKT/25	3,231m ² (about)
A/SK-SKT/26	1,950m ² (about)
A/SK-SKT/27	1,950m ² (about) – including Government land of about 159m ²

Land Status :

A/SK-SKT/23	Lot 1104	New Grant No. 7847
A/SK-SKT/24	Lot 1107	New Grant No. 8281
A/SK-SKT/25	Lot 1002	New Grant No. 6977
A/SK-SKT/26	Lot 963 (Part)	New Grant No. 6503
A/SK-SKT/27	- Lot 963 (Part) and Ext. to 963(Part) and 991 (Part) (about 1791m ² or 91.8%) - Government Land (about 159m ² or 8.2%)	New Grant No. 6503 New Grant No. 7294

All restricted to industrial and/or godown purposes excluding any offensive trades

Plan : Approved Sai Kung Town Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-SKT/6

<u>Zonings</u>	:	A/SK-SKT/23	“Residential (Group E)1” (“R(E)1”)
		A/SK-SKT/24	“R(E)1” (99.6%) and ‘Road’ (0.4%)
		A/SK-SKT/25	“R(E)1” (94.9%) and ‘Road’ (6.1%)
		A/SK-SKT/26	“R(E)1” (96.5%) and ‘Road’ (3.5%)
		A/SK-SKT/27	“R(E)1”

“R(E)1”- 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)

<u>Applications</u>	:	A/SK-SKT/23	Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) (RCHE) and Flat with Minor Relaxation of PR Restriction
		A/SK-SKT/24	Proposed Social Welfare Facility (RCHE) with Minor Relaxation of PR Restriction
		A/SK-SKT/25	Proposed Social Welfare Facility (RCHE) and Flat with Minor Relaxation of PR Restriction
		A/SK-SKT/26	Proposed Social Welfare Facility (RCHE) with Minor Relaxation of PR Restriction
		A/SK-SKT/27	Proposed Social Welfare Facility (RCHE) with Minor Relaxation of PR Restriction

1. **The Proposals**

1.1 The applicants, which are under the same group of companies, seek planning permissions for redevelopment of the application sites (the Sites) from industrial use to the followings:

(a)	Application No. A/SK-SKT/23	Proposed RCHE and flat with minor relaxation of PR restriction from 2 to 2.8;
(b)	Application No. A/SK-SKT/24	Proposed RCHE with minor relaxation of PR restriction from 2 to 2.8;
(c)	Application No. A/SK-SKT/25	proposed RCHE and flat with minor relaxation of PR restriction from 2 to 2.8;
(d)	Application No. A/SK-SKT/26	Proposed RCHE with minor relaxation of PR restriction from 2 to 2.74; and
(e)	Application No. A/SK-SKT/27	Proposed RCHE with minor relaxation of PR restriction from 2 to 2.77.

The Sites for Applications No. A/SK-SKT/23 and 27 fall within an area entirely zoned “R(E)1” and the Sites for Applications No. A/SK-SKT/24 to 26 fall within areas mainly zoned “R(E)1” and with minor portions shown as ‘Road’ on the approved Sai Kung Town OZP No. S/SK-SKT/6 (**Plans A-1 and A-2**). According to the Notes of the OZP, ‘Social Welfare Facility’ and ‘Flat’ 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. According to the submitted schemes, each of the five Sites would be occupied by a single 8-storey development. The PRs of the five proposed developments ranging from 2.74 to 2.8 would all exceed the maximum PR restriction (PR 2) for the “R(E)1” zone, and hence permissions from the Board are also required for the relaxations on PR restriction.

1.2 According to the applicants’ submissions, the Sites are designated as follows (**Drawing A-1**):

- (a) Application No. A/SK-SKT/23 – “Site A” with “Block 1”;
- (b) Application No. A/SK-SKT/24 – “Site B” with “Block 2”;
- (c) Application No. A/SK-SKT/25 – “Site C” with “Block 3”;
- (d) Application No. A/SK-SKT/26 – “Site D” with “Block 4”;
- (e) Application No. A/SK-SKT/27 – “Site E” with “Block 5”.

In total, the proposed developments would provide 99 flats within Sites A and C and an estimated number of 1,403 RCHE bedspaces in all Sites. The applicants claim that the target completion year is 2023 for each of the proposed developments. The applicants intend to develop private RCHEs at the Sites, while not ruling out the possibility of joining the Enhanced Bought Places Schemes (EBPS). Developments within each Site are self-contained and the major development parameters of the proposed developments for the applications are summarised as follows:

Development Parameters	Applications No. A/SK-					Total
	SKT/23 (Site A)	SKT/24 (Site B)	SKT/25 (Site C)	SKT/26 (Site D)	SKT/27 (Site E)	
Site Area (about)	2,850m ²	1,681m ²	3,231m ²	1,950m ²	1,950m ² Note 1	11,662m ² Note 2
GFA for RCHE	5,400m ²	4,706m ²	5,400m ²	5,340m ²	5,400m ²	26,246m ²
GFA for Flat	2,580m ²	--	3,647m ²	--	--	6,227m ²
Plot Ratio	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.74	2.77	2.78
(Difference from OZP restriction) (about)	(+0.8) (+40%)	(+0.8) (+40%)	(+0.8) (+40%)	(+0.74) (+37%)	(+0.77) (+39%)	(+0.78) (+39%)
Max. SC	40%					N.A.
No. of Storeys	8					N.A.
Max. Building Height (mPD) (about)	33.05	32.70	32.70	32.80	32.80	N.A.
No. of Blocks	1	1	1	1	1	5
No. of Flats	30	--	69	--	--	99
No. of RCHE Bedspaces (estimated)	288	245	294	288	288	1,403

Development Parameters	Applications No. A/SK-					Total
	SKT/23 (Site A)	SKT/24 (Site B)	SKT/25 (Site C)	SKT/26 (Site D)	SKT/27 (Site E)	
No. of Car Parking Spaces						
• Private Car	23	5	19	6	6	59
• Motorcycle	2	1	2	1	1	7
• Light Bus/Maxicab	1	1	1	1	1	5
No. of Loading/Unloading (L/UL) Spaces						
• Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV)	1	1	1	1	1	5
• Ambulance Space	1	1	1	1	1	5
Private Communal Open Space	402m ²	260m ²	511m ²	500m ²	290m ²	1,963m ²

Note 1: Including Government land of about 159m².

Note 2: The whole “R(E)1” zone is about 16,439m², the total area of all five applications covers about 71% of the “R(E)1” zone.

- 1.3 The Site of Application No. A/SK-SKT/25 (Site C) is the subject of a previously approved application (No. A/SK-SKT/10) for proposed flat and house and proposed minor relaxation of PR (from 2 to 2.13) and SC (from 40% to 42.6%). Comparison of the major development parameters between the previously approved application (No. A/SK-SKT/10) and Application No. A/SK-SKT/25 are summarised as follows:

Development Parameters	Previous Application (A/SK-SKT/10) (a)	Current Application (A/SK-SKT/25) (Site C) (b)	Difference (b) – (a)
Site Area (about)	3,231m ²	3,231m ²	--
GFA for Flat and/or House	6,462m ²	3,647m ²	-2,815m ² (-43.6%)
GFA for RCHE	--	5,400m ²	+5,400m ²
PR	2.13	2.8	+0.67 (+31.5%)
Max. SC	42.6%	40%	-2.6% (-6.1%)
BH (No. of Storeys)	Residential Block: 8 storeys over 1 basement Houses: 3 storeys over 1 basement	8 storeys	-1 basement

Development Parameters	Previous Application (A/SK-SKT/10) (a)	Current Application (A/SK-SKT/25) (Site C) (b)	Difference (b) – (a)
No. of Blocks	Residential Block: 1 Houses: 4	1 Residential & RCHE Block	-4 (-80%)
No. of Residential Units	94	69	-25 (-26.6%)
No. of RCHE Bedspaces	--	294	+294
Car Parking Spaces	Private Car: 31 Motorcycle: 1	Private Car: 19 Motorcycle: 2 Light Bus/Maxicab: 1	-12 (-38.7%) +1 (+100%)
Loading/ Unloading Spaces	1	2 (one each for HGV and ambulance)	+1 (+100%)

1.4 The Sites of Applications No. A/SK-SKT/26 and 27 (Sites D and E) are the subject of a previously approved application (No. A/SK-SKT/14) for proposed flat and shop and services and proposed minor relaxation of PR (from 2 to 2.036). Comparison of the major development parameters between the previously approved application (No. A/SK-SKT/14) and Applications No. A/SK-SKT/26 and 27 are summarised as follows:

Development Parameters	Previous Application (A/SK-SKT/14) (a)	Current Applications (A/SK-SKT/26 & 27) (Sites D and E) (b)	Difference (b) – (a)
Site Area (about)	3,731m ²	3,900m ²	+169m ² (+4.5%)
GFA for Flat and Shop and Services	7,459m ²	--	-7,459m ²
GFA for RCHE	--	10,740m ²	+10,740m ²
PR	2.036	2.75 (about)	+0.714 (+35.1%)
Max. SC	40%	40%	--
BH (No. of Storeys)	8 storeys	8 storeys	--
No. of Blocks	2	2	--
No. of Residential Units	178	--	-178
No. of RCHE Bedspaces	--	576	+576

Development Parameters	Previous Application (A/SK-SKT/14) (a)	Current Applications (A/SK-SKT/26 & 27) (Sites D and E) (b)	Difference (b) – (a)
Car Parking Spaces	Private Car: 14 Motorcycle: 2	Private Car: 12 Motorcycle: 2 Light Bus/Maxicab: 2	-2 (-14.3%)
Loading/ Unloading Spaces	2	4 (two each for HGV and ambulance)	+2 (+100%)

- 1.5 In support of the applications, the applicants have submitted layout plans, landscape plans, sections, landscape sections and photomontages which are at **Drawings A-1 to A-11e**.
- 1.6 For Sites A and C (Blocks 1 and 3) with proposed RCHE and flats, both uses would be accommodated from G/F to 7/F with separate entrances and lift lobbies while the communal carpark area, L/UL spaces and landscape area for both uses would be shared and provided at the ground floors of the building blocks (**Drawings A-7a, A-7b, A-9a and A-9b**).
- 1.7 Sites B, D and E (Blocks 2, 4 and 5) are for proposed RCHE only, the covered drop-off area, reception, office, activity/training room, etc. would be provided on G/F, other RCHE's facilities such as dormitory rooms, sickbays and multi-function rooms, etc. would be provided on 1/F to 7/F (**Drawings A-8a, A-8b, A-10a, A-10b, A-11a and A-11b**).
- 1.8 The minimum area per residents in the proposed RCHE is not less than 9.5m², whilst there is no indication on the average flat size for the proposed flats in Blocks 1 and 3. The applicants claim that no RCHE use is situated at a level more than 24m from the level of the lower street in all the blocks.
- 1.9 According to the applicants, landscape proposal is made to respond to the individual site conditions, building form and function to provide a safe and quality landscape scheme. Elements include enhancement of streetscape, integration of the developments with surrounding landscape, landscape garden on G/F and planting design. Private communal open space in each application (about 1,963m² in total for all applications) is proposed to serve the residents of both the proposed RCHE and flats. The consolidated landscape master plan for the five proposed developments is at **Drawing A-2** and the landscape plans for each of the five applications are shown in **Drawings A-7d, A-8d, A-9d, A-10d and A-11d** respectively.
- 1.10 Although the five proposed developments are submitted under five separate planning applications, the technical assessments in support of the applications have

been consolidated in a comprehensive manner covering all the five proposed developments.

1.11 Technical assessments submitted by the applicants include Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) (Appendix 5 in **Appendix If-1**), Environmental Assessments (EAs) (Appendix 6 in **Appendix If-2**), Quantitative Risk Assessments (QRAs) (Appendices 7 to 9 in **Appendix If-2**), and Water Supply Impact Assessment (WSIA) (Appendix 10 in **Appendix If-2**). The applicants have proposed environmental mitigation measures in the EAs including sufficient building set back from roadside, central air conditioning system for the proposed RCHE, and acoustic window/balcony, fixed glazing for the proposed flats, etc. to mitigate air quality and noise impacts to the Sites. In terms of sewage treatment, the applicants propose to connect the proposed developments to the existing sewerage system.

1.12 In support of the applications, the applicants have submitted the following documents:

- (a) Application form of Application No. A/SK-SKT/23 (Appendix Ia) received on 28.8.2019
- (b) Application form of Application No. A/SK-SKT/24 (Appendix Ib) received on 28.8.2019
- (c) Application form of Application No. A/SK-SKT/25 (Appendix Ic) received on 28.8.2019
- (d) Application form of Application No. A/SK-SKT/26 (Appendix Id) received on 28.8.2019
- (e) Application form of Application No. A/SK-SKT/27 (Appendix Ie) received on 28.8.2019
- (f) Further Information (FI) received on 30.11.2020 (Appendices If, If-1 and If-2) providing a Consolidated Report which supersedes all previous FI submissions ¹ and the original Supplementary Planning Statements
(accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirements)

1.13 The Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) agreed to defer making a decision on the applications two times on 18.10.2019 and 20.3.2020² respectively, as requested by the applicants, to allow time for preparation of FI in response to departmental comments. The applicants have submitted latest FI providing a Consolidated Report for the five applications as detailed in paragraph 1.11 above. The applications are scheduled for consideration by the Committee at this meeting.

¹ A total of 8 numbers of previous FI submissions (dated 18.12.2019, 20.5.2020, 22.6.2020, 21.7.2020 31.8.202, 22.9.2020, 29.9.2020 and 29.10.2020) have been received for each application to respond to departmental comments and revise relevant technical assessments, of which 7 submissions are accepted and not exempted from publication and 1 submission is accepted and exempted from publication.

² In light of the special work arrangement for government departments due to the novel coronavirus infection, the meeting originally scheduled on 7.2.2020 was rescheduled and the Board agreed to defer consideration of the applications.

2. Justifications from the Applicants

The justifications put forth by the applicants in support of the applications are detailed in the Sections 2 and 5 of the Supplementary Planning Statement at **Appendix If-1** and the consolidated responses-to-comments at Appendix 12 in **Appendix If-2**. They can be summarised as follows:

- (a) the proposed developments are in line with the Government's policy direction to increase housing supply and RCHE bedspace supply;
- (b) majority of RCHEs in Sai Kung District are concentrated in Tseung Kwan O New Town in a high density urban setting, there are only a few in or close to Sai Kung Town. It is unique to provide a RCHE cluster at the Sites with low to medium density sub-urban setting, which is not too far away from the metro area. Also, there are public services not far away, including the Sai Kung Fire Station located within 250m to the southwest, and the public clinic in Sai Kung Town;
- (c) the five RCHEs in the same neighbourhood will offer the opportunities to provide additional shared-use private services such as medical/para-medical visits, transportation services, etc. The proposed developments would form a "mixed-use" of RCHE-cum-residential cluster offering opportunities for families with RCHE service needs. The "mixed-use" scheme would foster a harmonious living environment for those families with such needs;
- (d) the proposed developments are totally in line with the planning intention of the "R(E)1" zone. The Sites in the surrounding are undergoing gradual transformation of the cluster of industrial buildings into residential use. The proposed "RCHE-cum-Residential Cluster" would catalyse the transformation of the area from obsolete industrial buildings into quality living environment for residents of the RCHEs and flats;
- (e) the prevailing "R(E)1" zone covers about 4,777m² of road area and sitting-out area at the eastern portion (**Plans A-1** and **A-2**). Therefore, development of each site within the "R(E)1" zone at PR 2 cannot optimise the anticipated total GFA of the zone. The owners of the Sites, which are under the same group of companies, have decided to submit the five applications for the proposed developments with minor relaxation of plot ratio restriction from 2 to about 2.8. The total anticipated GFA of the Sites at PR 2.8 is still not more than the anticipated GFA of the whole "R(E)1" zone at PR 2. If the Sites can only be developed at PR 2, the total number of RCHE bedspaces would be reduced to 996 (-407) and the total number of flats reduced to 71 (-28);
- (f) the proposed developments meet the three main pre-requisites in the Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines, i.e. projected façade length, site coverage of greenery area at primary zone, and building masses setback. Perimeter of the Sites will be lined with visually porous fences (**Drawings A-7e, A-8e, A-9e, A-10e** and **A-11e**), which creates visually wider streets and matching the urban characteristics of the area. Heat island effect will be mitigated by maintaining adequate air corridors along the existing roads and sitting out area, which is a design improvement over the existing condition with multi-storey factories building up to the boundaries;

- (g) to optimise the development potentials of the Sites, it is inevitable that the PR and BH of the five buildings are similar. The proposed developments will be lower than the two nearby residential developments, i.e. Lakeside Garden and Park Mediterranean (**Drawings A-4 to A-6**). It is regarded that there will be no adverse visual impact. There is limitation to further reduce floor-to-floor height (i.e. 4500mm for G/F and 3150mm for typical floor). If the stepped building height required under the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP is strictly adhered by reducing the number of storeys at the Sites in the southern/ southwestern portion, it would reduce flat and RCHE bedspace supplies;
- (h) if the owners of the private lots have to implement the whole “R(E)1” zone, it is expected to take lengthy procedures as it must involve land exchange by surrendering private land of area 11,662m² for a new reconfigured lot out of the area of 16,439m². The land exchange process would need to involve gazetting of a new road and/or re-provisioning of the well-established sitting out area. Under the applicants’ current approach, the existing road network of Hong Ting Road and Hong Nin Path would still be functioning and can be kept to serve the proposed redevelopments. Also, the existing sitting out area to the east of the Sites can be kept for public enjoyment;
- (i) based on the TIA, under the assumption that the improvements under the Hiram’s Highway Improvement Stage 2 (HH2) project are not in place, the proposed developments would still bring negligible traffic impact to the local network;
- (j) the EA has reviewed that there would not be unacceptable air quality, noise and sewerage impact due to the proposed developments. With the proposed noise mitigation measures, all residential units comply with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) traffic noise criteria. For the RCHE portion, it will be provided with central air conditioning system for ventilation purpose, so it is considered noise tolerant in nature. The sewage flow from the proposed developments would be within the capacity of the existing sewerage system. After proposed upgrading of the identified segments of existing sewers, no unacceptable sewerage impact is anticipated; and
- (k) according to the QRAs on the high-pressure town gas pipeline along Hiram’s Highway, the Petrol-cum-LPG Filling Station to the north of the Sites, as well as Pak Kong Water Treatment Works (PKWTW) in close vicinity, the individual risk and societal risk associated with these developments are in compliance with the “Hong Kong Risk Guidelines for Potentially Hazardous Installations”, and thus no further mitigation measures are required.

3. **Compliance with the Owner’s “Consent/Notification” Requirement**

The applicants are the sole “current land owners”. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection. The “owner’s consent/notification” requirement is not applicable on the Government land within Site E.

4. Previous Applications

- 4.1 Site C is the subject of a previously approved application (No. A/SK-SKT/10) by the same applicant for proposed flat and house and proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction (from 2 to 2.13) (i.e. relaxation by 6.5%) and SC restriction (from 40% to 42.6%), which was approved with conditions by the Committee on 22.1.2016. Validity of the planning permission lapsed on 23.1.2020.
- 4.2 Sites D and E are the subject of a previously approved application (No. A/SK-SKT/14) by the same applicant for proposed flat and shop and services and proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction (from 2 to 2.036) (i.e. relaxation by 1.8%), which was approved by the Committee on 2.3.2018. The planning permission is still valid but the proposed development has not yet commenced.
- 4.2 The previous applications (No. A/SK-SKT/10 and 14) were approved mainly 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, no significant impacts on sewerage, drainage, risk and environmental aspects, and the requested relaxations of PR and/or SC restrictions are minor and technical in nature. In particular, the Committee noted that the exceedance of PR and/or SC from the OZP restriction(s) in both applications were resulted from the technical issue of exclusion of the area shown as ‘Road’ from site area calculation.
- 4.3 Details of these applications are summarised at **Appendix II** and their locations are shown on **Plans A-1** and **A-2**.

5. Similar Application

There is one similar application No. A/SK-SKT/22 for proposed 19 houses and minor relaxation of PR restriction (from 0.75 to 0.756) in the “R(E)2” zone to the southwest of the Sites, which was rejected by the Committee on 20.3.2020 mainly on the ground that the applicant fails to demonstrate the industrial/residential (I/R) interface problem could be satisfactorily resolved. The applicant has applied for review of the Committee’s decision, which is still being processed.

6. The Sites and their Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1 and A-2, Aerial Photo on Plan A-3 and Site Photos on A-4a to 4d)

- 6.1 The Sites are:
- (a) located at the south-western part of Sai Kung Town about 400m from the town centre;
 - (b) accessible from Hong Tsuen Road, Hong Ting Road and Hong Nin Path;
 - (c) currently occupied by 5 industrial buildings (Four Seas Group Building (Site A), Four Seas eFood Centre (Site B), Pricerite Group Building (Site C) and

buildings of China Paint Manufacturing Company (1946) Ltd. (Sites D and E)), which are largely vacant; and

- (d) falling within the consultation zone of PKWTW, which is a Potential Hazard Installation (PHI).

6.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) to the immediate north is an area zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) currently covered by amenity planting and to its further north is Hiram’s Highway, where an existing high pressure gas pipeline runs underneath;
- (b) to the immediate east is a sitting-out area sandwiched between Chui Tong Road and Hong Nin Path within the same “R(E)1” zone (**Plan A-4d**). To the northeast is an area zoned “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Commercial Development (with Multi-storey Vehicle Park)” occupied by the commercial building ‘Centro’. To the southeast across Chui Tong Road is an existing 8 to 13-storey residential development namely ‘Lakeside Garden’;
- (c) to the south across Hong Tsuen Road is a “Government, Institution or Community (2)” (“G/IC(2)”) site currently occupied by some temporary vehicle repair workshops and an open car park. The “G/IC(2)” site is subject to a maximum BH of 3 storeys under the OZP. To the further south is the “GB” zone mainly covered by vegetated slopes;
- (d) to the immediate west is a “Residential (Group B)4” (“R(B)4”) site occupied by three 8-storey residential blocks namely ‘Park Mediterranean’; and
- (e) to the northwest is an area zoned “OU” annotated “Petrol Filling Station” (PFS). A petrol filling cum LPG station is currently in use.

7. Planning Intention

7.1 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 I/R interface problem.

7.2 The ES of the OZP specifies that building blocks within the “R(E)1” zone should be arranged in a stepped manner, with maximum building height at the north, descending to the south and west.

8. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

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

Land Administration

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

A/SK-SKT/23 (Site A)

- (a) the Site falls within Lot 1104 in D.D. 215 with a site area of about 2,850m² and is held under New Grant No. 7847 dated 11.2.1991, as modified by a Modification Letter dated 16.4.1993. The conditions contain, inter alia, the following salient conditions:
- (i) the lot is restricted to be used for industrial and/or godown purposes excluding any offensive trades under the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance, or any enactment amending the same or substituted therefor;
 - (ii) the total GFA of any building or buildings on the lot shall not be less than 6,840m²;
 - (iii) any building on the lot shall not contain more than four storeys; and
 - (iv) no part of any building or other structure on the lot shall exceed a height of 23.15mPD. Three lift machine rooms each at height of 2.95m may be built on the roof of the building;

A/SK-SKT/24 (Site B)

- (b) the Site falls within Lot 1107 in D.D. 215 with a site area of about 1,681m² and is held under New Grant No. 8281 dated 15.12.1993, as modified by a Modification Letter dated 24.10.1998. The conditions contain, inter alia, the following salient conditions:
- (i) the lot is restricted to be used for industrial and/or godown purposes excluding any offensive trades under the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance, or any enactment amending the same or substituted therefor;
 - (ii) the total GFA of any building or buildings on the lot shall not be less than 3,026m²; and
 - (iii) no part of any building or other structure erected on the lot shall be more than 4 storeys or exceed a height of 23.15mPD. Machine rooms, air-conditioning units, water tanks, stairhoods and similar roof top structures may be erected on the roof of the building subject to approval of the Director of Lands. The maximum aggregate height of building and such structures shall not exceed 26mPD;

A/SK-SKT/25 (Site C)

- (c) the Site comprises Lot 1002 in D.D. 215 with a site area of about 3,231m² and is held under New Grant No. 6977 dated 23.1.1986 as modified by a Modification Letter dated 30.12.1989. The conditions contain, inter alia, the following salient conditions:
- (i) the lot is restricted to be used for industrial and/or godown purposes excluding any offensive trades under the Public Health and Urban Services Ordinance, or any enactment amending the same or substituted therefor;
 - (ii) no building or buildings shall be erected on the lot except a factory or factories or a godown or godowns or both, ancillary offices and such canteen and other welfare facilities (but excluding residential quarters) for workmen employed on the lot and also such quarters as may be required for watchmen or caretakers;
 - (iii) the total GFA of any building or buildings on the lot shall not be less than 4,847m² and shall not exceed 8,078m²;
 - (iv) no part of any building or other structure on the lot shall exceed a height of 15m above the mean formation level of the land on which it stands;
 - (v) the roof of the existing building erected on the lot may be used for recreational purposes for the life time of the existing building, and such recreational facilities shall be used on by employees on the lot or bona fide visiting players or teams;
 - (vi) spaces shall be provided for the manoeuvring, parking, loading and unloading of vehicles (excluding containers on trailers with their prime movers attached) at the rate of not less than one such space for each 930m² or part thereof of GFA, excluding any floor area to be used for this purpose, of any building erected on the lot, or at the rate of not less than one such space for each 460m² or part thereof of the area of the lot, whichever rate provides the greater amount of such space;
 - (vii) space shall be provided for manoeuvring, parking, loading and unloading of at least one container or trailer with its prime movers attached; and
 - (viii) according to available records, the lot is subject to a temporary waiver for non-provision of required space for the container as per para. (c)(vii) above etc. for a term of one year from 15.11.1994 and thereafter quarterly;

A/SK-SKT/26 (Site D)

- (d) the Site falls within Lot 963 and the Ext. Thereto in D.D. 215, which is held under New Grant No. 6503 dated 25.3.1981 and Ext. Letter dated 25.5.1984, as modified by 2 Modifications Letters dated 16.10.1985 and 13.8.1991 respectively. The conditions contain, inter alia, the following conditions:
- (i) the lot is restricted to be used for industrial and/or godown purposes excluding any offensive trades under the Public Health and Urban Services Ordinance, or any enactment amending the same or substituted therefor;
 - (ii) the total lot area of Lot 963 and the Ext. thereto in D.D. 215 is 2,861.3m²;
 - (iii) the maximum permitted PR shall not exceed 4; and
 - (iv) no part of any structure on the lot shall exceed a height of 16.7mPD (or 55 feet) above the mean level of the lowest street adjoining the Site;

A/SK-SKT/27 (Site E)

- (e) the Site falls within portion of two private lots (namely Lot 963 and the Ext. thereto in D.D. 215 and Lot 991 in D.D. 215 and Government land between the two private lots.;
- (f) details of Lot 296 and Ext thereto in D.D. 215 are as para. 8.1.1 (d) above;
- (g) Lot 991 in D.D. 215 with a site area of 1,410m² is held under New Grant No. 7294 dated 15.1.1988. The lease conditions contain, inter alia, the following salient conditions:
- (i) the lot is restricted to be used for industrial and/or godown purposes excluding the manufacture/storage of paint products, related products and other dangerous goods and any offensive trades under the Public Health and Urban Services Ordinance, or any enactment amending the same or substituted therefor;
 - (ii) the total GFA of any building or buildings on the lot shall not be less than 3,384m² and shall not exceed 5,640m²; and
 - (iii) no part of any building or other structure erected on the lot shall exceed a height of 16.7m the mean formation level of the land on which it stands; the maximum floor height of roof structures (water tanks, exhaust flues, mechanical plant rooms, lift machines rooms, stairhoods and parapets at roof level) not exceeding 4.5m shall not be taken into account;

All applications

- (h) the Sites do not fall within any village environs. According to the land status plan, they fall within the consultation zone of Water Supplies Department's PKWTW. Concerned departments should be consulted in this regard; and
- (i) if the planning applications are approved by the Committee, the lot owners will need to apply to Sai Kung District Lands Office for a lease modification or land exchange to effect the proposal. 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) no objection in-principle to the applications subject to timely implementation of HH2 project prior to the population intake of the proposed developments;
- (b) as regards the TIA submitted by the applicants (Appendix 5 in **Appendix If-1**), the volume/capacity (v/c) ratio of both Hiram's Highway and Po Tung Road (Yau Ma Po Street – Fuk Man Road) exceeds 1.0 with maximum v/c ratio to 1.25 in design year 2026. Without HH2 project in place, the traffic condition along the above-mentioned road section is not acceptable. As such, the applicants are required to clearly state in the TIA regarding the condition mentioned in paragraph (a) above and update relevant assumptions and assessments accordingly;
- (c) no objection in-principle to using the existing road network for access to the developments during its operational stage based on the findings presented in the TIA. However, the applicants have not included any assessment regarding the construction traffic impact to the existing road network. As a result, it is unable to advise whether the existing road network is suitable for access of the developments during the construction stage due to no information available in relation to construction traffic impact; and
- (d) in view of the above, the following approval conditions are recommended be imposed should the applications be approved:
 - (i) no population intake of the proposed developments shall be taken place before the completion of the HH2 Project; and

- (ii) the submission of a revised TIA and the implementation of traffic improvement measures identified therein to the satisfaction of C for T or of the Board.

8.1.3 Comments of the Chief Engineer 5/Major Works, Major Works Project Management Office, Highways Department (CE5/MW, MWPMO, HyD):

the HH2 Scheme and amendment Scheme were gazetted on 3.1.2020 and 20.11.2020 respectively. In accordance with Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Chapter 370), HyD will submit all correspondences relating to the objections to the Chief Executive in Council for consideration. If the relevant statutory procedures can be completed smoothly by mid-2021, it is anticipated that the detailed design of the Project can commence by end-2021. However, the completion date of the HH2 project is still uncertain at this moment and it is subject to the progress of Public Works Programme procedures.

Environment

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

- (a) according to the EA for the applications (Appendix 6 of **Appendix If-2**), it is understood that the applicants will implement appropriate noise mitigation measures to comply with HKPSG traffic noise criteria, such as acoustic balcony, acoustic window, fixed glazing, etc. They have also committed to conduct land contamination assessments and remediation works (if necessary) in accordance with the prevailing guidelines;
- (b) on the above basis, he has no objection to the applications and proposes the following approval conditions:
 - (i) the submission of a revised noise impact assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein to meet HKPSG requirements to the satisfaction of the DEP or of the Board; and
 - (ii) the submission of a land contamination assessment in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to the development of the Sites to the satisfaction of the DEP or of the Board; and
- (c) detailed comments on the EA are at **Appendix III**.

Urban Design and Landscape

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

Urban Design

- (a) the Sites are bounded by Hiram's Highway to the north, Chui Tong Road to the east and Hong Tsuen Road to the south. To the west are a petrol-cum-LPG filling station and the residential development at Park Mediterranean (BH: 8 storeys / 41mPD). To the north across Hiram's Highway are low-rise low-density residential developments on a slope (BH: 1 to 3 storeys). To the east across Chui Tong Road are the commercial development at Centro (BH: 10 storeys / 47.5mPD) and the residential development at Lakeside Garden (BH: 13 storeys / 44.2mPD). To the south across Hong Tsuen Road are a car park, some temporary structures and vegetated hills;
- (b) in order to substantiate the proposed minor relaxation of PR, the applicants proposed several design measures, including building setback of not less than 7.5m from the centreline of roads, greenery of not less than 20%, projected façade length of less than 60m, no-podium design and vertical green walls. Given the OZP has restricted maximum SC to 40%, there should be ample scope for the above measures without the need for relaxation of PR. Moreover, such measures are primarily for the benefits of their own residents and visitors. There are no apparent merits that would be of public benefit and no specific design measures that would constitute innovative design adapted to the characteristics of the Sites. Nonetheless, the proposed developments with minor relaxation of PR is not expected to cause significant visual impact and is considered not incompatible with the surrounding rural-urban context;

Landscape

- (c) no comment on the applications and no adverse comment on the landscape proposal (Appendix 4 in **Appendix If-1** and **Drawings A-2, A-7d, A-7e, A-8d, A-8e, A-9d, A-9e, A-10d, A-10e, A-11d** and **A-11e**) from landscape planning perspective; and
- (d) in view that the Sites are not located at landscape sensitive zone and significant adverse landscape impact caused by the proposed developments is not anticipated, it is considered not necessary to impose a landscape condition in the planning permission should the applications be approved by the Board.

Drainage and Sewerage

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

- (a) provided that adequate stormwater drainage facilities will be provided in connection with the proposed developments to deal with the surface runoff of the Sites without causing any adverse drainage impacts or nuisance to the adjoining areas, there is no in-principle objection to the applications from a drainage maintenance viewpoint; and

- (b) no comments on the SIA (Chapter 6 of Appendix 6 in **Appendix If-2**).

8.1.7 Comments of DEP:

no comments on the SIA (Chapter 6 of Appendix 6 in **Appendix If-2**).

Building Matters

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

no in-principle objection under the Buildings Ordinance on the planning applications subject to the following comments:

- (a) barrier free access and facilities including accessible lift and accessible carpark should be provided under Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) 72;
- (b) applicants' attention should be drawn to the policy on GFA concessions under PNAP APP-151, in particular, the 10% overall cap on GFA concessions and where appropriate, the Sustainable Building Design requirements including building setback and building separation under PNAP APP-152;
- (c) emergency vehicular access (EVA) complying with B(P)R 41D shall be provided for building within the Sites; and
- (d) the Sites intended to be used for RCHE are required to comply with the building safety and other relevant requirements as may be imposed by the licensing authority, if applicable.

Fire Safety

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

- (a) no in-principle objection to the applications subject to:
 - i) fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of D of FS;
 - ii) height restriction stipulated in Section 20 of the Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) Regulation (Cap. 459A) is observed; and
 - iii) safety distance from all fuelling facilities in the petrol filling cum LPG station in the proximity of the Sites should conform with the requirements stipulated in the "Guidance for the Design, Construction, Modification, Maintenance and Decommissioning of Filling Stations (4th edition)" jointly published by the Association for Petroleum and Explosive Administration and the Energy Institute (for Sites A, C and E only);

- (b) detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plan or referral from relevant licensing authority; and
- (c) the emergency vehicular access provision in the Sites shall comply with the standard as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 under the B(P)R 41D which is administrated by the BD.

Risk Aspect

8.1.10 Comments of DEP:

no comment from chlorine risk perspective on the QRA on PKWTW (Appendix 9 in **Appendix If-2**). It is noted that the individual risks and societal risks associated with the PKWTW complies with the Hong Kong Risk Guidelines.

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

no comment on the QRAs on town gas safety and LPG station (Appendices 7 and 8 in **Appendix If-2**) from regulatory services perspective.

Social Welfare

8.1.12 Comments of the Director of Social Welfare (DSW):

- (a) the demand for subsidised residential care services (RCS) for the elderly over the territory is keen. As at August 2020, there are 39,708 waitlistees on the central waiting list applying for various types of RCS places, with an average waiting time for care-and-attention places and nursing home places at 23 months and 29 months respectively. While the RCS is planned on a five-cluster basis and Sai Kung falls within the East Kowloon Cluster, there are 5,324 subsidised and 6,299 non-subsidised RCS places provided in the East Kowloon Cluster as at 30.6.2020, whereas Sai Kung District has 1,281 subsidised and 998 non-subsidised RCS places respectively;
- (b) it is noted that the applicants intend to develop private RCHEs at the Sites, but do not rule out the possibility of joining the Enhanced Bought Place Scheme (EBPS);
- (c) the applicants should ensure that the design and construction of the RCHE shall comply with all relevant licensing and statutory requirements including but not limited to i) Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123) and Regulations, ii) Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) Ordinance (Cap. 459) and its subsidiary legislation and iii) latest version of Code of Practice of Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons);

- (d) the applicants should be requested to incorporate subvented welfare facilities at the Sites in view of acute welfare demand. If affirmative, DSW should be advised on the area available for incorporating welfare facilities for further processing;
- (e) under section 20 of the Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) Regulation, no part of a RCHE shall be situated at a height more than 24 metres above the ground floor, measuring vertically from the ground of the building to the floor of the premises in which the RCHE is to be situated; and
- (f) detailed comments from the service and operation points of view is at **Appendix III**.

District Officer's Comments

8.1.13 Comments of the District Officer/Sai Kung, Home Affairs Department (DO/SK, HAD):

- (a) no comment on the applications. However, local views should be fully considered. The former Chairman of Sai Kung District Council (SKDC), Chairman of Sai Kung Rural Committee and Chairman of Sai Kung Area Committee object to the applications. Their main concern is that the proposed developments will add extra loading of traffic in Hiram's Highway and overload the public healthcare services and ambulance services in Tseung Kwan O; and
- (b) no further comments heard from the locals since September 2019.

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

- (a) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, HyD (CHE/NTE, HyD);
- (b) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD);
- (c) Chief Engineer (Works), HAD; and
- (d) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department.

9. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Periods

9.1 The applications and the subsequent FI submissions were published for public inspection on 6.9.2019, 3.1.2020, 29.5.2020, 30.6.2020, 4.8.2020, 11.9.2020, 29.9.2020 and 6.11.2020. During the statutory public inspection periods, a total of 389 comments have been received for the five applications, all raising objection to/concern over the applications. Amongst all the comments, 40 submissions are made for all the five applications while some commenters make similar submissions for each of the applications separately. The commenters include SKDC Members, a former Legislative Council Member, the former SKDC Chairman, the Sai Kung Rural Committee, Sai Kung Planning Concern Front, a "Village Chief" of Nam Wai, Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd. and individuals. 123 public comments are

submitted in the form of three types of standard letters (with 25 comments in the first type (**Appendix IVa**), 95 comments in the second type (**Appendix IVb**) and 3 comments in the third type (**Appendix IVc**)). Due to the relatively large volume of the public comments, a full set of public comments received on the applications is deposited at the Board's Secretariat for Members' inspection and reference. A breakdown of the comments received on each of the applications is given below:

Application No.	No. of Comments
A/SK-SKT/23	98
A/SK-SKT/24	72
A/SK-SKT/25	71
A/SK-SKT/26	72
A/SK-SKT/27	76
TOTAL	389

9.2 The grounds of objection and concerns are summarised below:

- (a) no need for combined development of 'Flats' and 'Social Welfare Facility', and no need for the applicants to seek minor relaxation of PR restriction if 'Flats' are not proposed;
- (b) excessive building height of 8 storeys would induce potential risk to fire safety and not in line with relevant guidelines;
- (c) excessive SC, leaving insufficient outdoor space for future users;
- (d) posing health risk, e.g. difficulty in controlling pandemic outbreak, due to excessive scale and density of RCHE development, as well as the usage of central air conditioning system;
- (e) overtaxing the capacity of local transport and the road network and posing traffic safety risk as well as potential sewerage, air quality, noise, and risk issues;
- (f) overstraining emergency, medical and social welfare facilities in Sai Kung; and
- (g) the developer lacks genuine intention in developing RCHE.

9.3 Some commenters made proposals which are summarised below:

- (a) the Sites should be amalgamated for more efficient land use/ all the proposed developments should be implemented concurrently;
- (b) the proposed flats should be assigned for RCHE bedspaces;
- (c) community facilities, such as an organic farm and a geriatrics polyclinic, which is open to public, should be set up at the Sites;
- (d) the applicants should provide ambulances stationed at the proposed developments, which should also serve the need of Sai Kung residents;
- (e) shuttle bus services should be provided for connection to transport nodes;
- (f) Sai Kung residents should be prioritised in the allocation of bedspaces and the RCHE services should be priced reasonably and affordably; and
- (g) a QRA should be conducted to evaluate the potential risk of the existing high pressure gas pipeline along Hiram's Highway.

10. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 10.1 The applicants seek planning permissions for redevelopments of the Sites which are zoned “R(E)1” and minor portions of areas shown as ‘Road’ on the OZP into five 8-storey buildings:

(a)	Application No. A/SK-SKT/23	(Block 1 in Site A)	Proposed RCHE and flat with minor relaxation of PR restriction from 2 to 2.8 (+40%);
(b)	Application No. A/SK-SKT/24	(Block 2 in Site B)	Proposed RCHE with minor relaxation of PR restriction from 2 to 2.8 (+40%);
(c)	Application No. A/SK-SKT/25	(Block 3 in Site C)	Proposed RCHE and flat use with minor relaxation of PR restriction from 2 to 2.8 (+40%);
(d)	Application No. A/SK-SKT/26	(Block 4 in Site D)	Proposed RCHE with minor relaxation of PR restriction from 2 to 2.74 (+37%); and
(e)	Application No. A/SK-SKT/27	(Block 5 in Site E)	Proposed RCHE with minor relaxation of PR restriction from 2 to 2.77 (+39%).

Planning Intention

- 10.2 The planning intention of the “R(E)1” zone is primarily for phasing out of existing industrial uses through redevelopment for residential use. ‘Social Welfare Facility’ and ‘Flat’ uses within the “R(E)1” zone require planning permission from the Board 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 applications cover all the five existing industrial buildings in the subject “R(E)1” zone. Though the applicants have not indicated that the proposed developments are to be implemented in one go, it is noted that the anticipated completion year for all the proposed developments are targeted for year 2023 and assumed for the technical assessments. The redevelopment proposals are in line with the planning intention regarding phasing out of existing industrial use.
- 10.3 The proposed developments are mainly for RCHE, with flat use proposed in Sites A and C and flat use constitutes about 32.1% and 40.3% respectively of the GFA of the two sites³. Though the proposed developments are in general not entirely in line with the planning intention of redevelopment of the sites for residential use, RCHE is a kind of residential use provided in the form of social welfare facility.

Justification for Relaxations of PR Restriction

- 10.4 The applicants also apply for minor relaxations of PR from 2 to 2.8 (+40%) for Sites A to C, to 2.74 (+37%) for Site D and to 2.77 (+39%) for Site E. The whole “R(E)1” zone covers an area of about 16,439m² whilst the sum of site areas of the five applications is about 11,662m² (about 71%). The applicants claim that the development of each site within the “R(E)1” zone at PR 2 cannot optimise the anticipated total GFA of the zone and as such, the applicants propose to include the area covered by existing roads and sitting-out area at the eastern portion of the “R(E)1” zone (all on government land of 4,777m² as claimed by the applicants) into

³ Flat use constitutes about 19.2% of the total GFA of the five developments.

PR calculation. However, such areas are not forming part of the Sites of the proposed developments. It should be noted that the OZP is to indicate the broad land-use zonings and the “R(E)1” zone would allow flexibility that the individual industrial site may be amalgamated to provide a more comprehensive redevelopment and to allow urban design elements including stepped building height profile as suggested in the ES of the OZP. While the applications are for five individual developments at the respective sites and the applicants propose to maximise the development potentials of the Sites which is merely for the benefit of the individual proposed development, there is no justification to include the areas occupied by existing roads and sitting-out area for the purpose of PR calculation and to transfer the GFA into the proposed developments through minor relaxations of PR for individual development sites under application.

- 10.5 According to the ES of the OZP, minor relaxation of the development restrictions may be considered by the Board to provide flexibility for innovative design adapted to the characteristics of particular sites. Notwithstanding the applicants have proposed some urban design and landscape measures (**Drawings A-2, A-7d, A-7e, A-8d, A-8e, A-9d, A-9e, A-10d, A-10e, A-11d and A-11e**), including building setback of not less than 7.5m from the centerline of roads, greenery of not less than 20%, projected façade length of less than 60m, no-podium design and vertical green walls, some of the measures are requirements set out in the SBD Guidelines which are required to be adhered to. CTP/UD&L, PlanD also advises that given the Sites are restricted to a maximum SC of 40% under the Notes of the “R(E)1” zone, there should be ample scope for the above measures without the need for relaxation of PR. The proposed measures are also considered primarily for the benefits of the residents and visitors in the future developments. There are no apparent merits that would be of public benefit and no specific design measures that would constitute innovative design adapted to the characteristics of the Sites. Besides, in achieving the proposed development intensity of the proposed developments, it is noted that the BH profile with building blocks arranged in a stepped manner as specified in the ES of the OZP (paragraph 7.2 refers) would not be adhered to. The applicants fail to provide strong justifications and design merits to support the proposed relaxation of the PR of the Sites.

Land Use Compatibility and Visual and Landscape Impact

- 10.6 With the redevelopment of all the five industrial buildings to flat/RCHE uses, the area will in general become a mix of medium-density residential developments, commercial and GIC uses. The proposed developments are considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments. CTP/UD&L, PlanD advises that the Sites are not located at landscape sensitive zone and significant adverse landscape impact is not anticipated and the proposed developments with minor relaxations of PR are not expected to cause significant visual impact and are considered not incompatible with the surrounding rural-urban context.

Provision of RCHE

- 10.7 DSW advises that there is a keen demand for subsidised residential care service (RCS) over the territory. According to DSW, as at 30.6.2020, there are 1,281 subsidised and 998 non-subsidised RCS places respectively in Sai Kung District. It is estimated that there is a deficit of 78 and 1,448 RCHE subsidised beds for the

planned population in Sai Kung Town area and Sai Kung District⁴ respectively according to requirements under the HKPSG. The proposed addition of about 1,403 RCHE bedspaces, if materialised, represents a significant increase to the current provision of RCS in the district. It is noted that the applicants intend to develop private RCHEs and not ruling out the possibility of joining the EBPS.

Technical Considerations

- 10.8 On traffic aspect, in view of the concerns on v/c ratio of both Hiram's Highway and Po Tung Road (Yau Ma Po Road – Fuk Man Road) in design year 2026 under the TIA submitted by the applicants (Appendix 5 in **Appendix If-1**), C for T has requested an approval condition on no population intake prior to the completion of the HH2 Project be imposed. In this regard, CE5/MW, MWPMO, HyD advises that the proposed works for the HH2 Project have yet to be authorised, and the completion date of the HH2 Project is still uncertain at this moment and it is subject to the progress of Public Works Programme procedures. Should the applications be approved, occupation of the proposed developments would be subject to the completion of the HH2 Project, so as to address any potential traffic impact arising from the proposed developments.
- 10.9 The applicants have submitted various technical assessments including TIA, EA, QRAs and WSIA, relevant departments including C for T, CHE/NTE, HyD, DEP, CE/MS, DSD, CE/C, WSD and DEMS have no in-principle objection to the applications on technical aspects.

Previous Applications

- 10.10 Sites C, D and E are the subject of previous planning permissions for primarily residential use with minor relaxation of PR (Applications No. A/SK-SKT/10 and 14) granted in 22.1.2016 and 2.3.2018 respectively (**Plans A-1** and **A-2**). Permission granted under Application No. A/SK-SKT/10 has lapsed and the permission for Application No. A/SK-SKT/14 is still valid. The previous approvals were granted as the proposed developments were generally in line with the planning intention of the "R(E)1" zone and the proposed minor relaxations of PR (+6.5% and +1.8% respectively) were solely to cater for the technical issue of excluding areas shown as 'Road' from the respectively private lots, and were minor in nature. Compared to the current applications for Site C, D and E, the applied use are mainly for RCHE with relaxations of PR of +40%, +37% and +39% respectively.

Public Comments

- 10.11 There are 389 public comments, all raising objection to/ concern over the applications, received during the statutory public periods for the applications and subsequent FI submissions. Regarding the views that flats should not be developed at the Sites, the concerns on intensity/ density and scale of the proposed developments, impacts on traffic and other infrastructure and potential environmental impacts, the planning considerations and assessments in paragraphs 10.2 to 10.10 above are relevant. As for the provision of emergency and medical services, they would be monitored and assessed by the relevant departments. On the

⁴ Excluding Anderson Road Quarry site and areas not covered by statutory plans.

detailed design and operation of the proposed RCHE, DSW advises that the applicants shall comply with the relevant licensing and statutory requirements.

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 does not support the five applications for the following reason:

the applicant(s) fails to provide strong planning justifications and design merits to justify for the proposed minor relaxation(s) of PR.

11.2 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to approve the application(s), it is suggested that the permission(s) shall be valid until 18.12.2024, and after the said date, the permission(s) shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development(s) permitted is commenced or the permission(s) is renewed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members' consideration:

Approval Conditions

- (a) no population intake of the proposed development shall be taken place before the completion of the Hiram's Highway Improvement Stage 2 project;
- (b) the submission of a revised traffic impact assessment and the implementation of traffic improvement measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the submission of a revised noise impact assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein to meet the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines requirements to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the submission of a land contamination assessment in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to the development of the Site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (e) the provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory Clauses

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

12. Decision Sought

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

13. Attachments

Appendix Ia	Application form of Application No. A/SK-SKT/23 received on 28.8.2019
Appendix Ib	Application form of Application No. A/SK-SKT/24 received on 28.8.2019
Appendix Ic	Application form of Application No. A/SK-SKT/25 received on 28.8.2019
Appendix Id	Application form of Application No. A/SK-SKT/26 received on 28.8.2019
Appendix Ie	Application form of Application No. A/SK-SKT/27 received on 28.8.2019
Appendices If, If-1 and If-2	FI received on 30.11.2020 providing Consolidated Supplementary Planning Statement and Technical Assessments
Appendix II	Previous Applications
Appendix III	Detailed Comments from Government Departments
Appendices IVa to IVc	Public Comments
Appendix V	Advisory Clauses
Drawing A-1	Master Layout Plan
Drawing A-2	Landscape Master Plan
Drawing A-3	Section Plan
Drawing A-4	Location Plan of Selected Viewpoints
Drawings A-5 and A-6	Photomontages at Selected Viewpoints
Drawings A-7a to A-7e	Site A – Layout Plan of G/F, Layout Plan of 1-6/F, Schematic Section Plan, Landscape Plan and Landscape Section
Drawings A-8a to A-8e	Site B – Layout Plan of G/F, Layout Plan of Typical Floors, Schematic Section Plan, Landscape Plan and Landscape Section
Drawings A-9a to A-9e	Site C – Layout Plan of G/F, Layout Plan of Typical Floors, Schematic Section Plan, Landscape Plan and Landscape Section
Drawings A-10a to A-10e	Site D – Layout Plan of G/F, Layout Plan of 1-6/F, Schematic Section Plan, Landscape Plan and Landscape Section
Drawings A-11a to A-11e	Site E – Layout Plan of G/F, Layout Plan of 1-6/F,

Plan A-1	Schematic Section Plan, Landscape Plan and Landscape Section
Plan A-2	Location Plan
Plan A-3	Site Plan
Plans A-4a to A-4d	Aerial Photo
	Site Photos

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
DECEMBER 2020**