

RNTPC Paper No. A/TSW/72C
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

APPLICATION NO. A/TSW/72

- Applicant** : Harbour Plaza Resort City Limited represented by Kenneth To and Associates Limited
- Site** : Tin Shui Wai Town Lot (TSWTL) No. 4, 12 and 18 Tin Yan Road, Tin Shui Wai, N.T.
- Site Area** : About 27,900 m²
- Lease** : New Grant No. 3466
(a) Restricted to non-industrial (excluding godown) purposes
(b) The total Gross Floor Area (GFA) of building(s) erected on TSWTL Nos. 1 to 7, for either residential and non-residential purposes shall be specified in the Development Schedule of the Master Layout Plan (MLP)¹, shall not exceed 972,000m² for residential purposes and shall not exceed a total of 135,000m² for non-domestic purposes for all seven lots.
- Plan** : Approved Tin Shui Wai (TSW) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TSW/14
- Zoning** : “Commercial” (“C”)
[On land designated “C” at TSWTL No. 4, no new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum GFA of 135,000m²; and the distribution of the non-domestic GFA amongst the sites under this zone and the “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) sites at TSWTLs No. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 would be controlled by the submission of MLPs^{1 & 2}.]
- Application** : Proposed Flat and Permitted Commercial Development with Minor Relaxation of GFA Restriction

¹ Master Layout Plan (MLP) refers to that governed by the Lease. Under the Lease, the total non-domestic GFA of the seven lots is restricted to a maximum of 135,000m². The existing non-domestic GFA of TSWTL No. 4 is about 108,082m² and that of TSWTLs No. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 is about 26,917m² in total.

² According to the Notes of the OZP for “R(B)” zone, the total non-domestic GFA of TSWTLs No. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 and the site zoned “C” at TSWTL No. 4 shall not exceed 135,000m².

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission to use the application site (the Site) for proposed flat and permitted commercial development with minor relaxation of GFA restriction from 135,000m² to 187,436m² (i.e. +52,436m² or +38.84%) (**Plan A-1**). The Site falls within an area zoned “C” on the OZP. According to the Notes of the OZP for “C” zone, ‘Flat’ is a Column 2 use which requires planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board), whilst commercial use is permitted as of right. The “C” zone is restricted to a maximum GFA of 135,000m² and there is no building height (BH) restriction on the OZP. Based on the individual merits of a development or redevelopment proposal, minor relaxation of the GFA restriction may be considered by the Board on application.
- 1.2 The Site is located at TSWTL No. 4 and comprises two separate land parcels (i.e. TSW Areas 20 and 23 respectively) (**Plan A-1**). The Site is currently occupied by two 24/25-storey hotel blocks, i.e. Harbour Plaza Resort City (Towers 1 and 2) cum a 3-storey commercial podium, i.e. +WOO Phase One and Fortune Kingswood Two, and two levels of basement with a total GFA of about 108,082m² and BH of about 100mPD (**Plans A-4a and A-4b**). The existing hotel development, which was completed in 1999, currently provides 1,102 hotel rooms. The applicant proposes to redevelop the two existing 24/25-storey hotel blocks into two 51-storey residential towers (including 1 level of sky garden) cum the existing 3-storey commercial podium and 2-level basements with a total GFA of about 187,436m² and maximum BH of about 171.5mPD (**Drawing A-8**). The existing commercial podium for eating place, shop and services and place of entertainment with a GFA of about 47,936m² will be retained with addition and alteration works to be carried out only (**Drawings A-4 to A-6**).
- 1.3 With the addition of 139,500m² domestic GFA, the total GFA would be 187,436m² and hence the applicant applies for relaxation of GFA from 135,000m² to 187,436m² (i.e. an increase of 52,436m² or +38.84%). The proposed residential development will provide a maximum of 5,000 flats at a domestic plot ratio (PR) of 5.0 and the total PR of the whole development will be about 6.718 including the existing non-domestic PR of 1.718 for the commercial podium. The proposed development will provide a total of 980 car parking spaces, 50 motorcycle parking spaces, 150 bicycle parking spaces and 49 loading/unloading bays for goods vehicles at the existing basement levels (**Drawings A-2 and A-3**). The proposed development will accommodate a population of about 7,500 persons and is scheduled for completion in a short term.
- 1.4 The major development parameters of the proposed development are summarised as follows:

Development Parameters	Proposed Scheme
Site Area	About 27,900 m ²

Development Parameters	Proposed Scheme
Proposed Use	Proposed Flat and Permitted Commercial Development with Minor Relaxation of Gross Floor Area Restriction
Total PR	6.718
- Domestic	5.0
- Non-domestic	1.718
Total GFA	Not more than 187,436 m ²
- Domestic GFA	139,500 m ²
- Non-domestic GFA	47,936 m ²
No. of Blocks	2
Building Height	156.375 mPD - 171.5 mPD
No. of Storeys	51 residential floors (including 1 level of sky garden)* with 3 levels of commercial podium and 2 levels of basement
No. of Flats	Maximum 5,000
Domestic Site Coverage	Not more than 33.33% (about 25% under the proposed scheme)
Average Flat Size	27.9 m ²
Private Open Space	Not less than 7,500 m ²
Private Car Parking Spaces	980
- Domestic	374
- Residential	364 (including 4 accessible car parking spaces)
- Visitor	10
- Non-domestic (commercial)	606 (including 6 accessible car parking spaces)
Motorcycle parking spaces (residential)	50
Bicycle parking	150
Loading/Unloading Bays	
- Residential	2
- Commercial	47
Estimated Population	7,500 persons

* excluding G/F lobby, transfer plate and E&M zone (**Drawing A-8**)

1.5 With a view to making the proposed residential cum commercial development the signature buildings in the town centre while in keeping with the character of surrounding areas, the applicant proposes to incorporate a range of design measures into the proposed residential cum commercial development. As illustrated in **Drawings A-8 to A-12 and A-19 to A-21**, the proposed design measures include:

- (i) variation in building height profile with introduction of obvious stepping at the roof level with maximum BH at 171.5mPD stepping down to about 156.375mPD (**Drawing A-12**) (i.e. similar to the BH of the adjacent residential development Central Park Towers of 158mPD);

- (ii) adoption of innovative building design with incorporation of articulated edges on residential blocks and the choice of building finishes including transparent materials and vertical greening;
- (iii) introduction of sky gardens with high headroom of about 7m to breakdown the visual mass of the proposed development;
- (iv) incorporation of multi-levelled landscape framework along podium edges to soften the development mass and to make a transition of building façade greenery towards down to the ground level greenery of TSW Park;
- (v) 10 to 12m building setback of the residential towers to allow more openness and visual relief of the TSW Park;
- (vi) maintaining existing view corridor of about 110m between the two towers to enhance the visual permeability and breezeway;
- (vii) introduction of retail facilities and informal activity spaces, i.e. stepped seating complementing with feature trees and sculptures at ground floor to enhance the liveliness of the neighbourhood; and
- (viii) provision of 8,370m² planting areas for tree/shrub/grass in the communal and open area (i.e. not less than 30% of the site area) at both ground and podium levels to create a high quality living and greening environment.

1.6 The site location plan, comparison floor plans between the existing hotel development and the proposed development, section plan, landscape plan, open space plan, green coverage plan, building setback and building separation plan, photomontages and artist's impression of the proposed development submitted by the applicant to support the application are shown in **Drawings A-1 to A-21** respectively. Besides, the applicant also submitted various technical assessment reports including Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Environmental Noise Impact Assessment, Environmental Air Quality Impact Assessment, Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA), Air Ventilation Assessment - Expert Evaluation (AVA-EE), Visual Appraisal as well as Landscape Plan and Tree Survey Report to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the proposed development.

1.7 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:

- (a) Application Form received on 31.12.2018 **(Appendix I)**
- (b) Further Information (FI) received on 16.11.2020 enclosing **(Appendix Ia)**
a consolidated planning statement and technical assessments report
(exempted from publication and recounting requirements)
[Planning statement received on 31.12.2018, and FIs received on 13.2.2019, 4.4.2019, 31.7.2019, 6.9.2019, 21.10.2019, 28.11.2019, 7.1.2020, 28.2.2020, 25.3.2020, 26.6.2020, 17.8.2020, 4.9.2020 and 4.11.2020 were superseded and not attached]
- (c) FI received on 9.12.2020 enclosing responses to **(Appendix Ib)**
departmental comments and clarification on occupancy

rate and completion year of the hotels, proposed site coverage and provision of welfare facilities

- 1.8 On 31.5.2019, 15.5.2020 and 23.10.2020, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board decided to defer decision on the application for 2 months each, as requested by the applicant, to allow sufficient time for the preparation of FI(s) to address comments from various Government departments. The applicant submitted FIs as mentioned in paragraph 1.7 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 the supplementary planning statement at **Appendix Ia**. They can be summarized as follows:

- (a) Between mid-2012 and end-2017, the Board has approved planning applications for relaxing the development intensity of 49 housing sites which contributed to supply of about 10,540 additional housing units. So the proposed development is in line with the Government's policy to optimize land utilization and increase housing supply by adding 5,000 units within a short time frame by 2022³ to meet the imminent territorial-wide housing needs.
- (b) As located in the district centre of TSW New Town, the proposed domestic PR of 5.0 (on top of existing non-domestic plot ratio of 1.718) for the Site is compatible with the development intensity of the surrounding developments with PR restriction of not more than 5.0.
- (c) The proposed development together with other private residential development initiatives in the new town will further improve the public/private housing ratio from 81:19 to 72:28 in TSW New Town.
- (d) With the adoption of architectural articulations and high quality and distinctive architectural design, the proposed development would become the signature landmark buildings to help reinforce the position of the Site as the district focal point. The BH in the vicinity is up to 158.6mPD. As such, the maximum BH of the proposed residential development of 171.5mPD is of similar scale to the adjacent development and response to the urban design principles for TSW New Town with BH descending from the central core towards the rural edges.
- (e) The Site is highly accessible by public transport, cycling and on foot. The proposed residential development cum a commercial podium is highly suitable in the land use context of TSW which is a high-density residential neighbourhood. Previous planning approvals for residential use within the "C" zones in other districts demonstrated that 'Flat' is a suitable and compatible use at commercial sites.

³ Estimated by the applicant at the time of submission of the application in 2018.

- (f) To enhance the visual compatibility, the proposed development will adopt innovative building design with incorporation of articulated edges on residential blocks, transparent building finishes materials, ample vertical greening, sky-gardens, etc. The proposed development will also offer an opportunity for improvement to the quality of the local landscape context through building setbacks and multi-levelled landscape framework along podium edges at the development. The existing view corridor of about 110m between the proposed two residential towers will be maintained to enhance the visual permeability and breezeway between the New Town and the surrounding rural landscape area.
- (g) Various technical assessments conducted have demonstrated that the proposed development with appropriate mitigation measures would not result in any adverse traffic, environmental, air quality, noise, drainage, sewerage, visual, landscape and air ventilation impacts onto the surrounding environment.
- (h) Job opportunities will be created during construction and upon operation (i.e. property management and serving/cleaning staff) of the proposed residential development. Hence, local employment opportunity associated with the proposed development would still be available.
- (i) Good site management and air pollution control measures will be implemented during construction stage to minimize potential air quality impact. Appropriate piling method such as non-percussive piling for foundation and excavation and lateral support work will be adopted to minimize the noise and vibration generated throughout the construction period. All construction works will be conducted in compliance with the requirements of Buildings Department and Environmental Protection Department.
- (j) The applicant is willing to explore the provision of a child care centre in the development at the detailed design stage.

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

The applicant is one of the “current land owners” and has complied with the requirements as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Satisfying the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements under Sections 12A and 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 31A) by posting site notice and sending notice to another owner by registered mail. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection.

4. Background

4.1 According to the records of the Lands Department, TSWTL No. 4 (i.e. the Site) together with TSWTLs No. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 are all governed by New Grant No.

3466 dated 21.5.1985 (see paragraph 9.1.1 below).

4.2 The draft TSW OZP No. S/TSW/1, which showed the land uses in the southern part of TSW New Town (where the Site is located), was exhibited under the Town Planning Ordinance on 21.10.1994. Subsequently, the OZP was amended and the draft TSW OZP No. S/TSW/2, which also showed the land uses in the northern part of TSW New Town, was exhibited on 18.7.1997. On 1.12.1998, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft OZP, which was subsequently renumbered as approved TSW OZP No. S/TSW/3. The subject “C” zone covering the Site has been incorporated on the OZP since the draft TSW OZP No. S/TSW/1 gazetted in 1994. As stipulated in the Explanatory Statement of the then OZP, the “C” zone is intended to serve as a town centre providing retailing and commercial facilities for TSW. The GFA restrictions for the “C” zone as well as those of the “R(B)” zones on the OZP covering TSWTLs No. 1 to 7 are generally to reflect those restrictions as already stipulated in the lease.

4.3 The existing hotel cum commercial development at the Site was completed in 1999.

5. Previous Application

The Site is not the subject of any previous application.

6. Similar Application

There is no similar application for ‘flat’ use and/or minor relaxation of GFA restriction in the subject “C” zone on the OZP.

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

7.1 The Site is:

- (a) located at the southern part of TSW New Town and comprises two separate land parcels namely TSW Areas 20 and 23;
- (b) currently being used as two 24/25-storey hotel blocks namely Harbour Plaza Resort City (Towers 1 and 2) (providing 1,102 hotel rooms) with two 3-storey shopping centres namely +WOO Phase One and Fortune Kingswood Two; and
- (c) accessible from Tin Yan Road.

7.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics (**Plan A-2**):

- (a) to its immediate northwest is the TSW Public Transport Interchange (Bus Terminus). To its further north and northwest are private residential developments of Central Park Towers and a proposed private residential development on top of the Tin Wing Light Rail Stop with valid planning permission (Application No. A/TSW/64) which is under construction;
- (b) to its east and northeast across Tin Yan Road and Tin Shing Road are private residential developments of Lynwood Court and Kenswood Court, schools of TSW Catholic Primary School, Queen Elizabeth School Old Students' Secondary School and Talent Kindergarten, and Tin Pak Road Park;
- (c) to its immediate south and southwest is the district park i.e. TSW Park; and
- (d) an open space named Ginza Square (zoned "O" on the OZP) is located in between the two land parcels of the Site.

8. Planning Intention

- 8.1 The planning intention of the "C" zone is primarily for commercial developments, which may include shop, services, place of entertainment and eating place, functioning mainly as local shopping centres serving the immediate neighbourhood.
- 8.2 As stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP, the Sites zoned "C" are developed as the town centre providing retail and other commercial facilities to serve TSW New Town. The development and future redevelopment of the zone was governed by the Conditions of Grant and the MLP approved under the lease. To provide flexibility for innovative design adapted to the characteristics of particular sites, minor relaxation of the restrictions stated in the Notes may be considered by the Board through the planning permission system. Each proposal will be considered on its individual planning merits.

9. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

- 9.1 The following Government departments have been consulted and their views on the application and the public comments received are summarised as follows:

Land Administration

- 9.1.1 Comments of the District Land Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department (DLO/YL, LandsD):

- (a) The subject lot (i.e. TSWTL No.4) together with other lots (i.e. TSWTL No. 1 to 3, 5 to 7) are all governed by New Grant No. 3466 dated 21.5.1985 as varied and modified by various modification

letters (hereinafter collectively referred to the New Grant) for non-industrial (excluding godown) purposes. Under Special Condition (“S.C.”) (10) of the New Grant, the total GFA of building(s) erected on all of the lots, i.e. the subject lot and the other lots, for either residential or non-residential purposes shall be specified in the Development Schedule of the MLP as referred to in S.C. (4)(a)(I) of the New Grant, which shall not exceed 972,000m² for residential purposes and shall not exceed a total of 135,000m² for non-domestic purposes for all seven lots.

- (b) According to the S.C. (8)(a) of the New Grant, the lot shall be developed in all respects complying with the MLP and the Landscaping Proposals.
- (c) The GFA figures and relevant details of the existing development as mentioned in the planning statement have not been verified at this stage. It will be considered in detail at the lease modification application stage.
- (d) The proposed parking provision would be greatly increased. Noting that the existing basements (B2/F and B1/F) would be retained, the applicant should clarify how the retained basements could accommodate the additional parking provisions. Transport Department (TD)’s comment on this aspect should be sought.
- (e) Should the Board approve the planning application, the owners are required to apply to LandsD for modification of the lease and amendment of MLP or Landscaping proposals, if applicable, for the proposed scheme. However, there is no guarantee that the said application, including the granting of any Government land (if any), will be approved. Such application will be dealt with by LandsD acting in the capacity as the landlord at LandsD’s discretion, and if it is approved will be subject to such terms and conditions including among others, the payment of such appropriate fees as may be imposed by LandsD.
- (f) His other comments are also detailed in **Appendix II**.

Traffic

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

The planning application is considered acceptable to TD, with the following approval conditions suggested:

- (i) the design and provision of junction improvement works to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (ii) the design and provision of ingress/egress point, vehicular access, parking spaces, loading/unloading and lay-by facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board.

9.1.3 Comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (CHE/NTW, HyD):

- (a) The access arrangement should be commented by TD.
- (b) If the proposed access arrangement is agreed by TD, any necessary road modification and/or road realignment shall be implemented by the applicant at its own cost to the satisfaction of TD and HyD.
- (c) Adequate drainage measures should be provided at the site access to prevent surface water flowing from the Site to nearby public roads/drains.

Environment

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

- (a) He has no objection to the application. However, according to the Sewerage Impact Assessment report, it is noted that there will be some upgrading works. So it is suggested to impose the following approval conditions:
 - (i) the submission of a revised Noise Impact Assessment Report before commencement of the construction works, including site formation works and piling works, and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
 - (ii) the submission of a Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services and the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board; and
 - (iii) in relation to (ii) above, the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Revised Sewerage Impact

Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board.

- (b) The applicant should be reminded to address the following technical comment in the Noise Impact Assessment report to be submitted under the planning approval condition:

the applicant should address any possible squeal noise from Light Rail Transit, having regard to any squeal noise heard during the on-site measurement of Sound Exposure Level, distance from Noise Sensitive Receivers to curved track and radius of curvature of the track.

Urban Design, Air Ventilation and Landscape Aspects

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

Urban Design

- (a) The Site is zoned “C” on the current TSW OZP No. S/TSW/14 and is at a bay between the Tin Shui Wai Park and Tin Yan Road. Currently the Site is a hotel cum retail and commercial facilities (at 3-storey podium) at 24 to 25 storeys (i.e. from about 98 to 99mPD). On its surrounding context, the height of the proposed development would not be visually incompatible with other surrounding developments, such as the future Tin Wing LRT Station residential development (at about 143mPD) under the approved planning application No. A/TSW/64 and the existing residential development of Central Park Tower (at about 158mPD) to the northwest of the site, according to the visual appraisal submitted by the applicant.
- (b) The Site is also located in the core of existing TSW Park. According to para. 10.6.3 in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the TSW OZP, the TSW Park together with other open spaces in Areas 107 and 117 has formed as a visual corridor running in a northwest to southeast direction to provide the visual link with Lau Fau Shan and Wang Chau. This visual corridor serves as visual linkage between the New Town and the surrounding rural landscape. There are some residential developments such as Central Park Towers, Chestwood Court, Lynwood Court and Kenwood Court, etc. surrounding the TSW Park. Two residential developments namely Central Park Tower (about 158mPD) and another Chestwood Court (about 101mPD) are located on the peripheral areas of the Park. Other government, institution and community uses are also in the vicinity, such as public transport interchange, swimming pool, sports ground,

parks and schools.

- (c) The applicant seeks approval for a development involving two buildings with modification of the existing commercial podium and redevelopment of the existing hotel for residential use. In the submitted FI, the latest development proposal (i.e. Table 4.1 in 'Annex A') mainly includes (i) relaxation of total GFA to 187,436m² under plot ratio (PR) of 6.718 (i.e. domestic PR of 5 and non-domestic PR of 1.718); (ii) new provision of 5,000 residential units; and (iii) the maximum building height ranging from 171.5mPD to 156.375mPD, i.e. 50 storeys (excluding 1 level of skygarden, G/F lobby and 2 levels of basement).
- (d) According to the applicant's submission, the proposed development would serve as a definable landmark building in TSW New Town to promote orientation and way-finding of the town centre which is currently lacking (Para. 3.4.1 of Appendix 9 Visual Appraisal in Consolidated Report dated 16.11.2020). In order to strengthen the 'landmark' role claimed by the applicant and to mitigate the potential visual impact, different design elements have been included. These include maintaining the view corridor of about 110m between the two sites, the artificial lawn on the podium and retail facilities. Some new design measures proposed by the applicant include responsive building height profile from 171.5mPD to 156.375mPD; innovative building design with articulated edges on residential blocks, provision of sky garden; and building setback of residential towers from certain angles. Although the provision of the above measures (except the provision of 7m sky garden) does not closely attribute to the proposed relaxation of GFA restriction, the applicant has demonstrated efforts in contributing to design merits of this proposal. It is also noted that the applicant would include building finishes such as transparent materials, vertical greenings, informal activity spaces and interesting frontage in the proposed development.
- (e) According to the Responses to Comments and supplementary photomontages in **Appendix Ib** and the Revised Visual Appraisal in **Appendix Ia**, the potential visual impact at certain viewpoints (e.g. VP1, 2, 2a, 4, 4a, 6 and 6a) is slightly adverse/negligible as the proposed development would be partially/entirely screened by existing trees. As regards VP3, 4, 4a and 5, based on the submissions, while there are developments in the vicinity of comparable visual mass with the proposed "definable landmark building", some visual obstruction by the proposed development to the existing open sky view is observed. Given the above, significant adverse visual impact of the proposed development is not

anticipated.

Air Ventilation

- (f) It is noted that the proposed residential blocks (171.5mPD) at Area 23 would have a wider frontage and significantly taller building height when compared to the existing hotel blocks (100mPD). This may create stronger downwash at the windward side while diminish the wind availability of the leeward side of the proposed development under S/SSW winds. While the proposed buildings have extended frontage, they will be slimmer, which may create less blockage enhance air flow to areas around Ginza Square and Tin Shui Wai Park under E wind. According to the AVA-EE report submitted by the applicant, the proposed development would not induce adverse impacts on the surrounding environment.

Landscape

- (g) It is noted that artificial lawn proposed on 3/F is demarcated as open space with reference to Figure 2 in Appendix 8 (**Drawing A-9**). The applicant should specify the proposed functions of the lawn area on landscape plan. To enhance the quality of the landscape amenity, real lawn instead of artificial lawn is a better option to be considered.
- (h) According to Figure 4.1 in Appendix 9 – Visual Appraisal, it is noted that full height vertical greening (“VG”) on residential towers is proposed in artist’s impression (**Drawing A-12**). The full height VG on residential towers should be clearly delineated on plan and elevation to illustrate the design intent of the VG location, extent, spacing, interface with residential flat, maintenance access etc.
- (i) The applicant is reminded to take into consideration the long-term commitment to provide proper maintenance of the proposed VG from the aspects of healthy plant growth, hygiene of the residence and proper operation of building services.
- (j) Should the Board approve the application, she would recommend the following landscape condition to be included in the permission:

the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board.

Visual and Architectural

9.1.6 Comments of Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD):

- (a) It is noted that the proposed residential development mainly consists of two residential towers with building height of 171.5mPD, which may not be incompatible with adjacent residential developments, such as “Central Park Towers” (158.6mPD).
- (b) The building length of tower at TSW Area 23 appears to exceed 60m, which may have adverse impact on the air ventilation and visual permeability. The applicant is advised to comply with the building separation requirements of the design guidelines promulgated in PNAP APP-152.

Drainage

9.1.7 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD):

- (a) He has no objection in principle to the application from drainage point of view.
- (b) Should the Board consider that the application is acceptable from planning point of view, he would suggest that the following conditions should be incorporated:
 - (i) the implementation of the drainage facilities identified in the Drainage Impact Assessment Report to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
 - (ii) the submission of a Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services and the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board; and
 - (iii) in relation to (ii) above, the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board.

Building Matters

9.1.8 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (CBS/NTW, BD):

- (a) Before any new building works are to be carried out on the Site, prior approval and consent of the Building Authority (BA) should be obtained, otherwise they are unauthorised building works (UBW). An Authorized Person should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the Buildings Ordinance (BO).
- (b) If the applicant applies for GFA concession under PNAP APP-151, compliance with the SBD guideline on building separation, building setback and site coverage of the greenery stipulated in PNAP APP-152, where applicable, is required.
- (c) For any carparking spaces to be disregarded from GFA calculation under Regulation 23(3)(b) of the B(P)R, the applicant shall comply with PNAP APP-2.
- (d) According to the submitted supporting planning statement and the record building plans, the area used for the existing back of house area serving hotel is proposed to be converted to car parking space area on basement floors. Unless such area is converted to car parking spaces and/or mandatory plant rooms which shall be disregarded from the GFA calculation under Regulation 23(3)(b) of the B(P)R, such area and its circulation area shall be GFA accountable.
- (e) For sky-gardens at residential towers to be exempted from GFA calculation, compliance with the requirements stipulated in JPN1 is required. If the proposed sky-gardens are also serving the purpose of refuge floors, the requirements under PNAP APP-122 shall also be complied with. Besides, he reserves the comment on the high headroom of about 7m for the sky gardens in the planning application stage and detailed comment under the BO on the high headroom issue will be carried out at building plan submission stage.
- (f) His other comments are also detailed in **Appendix II**.

Fire Safety

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

- (a) He has no objection in principle to the application subject to water

supplies for firefighting and fire service installations being provided to his satisfaction.

- (b) Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans.
- (c) The EVA provision in the Site 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 Building (Planning) Regulation 41D which is administered by the Buildings Department (BD).
- (d) Should the Board consider to approve the application, the following approval condition should be incorporated:

the water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations being provided to the satisfaction of the Fire Services Department (FSD).

Geotechnical

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

- (a) He has no comment on the application.
- (b) The applicant should be reminded to submit the proposed building works to the Buildings Department for approval as required under the provisions of the BO.
- (c) The applicant should also be reminded that the Site is located within Scheduled Area No. 2 and may be underlain by cavernous marble. Depending on the nature of foundation, if necessary, of the new development at the proposed area, extensive geotechnical investigation may be required. Such investigation may require a high level of involvement of an experienced geotechnical engineer both in the design and in the supervision of geotechnical aspects of the works required to be carried out on the Site.

Others

9.1.11 Comments of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH):

He has no objection in principle to the application. His comments on the application are detailed at **Appendix II**.

District Officer's Comments

9.1.12 Comments of the District Officer/Yuen Long (DO/YL):

- (a) His office has received very strong public oppositions.
- (b) During the Yuen Long District Council (YLDC) meeting on 20 February 2019, two TSW based members, namely LEE Yuet-man and WONG Cheuk-kin, jointly submitted a discussion item against the application. Moreover, 34 out of 41 YLDC members also made a motion (which was passed with majority support) against the application. Same opposition was raised by LEE again during the YLDC full council meeting on 16 April 2019. In addition, various organizations and political parties such as Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB) and New Territories Association of Societies (NTAS) also petitioned against the application to the Director of Lands before the aforesaid DC meeting. In gist, major concerns of YLDC members arose from the possible loss of employment opportunities, influx of new population (5,000 new flats) and building density as well as the overloading problem of existing transport network which may be induced if the application is approved.

9.2 The following Government departments have no comment on/no objection to the application:

- (a) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC);
- (b) Project Manager (West), CEDD (PM/W, CEDD);
- (c) Chief Engineer/Sewerage Projects, DSD (CE/SP, DSD);
- (d) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS);
- (e) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS);
- (f) Commissioner of Police (C of P);
- (g) Commissioner for Tourism (C for Tourism); and
- (h) Chief Engineer/Construction Division, Water Supplies Department (CE/CD, WSD).

10. Public Comments Received during Statutory Publication Periods

10.1 Between January 2019 and November 2020, the application was published for public inspections. During the statutory public inspection periods, a total of 6,052 public comments were received. Amongst the public comments received, 19 of them support the application, 9 have no strong view, 6,022 (about 99.5%) raise objection to the application and 2 are irrelevant to the application. Samples of the comments, in which some are standard letters, are attached to this paper (**Appendices III-1 to III-50**). All the public comments received are deposited at the Secretariat for

Members' inspection at the meeting.

- 10.2 A brief summary of the commenters for 6,050 public comments (excluding 2 irrelevant comments) is as follows:

Support		No Strong View		Object	
	No.		No.		No.
Members of the Public	19	Members of the Public	9	Ex-Legislative Councillor	2
				Ex- and Current District Councillors	12
				Owners Committees	5
				TSW New Force (天水圍民生關注平台)	1
				Land Justice League	1
				Members of the Public (including the comments organized by the ex- and current District Councillors, Owners Committees, etc.)	6,001
Subtotal	19	Subtotal	9	Subtotal	6,022

- 10.3 Major reasons of supporting the application (samples at **Appendices III-1 to III-10**):

- (a) The proposed development would increase housing supply in short term.
- (b) Redeveloping old building to residential development in the developed areas is more efficient than converting rural land use to increase housing supply.
- (c) TSW lacks small-sized private housing units. The proposed development could provide more choices for homebuyers.
- (d) The proposed development encourages people from different economic status to move to TSW New Town and hence increasing the value and competitiveness of the district.
- (e) Converting hotel facilities to residential use without large-scale reconstruction is more environmental friendly.
- (f) Utilization of land by private developers should be encouraged.

- 10.4 Major reasons of objection to the application (samples at **Appendices III-13 to III-50**, some of which are standard letters):

Traffic and Infrastructure

- (a) The proposed development would create additional traffic flow to TSW New Town, likely to overload the existing transport network.

- (b) The proposed development would overload the capacity of all social facilities and infrastructures.

Social and Economic

- (c) Redeveloping the hotel would result in loss of employment opportunities in tourism and hospitality industries and arouse social grievances.
- (d) Redeveloping the hotel would affect Hong Kong's tourism industry and push tourists to stay in Shenzhen Bay and Lok Ma Chau Spur Line Boundary Control Points.
- (e) The proposed development together with the proposed developments in TSW Areas 112 and 115 would cause overpopulation in TSW New Town which would then become a residential-driven district without mixed land use.
- (f) The proposed scheme involves substandard floor space and results in loss of signature landmark (i.e. Harbour Plaza Resort City) in TSW New Town.
- (g) The proposed scheme would result in loss of commercial floor space and increase the property price.

Environmental

- (h) The proposed development involving large-scale demolition will not only severely affect the environment and quality of life in TSW, but also affect the ecology of TSW Wetland Park and the migrating birds.
- (i) The demolition and construction will generate many construction waste.
- (j) Adding 5,000 units in TSW will cause air pollution and health problems.

Landscape and Visual

- (k) The proposed development will be much higher than the surrounding developments and block the view and wind from TSW Park and Dragon Park, Central Park Towers and Kingswood Villa North, which will cause adverse visual impact and air ventilation problem.
- (l) Relaxation of BH restriction would create 'wall effect'.
- (m) The proposed scheme would affect the 'fengshui' in TSW New Town.
- (n) The proposed development will lead to the loss of open/recreational space.

Geotechnical Concern

- (o) The sinking problem at Tin Wing LRT Station has not been solved. Demolition and pilling works will further affect the foundation of the area.

Others

- (p) The developer abuses the planning system and adopts a dilatory approach in dealing with the application.
- (q) The developer has not made effort to mitigate the adverse impacts of the redevelopment.
- (r) The proposed development favours the developers to maximise profit at the expense of the public interest.
- (s) The relaxation of PR and BH is unfair to other companies and public.
- (t) Approval of the application would set an unpleasant precedent for similar cases in future.

10.5 Major suggestions to the application (samples at **Appendices III-11 to III-12**):

- (a) Adopt a sustainable development approach by introducing mixed use developments with wet markets, recreational facilities and social welfare facilities i.e. a new child care centre, government clinic, etc.
- (b) Strike a balance between environmental protection and development by conversion of the existing structure or renovations.
- (c) Connect the development to Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area by light rail and environmentally friendly rail system to alleviate the additional traffic volumes.
- (d) Provide a new bus route connecting Tin Wing LRT station to airport to meet the traffic needs.
- (e) Construct a new underground pedestrian connection linking MTR TSW Station and Ginza Square to alleviate the traffic burden caused by the proposed development.
- (f) Improve the existing functions of the hotel, such as setting up co-working space and holding exhibitions.
- (g) Introduce sky gardens in the development to improve the landscape and recreational qualities.

11. Planning Considerations and Assessments

Planning Intention of the OZP

- 11.1 The application is for proposed flat and permitted commercial development with minor relaxation of GFA restriction from 135,000m² to 187,436m² in the “C” zone on the OZP. The proposal involves redevelopment of the two existing 24/25-storey hotel blocks (i.e. Harbour Plaza Resort City Towers 1 and 2 with about 1,102 hotel rooms) into two 51-storey residential towers (about 5,000 flats) at the Site while the existing 3-storey shopping centres at the podium (i.e. +WOO Phase One and Fortune Kingswood Two) and 2-level basements would be retained. Since the proposal would retain the existing shopping centres and basements which have been the main commercial elements on the Site serving the community, the proposed development would not undermine the planning intention of the subject “C” zone, which is primarily for commercial developments and may include shop, services, place of entertainment and eating place, functioning mainly as local shopping centres serving the immediate neighbourhood. It should be noted that the subject “C” zone is not specifically intended for hotel development and C for Tourism has no comment on the application for redevelopment of the existing hotel into residential use.

Land Use Compatibility

- 11.2 As shown on **Plans A-1 and A-2**, the Site is located at the centre of TSW New Town which has been developed as the town centre providing retail and other commercial facilities to serve the residential neighbourhood. The Site comprises two separate land parcels with an open space (i.e. Ginza Square) in between. To the immediate south is the district park (i.e. TSW Park). To the immediate west and northwest are private residential developments of Central Park Towers and Chestwood Court, the proposed private residential development atop Tin Wing Light Rail Stop and the existing bus terminus. To the immediate northeast across Tin Shing Road are private residential developments of Lynwood Court, Maywood Court and Kenswood Court. To the immediate east across Tin Shing Road are mainly open spaces (i.e. Tin Pak Park) and various GIC facilities including schools, swimming pool, sports centre, etc. Radiating from the town centre are mainly public housing developments and some private housing developments intermixed with open spaces and GIC uses.
- 11.3 The proposed residential development cum existing shopping centres is compatible with the surrounding area which is residential in character intermixed with open spaces and GIC uses and function of the Site of providing retail/commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood would be maintained.

Development Intensity

- 11.4 According to the Notes of the “C” zone, the total development and/or redevelopment

of the Site is subject to a maximum GFA of 135,000m². The existing hotel cum shopping centre development has a total GFA of about 108,082m² comprising about 60,146 m² for the hotel portion and about 47,936m² for the shopping centre portion (equivalent to an overall PR of about 3.94 comprising PR 2.22 for the hotel portion and PR 1.718 for the shopping centre portion). The applicant proposes to relax the GFA restriction from 135,000m² to 187,436m² (i.e. an increase by about 38%) to facilitate the proposed residential development cum existing shopping centres.

- 11.5 Although the extent of the GFA relaxation is by about 38%, the domestic PR of the proposed residential development is about 5, which is compatible with the development intensity of the surrounding residential developments (such as Central Park Towers (PR 5.12) and proposed residential development at Tin Wing Light Rail Stop (PR 5)) (**Plan A-2**). Besides, with reference to the residential developments (where retail/other commercial uses are usually permitted on the lowest three floors) in the town centre of other New Towns/New Development Areas, domestic PRs ranging from 5 to 6.5 are generally adopted. In view of the above, the development intensity of the proposed development (with proposed PR 5 for the residential portion cum existing PR 1.718 for the retail/commercial portion resulting in an overall PR of 6.718) is considered commensurate with that of the surrounding residential developments in the context of the town centre of TSW New Town. The proposal is also in line with the Government's policy to encourage maximising use of scarce land resources by increasing development intensity as appropriate while there would not have adverse impact nor insurmountable problems arising from the proposed development.

Building Height, Building Mass and Visual Aspect

- 11.6 There is no BH nor SC restriction on the OZP. The BH of the existing hotel towers is about 100mPD while the BH of the proposed residential development is ranging from about 156.375mPD to 171.5mPD, which is generally compatible with that of the surrounding residential developments of Central Park Towers (BH of about 158mPD) and Tin Wing Light Rail Stop (BH of about 143mPD). The SC above podium remains more or less the same for the residential towers while the existing 3-storey shopping centres at the podium remains unchanged with only some addition and alteration works to be carried out.
- 11.7 The applicant has conducted Visual Appraisal for the proposed development. As illustrated in the photomontages (**Drawings A-13 to A-18**), when compared with the existing hotel cum commercial development, the proposed residential cum commercial development, with incorporation of sensitive design measures mentioned in paragraph 1.5 above, would not cause significant visual impact to the surrounding areas. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no adverse comment on the application from the visual and urban design perspectives.

Other Technical Aspects

- 11.8 The applicant has also submitted reports on TIA, Environmental Noise Impact Assessment, Environmental Air Quality Impact Assessment, SIA, DIA, AVA-EE as well as Landscape Plan and Tree Survey. Concerned Government departments, including C for T, DEP, CE/MN, DSD and CTP/UD&L, PlanD, have been consulted and they have no adverse comment on the application and it is anticipated that the proposed development would not cause any insurmountable problems on the traffic, environmental, sewerage, drainage, air ventilation and landscape aspects.
- 11.9 On the traffic aspect, the Site is well-served by public transport services, such as light rail, bus and green mini-bus (GMB). Public transport demand has been assessed and it is indicated that additional frequencies for light rail service as well as GMB and bus routes could cater for the future passenger demand of the area. Besides, the TIA conducted also indicates that all road junctions would operate within their capacities with the proposed development and the peak traffic generated by the proposed development is relatively small and would induce insignificant impact on the surrounding road network. C for T has no adverse comment on the application from traffic engineering perspective.
- 11.10 On the environmental aspects, with the incorporation of noise mitigation measures, such as acoustic window, acoustic fins with sound absorptive material and fixed glazing, the Environmental Noise Impact Assessment conducted indicates that the predicted road traffic noise levels at all residential flats would comply with the noise criterion. DEP has no adverse comment on the application from environmental perspective.
- 11.11 On the air ventilation aspect, according to the findings of the AVA-EE, the annual prevailing wind mainly comes from northeast and east while the summer prevailing wind mainly comes from southeast, south and southwest. The existing breezeways around the Site including Tin Yan Road, Tin Lung Road, Ka Yan Street and Ginza Square (**Plan A-2**) are maintained. In this regard, CTP/UD&L, PlanD considers that while the proposed residential buildings have extended frontage, they will be slimmer, which may create less blockage enhance air flow to areas around Ginza Square and Tin Shui Wai Park under east wind. Nevertheless, with the incorporation of design measures including maintaining the existing view corridor of about 110m between the two residential towers, incorporation of refuge floor/sky garden of 7m headroom, setting back of the residential blocks at the podium level, etc, it is anticipated that the proposed development would unlikely have any worse-off air ventilation impact when compared to the existing development.
- 11.12 On the landscape aspect, as shown on **Drawing A-9**, the applicant will provide 8,370m² planting areas for tree/shrub/grass in the communal and open area (i.e. not less than 30% of the site area) at both ground and podium levels. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no adverse comment on the application from the landscape perspective.

Planning and Design Merits

- 11.13 Addressing the community's imminent housing demand is one of the key policy priorities of the Government. The proposed residential development could provide about 5,000 private flats in a short term to meet the imminent housing demand of the public, which is in line with the Government's housing supply policy.
- 11.14 With a view to making the proposed residential cum commercial development the signature buildings in the town centre while in keeping with the character of surrounding areas, the applicant proposes to incorporate a range of design measures into the proposed residential cum commercial development. As illustrated in **Drawings A-8 to A-12 and A-19 to A-21**, the major design measures include variation in building height profile with introduction of obvious stepping at the roof level from 171.5mPD to 156.375mPD; adoption of innovative building design with incorporation of articulated edges on residential blocks and vertical greening; introduction of sky gardens; incorporation of multi-levelled landscape framework along podium edges; building setback of the residential towers; maintaining existing view corridor between the two towers; and others as described and detailed in paragraph 1.5 above. In this regard, CTP/UD&L, PlanD considers that the applicant has demonstrated efforts in contributing to design merits of the proposal.

Provision of GIC Facilities

- 11.15 The proposed development will lead to an increase of about 5,000 flats with an estimated population of about 7,500 in TSW New Town. Taking into account the requirement of Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the advice of relevant bureaux/departments, the overall planned provision of open space and GIC facilities will be generally adequate to serve the need of the existing and new population in TSW New Town (**Appendix IV**). However, there will be deficit in the provision of hospital beds, child care services facilities, community care services facilities and residential care homes for the elderly based on the planned population. For provision of hospital beds, they are determined in a regional context and the Hospital Authority and the Food and Health Bureau (FHB) will comprehensively review the overall demand and provision of hospital facilities in the territory and determine whether there is a need of site reservation for hospitals to meet the demand. For the provision of elderly services as well as child care facilities, the standards on such provision in the HKPSG have been revised in December 2018 and March 2020 respectively and the Social Welfare Department (SWD) will adjust its long term provision target progressively to meet the standard. In this regard, the applicant indicates that he is willing to explore the provision of a child care centre in the development at the detailed design stage.

Public Comments

- 11.16 A total of 6,052 comments were received in which 19 supporting, 9 with no strong

view, 6,022 objecting and 2 irrelevant to the application. Their grounds are summarized in paragraph 10 above. The planning considerations and assessments in paragraphs 11.1 to 11.15 above are relevant. In addition, as regards the concerns on employment opportunities, the applicant indicates that job opportunities will be created during construction and upon operation (i.e. property management and serving/cleaning staff) of the proposed residential development and local employment opportunity associated with the proposed development will still be available. With regard to the concerns on the disturbance to the shopping centres during construction period, the applicant indicates that only a small portion of the shopping centres will be temporarily closed during construction, and there will be no significant impact on the continual operation of the shopping centres throughout the construction period. Regarding the concerns on construction impact, the applicant indicates that good site management and air pollution control measures will be implemented during construction stage to minimize potential air quality impact. The applicant will also adopt appropriate piling method such as non-percussive piling for foundation and excavation and lateral support work to minimize the noise and vibration generated throughout the construction period. All construction works will be conducted in compliance with the relevant statutory requirements.

12. Planning Department's Views

- 12.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 above and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 10 above and the local views relayed by DO(YL) in paragraph 9.1.12 above, Planning Department has no objection to the application.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 18.12.2024, 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' reference:

Approval Conditions

- (a) the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission of a revised Noise Impact Assessment before commencement of the construction works, including site formation works and piling works, and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the implementation of the drainage facilities identified in the Drainage Impact Assessment Report to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;

- (d) the submission of a Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services and the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (f) the design and provision of junction improvement works to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (g) the design and provision of ingress/egress point, vehicular access, parking spaces, loading/unloading and lay-by facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (h) the provision of water supplies for firefighting and 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 II**.

- 12.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, the following reasons for rejection are suggested for Members' reference:
- (a) the proposed residential development is not in line with the planning intention of the "Commercial" zone primarily for commercial developments, which may include shop, services, place of entertainment and eating places, functioning mainly as local shopping centres serving the immediate neighbourhood. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
 - (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that there are strong justifications for the proposed minor relaxation of GFA restriction.

13. Decision Sought

- 13.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant permission.
- 13.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, Members are invited to consider the approval condition(s) and advisory clause(s), if any, to be attached to the permission, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.

- 13.3 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.

14. Attachments

Appendix I	Application Form received on 31.12.2018
Appendix Ia	Further Information received on 16.11.2020
Appendix Ib	Further Information received on 9.12.2020
Appendix II	Advisory Clauses
Appendices III-1 to III-50	Public comments
Appendix IV	Provision of Open Space and Major GIC Facilities in Tin Shui Wai Outline Zoning Plan
Drawing A-1	Site Location Plan
Drawing A-2	Basement 2 Plan
Drawing A-3	Basement 1 Plan
Drawing A-4	Comparison Ground Floor Plan
Drawing A-5	Comparison First Floor Plan
Drawing A-6	Comparison Second Floor Plan (for Commercial) and R1/F and R2/F (for Residential)
Drawing A-7	Comparison Third Floor Plan
Drawing A-8	Section Plan
Drawing A-9	Proposed Landscape Plan
Drawing A-10	Proposed Open Space Plan
Drawing A-11	Proposed Green Coverage Plan
Drawing A-12	Building Setback and Building Separation Plan
Drawing A-13	Photomontages of Viewpoint 1 (Entrance to Tin Shui Road Park at Tin Shui Path)
Drawing A-14	Photomontages of Viewpoint 2 (Tin Shui Wai Park)
Drawing A-15	Photomontages of Viewpoint 3 (Tin Shui Wai Sports Ground)
Drawing A-16	Photomontages of Viewpoint 4 (Tin Pak Road Park)
Drawing A-17	Photomontages of Viewpoint 5 (Footbridge at Tin Wah Road)
Drawing A-18	Photomontages of Viewpoint 6 (Dragon Park)
Drawings A-19 to A-21	Artist's Impression of the Proposed Development
Plan A-1	Location Plan
Plan A-2	Site Plan
Plan A-3	Aerial Photo
Plans A-4a and 4b	Site Photos