

**Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Flat Use,
Tung Chung Town Lot 49, Tung Chung Road North, Lantau Island
(Section 16 Planning Application No. A/I-TCTC/71)**

– Further Information No. 2 –

Item	Comments	Responses
1	Comments from Sai Kung & Islands District Planning Office, Planning Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. NG Ming Shum, Sheldon; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 14 April 2026	
1.1	<p>With reference to the RNTPC minutes of the previous approved case (A/I-TCTC/59), an additional advisory clause was suggested “to consult the Sustainable Lantau Office of the Civil Engineering and Development Department on ways to improve the proposed landscape treatments along the western periphery of the application site to better complement the adjacent nullah in terms of enhancing urban biodiversity.”</p> <p>Please advise your response and/or any necessary supplement information on this matter.</p>	<p>In light of the Board members' advisory comment on the previous Application No. A/I-TCTC/59, the Applicant has taken a proactive approach in refining the proposal.</p> <p>Enhanced landscape treatments have been incorporated into the proposed scheme under this Application, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Providing a 6.5m landscape buffer from the adjacent nullah at +4.5mPD level. As the landscape buffer sits on the drainage reserve area, according to Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines Chapter 4, 'Planting of trees or shrubs with penetrating roots should be avoided within 3m from the centre line of any existing or proposed watermain and 3m from the edge of drainage pipes', therefore, shrubs without penetrating roots, ground cover and lawn are proposed to be planted at the landscape buffer; and 2) Providing a 2m full height setback between T1 and the nullah to avoid human disturbance to the nullah. <p>The South Development and Sustainable Lantau Office (“SSLO”) of the Civil Engineering and Development Department has been consulted. To address SSLO’s comment, the Applicant has further incorporated the following features: 1) More native and nectar plant species will be used; and 2) Vine planting will be added on the west-facing façade to enhance landscape buffering at ground level (+11.3mPD) and landscape roof level (+16.8mPD). The selection of planting species of the proposed landscape buffer at +4.5mPD will take into account the limited sunlight available and future horticultural maintenance requirement. Also, bird-friendly design such as</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
		<p>glazing treatment, visual markers, building integrated structures, UV-reflective configuration or low-E coating will be considered to be adopted at the façade of the clubhouse block in the next stage of detailed design. Please refer to the revised Supporting Planning Statement (“SPS”) and Landscape Plans in Annexes A and B respectively.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to consult SSLO in detailed design stage to better complement the adjacent nullah in terms of enhancing urban biodiversity.</p>
2	<p>Further Comments from Sai Kung & Islands District Planning Office, Planning Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. NG Ming Shum, Sheldon; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 30 April 2026</p>	
2.1	<p>It is noted that there are a few lots surrounded by the proposed development, which are not owned by the applicant. With reference to Paragraph 2.6.3 in the supporting planning statement, “According to the lease condition, the Applicant shall provide lay, provide, construct and surface access roads within the Site so that pedestrian traffic may be carried on access roads for ingress, egress and regress to and from Lots 1767, 1772 and 1773 in D.D. 3 TC to Tung Chung Road North. Right of way for the landlocked lots will be fully respected” Please clarify how the right of way to these lots will be provided and maintained. Please illustrate the proposed access and the relationship between these lots and the site with reference to the drawings.</p>	<p>Please refer to the updated schematic architectural drawings (Annex C refers) illustrating the proposed access to Lots 1767, 1772 and 1773 in D.D. 3 TC. Since there is a level difference between these lots and Tung Chung Road North, accesses (including staircases/lifts) within the Application Site (as shown on the drawings) will be provided and maintained by the Applicant, so that the pedestrian traffic may be carried on access road with the Application Site for ingress, egress and regress to and from Lots 1767, 1772 and 1773 in D.D. 3 TC to Tung Chung Road North. Right of way for the landlocked lots will be fully respected. Details of the proposed access have been supplemented in para. 3.3.4 in the SPS.</p>
2.2	<p>Over 100 public comments were received during the publication periods of the original submission and the FI. Please provide response as appropriate.</p>	<p>Please find our responses on the public comments in Annex D.</p>
2.3	<p>Please clarify whether the increase in floor-to-floor height from 3.3m to 3.4m is required solely for the implementation of Modular Integrated Construction (MiC).</p>	<p>The increase in floor-to-floor height from 3.3m to 3.4m is required solely for the implementation of Modular Integrated Construction (MiC).</p>
2.4	<p>There is discrepancy in the provision of private open space in the application form, P.9 and P.11 of the supporting planning statement. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Not less than 754m² of private open space will be provided. Table 3.2 in P.9 of the SPS has been rectified.</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
2.5	It is noted that the site is not situated on flat land. Please elaborate on the topographic characteristics and development constraints of the site. Specifically, as the basement level appears to be higher than the surrounding area, please provide additional information on site grading and levels, with reference to the surrounding infrastructure (e.g., Tung Chung Road North, the Nullah, and lots 1767, 1772, and 1773).	<p>Site constraints, topographic characteristics and site grading and levels have been supplemented in Section 2.2 of the SPS. Since Tung Chung Road North is about 11.3mPD, a basement carpark with a height of 4.5m will be at +6.8mPD, which is similar or slightly above the third-party lots within the Application Site.</p> <p>Taking into account the physical development constraints of the Site and the need to comply with the relevant building regulations, the coverage of the building blocks has already been optimised as far as possible. Para. 3.1.1 of the SPS has been supplemented.</p>
2.6	The applicant is requested to clarify whether the proposed carparking facilities (both underground and above-ground) are eligible for Gross Floor Area (GFA) exemption under prevailing policies.	The proposed above-ground and underground carparking facilities shall be eligible for GFA exemption according to the latest PNAP APP-2, subject to the consideration of the Building Authority.
2.7	The applicant is requested to clarify whether the landscape roof located above the clubhouse and carpark is accessible to residents and/or the public.	The landscape roof located above the clubhouse and carpark are private open space, which is accessible by the residents.
2.8	The supporting planning statement highlighted several planning and design merits, including building separation, building setback, site coverage of greenery, provision of right of way to the third party lots and construction method. The applicant is advised to clarify if these merits are identical to those in the previous planning application no. A-I-TCTC/59 or if they are specific to the current planning application.	While the building separation, building setback, site coverage of greenery and provision of right of way to the third-party lots highlighted in this Application is similar to that proposed in the previous application No. A/I-TCTC/59. The adoption of MiC as the construction method and the enhanced landscape treatment abutting the nullah are specific to the current planning application.
3	Comments from Environmental Protection Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. WONG Wing Hong, Andy; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 22 April 2026	
3.1	<p><u>Planning Statement</u></p> <p>Section 4.2.5 – Please revise as follows: ...Therefore, no adverse air quality impact from vehicular emissions impact is anticipated.</p>	Section 4.2.5 of the SPS (Annex A refers) has been revised.
3.2	Section 4.2.6 – Please update the conclusions about odour and marine emissions.	Section 4.2.6 of the SPS has been revised.
	<u>Environmental Assessment</u>	

Item	Comments	Responses
	<p>Air Quality</p>	
3.3	Section 4.1.1 – Please clarify the meaning of the last sentence about odourous emissions from the proposed development.	The last sentence of Section 4.1.1 of the Environmental Assessment (“EA”) (Annex E refers) has been revised to “The potential odorous impact on the proposed development has also been addressed.”
3.4	Section 4.2.1 – Please delete the last bullet which is irrelevant to this AQIA.	Noted. The last bullet (“Criteria for Evaluating Air Quality Impact (Annex 4 of the EIAO-TM)”) has been removed from Section 4.2.1 of the EA.
3.5	Table 4.6 – Please rectify Note (b) to “v2.1”.	Noted. Note (b) has been rectified accordingly.
3.6	Section 4.4.8 – Please explain why Figure 4.2 is quoted here.	Typo. Section 4.4.8 of the EA has been updated to quote Appendix 4.1 for Tentative Construction Programme
3.7	Section 4.5.2, RtC#3.7 – Please supplement TD’s agreement on road type of Tung Chung Road North when available.	Noted. TD’s agreement on road type of Tung Chung Road North will be provided once available.
3.8	Section 4.6.2 – Please provide more information on the site visit (e.g. no. of hours).	The site visit time has been supplemented in Section 4.6.2 of the EA.
3.9	Section 4.6.3 – Please revise as follows: ...no odour was identified at accessible locations along the northwest and southwest boundary of the Pumping Station even under downwind moments as well as along the east of the mooring sites even under downwind moments.	Noted. Section 4.6.3 of the EA has been revised accordingly.
3.10	Section 4.6.4 – Please append EPD’s reply on odour complaint record.	EPD’s reply on odour complaint record has been appended to Appendix 4.4 and quoted in Section 4.6.4 of the EA.
3.11	Section 4.7.1 – Please revise as follows: ...Therefore, no adverse air quality impact from vehicular emissions impact is anticipated.	Noted. Section 4.7.1 of the EA has been revised accordingly.
3.12	Section 4.7.2 and 8.1.6 – Please revise to “... would not be subject to adverse air quality impact from marine emissions.” in the last sentence.	Noted, the last sentence of Section 4.7.2 and Section 8.1.6 of the EA have been revised accordingly.
3.13	Please replace “there’s” with “there is/was” for formality.	Noted. “there’s” have been replaced with “there is/was” for formality in Section 4.6.3, Section 4.6.4, Section 8.1.6, Section 8.1.7 of the EA.

Item	Comments	Responses
3.14	Figure 4.2 – Please remove the separation distance 235m, which is no included in Table 4.8.	Noted and Figure 4.2 of the EA has been updated accordingly.
3.15	Figure 4.5 – Please indicate 200m buffer distance in the figure.	Noted and 200m and 500m buffer distance have been shown in Figure 4.5 of the EA accordingly.
3.16	Figure 4.6 – Please rectify typo “31 October 2025” in the legend.	Noted and Figure 4.6 of the EA has been updated accordingly.
	Noise	
3.17	Re. S 1.4.6, the aircraft noise criterion for domestic premises is NEF25 as per HKPSG. Please revise.	Noted. S.1.4.6 of the EA has been revised accordingly.
3.18	Re. Figure 2.1b, please confirm there are no noise sensitive use relied on opened window for ventilation in the highlighted rooms. [(See attached file: Partial plan of figure 2.1b.png)]	The highlighted locations are storerooms and do not rely on openable window for ventilation. Figures 2.1b, 2.1d and 2.1f of the EA have been supplemented with label “STORE” to these 2 rooms.
3.19	Re. Figure 2.1d, please review whether locations T2-19 and T2-20 at T2-1/F, which appears to be communal area, are considered as NSRs.	Noted. T2-19 and T2-20 have been removed from Figure 2.1d of the EA.
3.20	Re. the TNIA model, the correction of traffic speed as a result of gradient has been applied even if the traffic speed was set to the speed limit of the road (e.g. 50km/h for road A), in other words, the box “corrected for gradient” was not checked. Please revise. Please also revise the compliance level and number of flats with noise exceedance under S 2.5.2 as appropriate.	Noted. The noise model, S.2.5.2, Appendix 2.3 and Appendix 2.4 of the EA have been updated. Please note that the conclusion is not affected. (“With the noise mitigation measures proposed, the Proposed Development would comply with the HKPSG road traffic noise standard criteria of 70 dB(A) (100% compliance).”)
3.21	Re. S 3 Fixed noise source impact assessment, please address the potential fixed noise source impact (e.g. outdoor E&M plants) from the North Lantau Hospital.	Noted. S.3.2.4 and Figure 3.2 of the EA have been supplemented to address potential fixed noise source impact from the North Lantau Hospital.
3.22	<u>Sewerage Impact Assessment</u> Please revise the “contributing population” in Table 3 under Section 5.1 of the Annex G from 1263 to 1171 to tally with Appendix D.	Noted. Please refer to the revised Table 3 under Section 5.1 of the Sewerage Impact Assessment (Annex F refers).

Item	Comments	Responses
3.23	To facilitate review, please provide softcopy of the report (in pdf), Response to Comments and modelling files / calculation spreadsheets (if any), and highlight the revised / updated content of the report in next submission.	Noted.
4	Comments from Drainage Services Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. LI Kei Chun, Colin; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 22 April 2026	
4.1	With regard to the captioned submission, please note that I have no adverse comment from drainage and sewerage planning perspectives provided that the project proponent shall ensure the drainage design should conform to the prevailing Government standards and guidelines, and the actual drainage network shall not deviate from the captioned submission. Should the project proponent observe change in their proposal, design assumptions or other parameters that may render change in the hydraulic calculation, further submission should be made to demonstrate the adequacy of the designed drainage network for review.	Noted.
4.2	In addition, as the project is anticipated to last for a considerable period of time, it is inevitable that the inherent uncertainties of climate change might impact the ensuing project stages. The project proponent is recommended to consider flood protection measures that are flexible enough to accommodate the possible impacts due to the changes in rainfall pattern/intensity, and/or changes in sea level rise, as a result of climate change and updated findings available from time to time.	Noted. Please kindly note that the flood protection measures have been recommended in the submitted Drainage Impact Assessment.
5	Comments from Urban Design Unit, Planning Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. LAM Sau Yin, Timothy; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 28 April 2026	
5.1	VA – discussion of the magnitude of change should be discussed in the VA as stated in Appendix C of the TPB-PG No. 41A	Noted.
5.2	VA – given the proposed BHR has been revised to 55.9mPD, the consultant please review whether the photomontages of VP1, VP2	The photomontages of VP1, VP2 and VP3 of the Visual Appraisal (Annex G refers) are revised.

Item	Comments	Responses
	and VP3 are accurate in representing the latest proposed scheme; and	
5.3	VA – it is noted that the photomontages stated the two towers as “max. +55.9mPD”, which appears to be inconsistency with the drawings in Annex C that the main roof heights of 55.5mPD.	Please be clarified that the number of storey of the two towers are 13 storeys and with a main roof height of 55.5mPD. To allow design flexibility and with reference to Joint Practice Notes No.8, a 4% relaxation of the absolute building height of the approved scheme to +55.9mPD has been proposed in this Application. Therefore, the photomontages of the propose schemes is prepared based on the towers having not more than +55.9mPD to demonstrate the worst-case scenario.
6	Comments from Landscape Unit, Planning Department (Responsible Officer: Ms. TSUI Hiu Wai, Isabella; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 30 April 2026	
6.1	Annex B - Updated Supporting Planning Statement, para. 4.6.1 - the tree information (such as total number of trees, number of trees to be felled, number of trees to be compensated and compensation ratio) does not tally with the same shown in Annex J - Updated Tree Felling and Preservation proposal.	Para. 4.6.4 of the SPS (Annex A refers) has been revised.
6.2	The applicant should be advised that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting and felling. Application for any tree works should be submitted to relevant departments for approval.	Noted.
6.3	For compliance of site coverage of greenery requirements under PNAP APP-152, submission should be made to Building Department for comments and approval.	Noted.
7	Comments from Traffic Survey & Support Division, Transport Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. LEE Lap Man, Raymond; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 30 April 2026	
7.1	Except the below minor issue, we have no further adverse comments on the TIA report from traffic engineering point of view please. <i>(i) Figure Nos. of relevant junctions should be indicated in Table 5.1 for ease of cross reference</i>	Please find the updated Table 5.1 in the revised Traffic Impact Assessment report (Annex H refers) for your easy reference.

Item	Comments	Responses																																																		
	<p style="text-align: center;">Table 5.1 Junction Performance of Identified Critical Junction in Year 2036</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="241 339 1093 707"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="3">Ref.</th> <th rowspan="3">Junction</th> <th rowspan="3">Method of Control</th> <th colspan="4">Year 2036 RC / RFC ⁽¹⁾</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2">Reference Scenario</th> <th colspan="2">Design Scenario</th> </tr> <tr> <th>AM Peak</th> <th>PM Peak</th> <th>AM Peak</th> <th>PM Peak</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>Yu Tung Road / Shun Tung Road (With Junction Modification)</td> <td>Signalized</td> <td>17% ⁽²⁾</td> <td>41% ⁽²⁾</td> <td>16% ⁽²⁾</td> <td>40% ⁽²⁾</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>Yu Tung Road/ Chung Yan Road (With Junction Modification)</td> <td>Signalized</td> <td>17% ⁽²⁾</td> <td>43% ⁽²⁾</td> <td>16% ⁽²⁾</td> <td>38% ⁽²⁾</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>Chung Yan Road/ Tung Chung Road North (With Junction Modification)</td> <td>Roundabout</td> <td>0.28</td> <td>0.25</td> <td>0.34</td> <td>0.26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>Tung Chung Road North/ Access Road to Chung Yan Road/ Yat Tung Street</td> <td>Priority</td> <td>0.54</td> <td>0.47</td> <td>0.54</td> <td>0.52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>Chui Kwan Drive/ Chung Yan Road</td> <td>Priority</td> <td>0.34</td> <td>0.19</td> <td>0.34</td> <td>0.19</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Notes: (1) RC = Reserve Capacity RFC = Ratio of Flow to Capacity for Priority Junction and Roundabout (2) Junction improvements mentioned in TCNTE (W) Study were considered.</p>	Ref.	Junction	Method of Control	Year 2036 RC / RFC ⁽¹⁾				Reference Scenario		Design Scenario		AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	A	Yu Tung Road / Shun Tung Road (With Junction Modification)	Signalized	17% ⁽²⁾	41% ⁽²⁾	16% ⁽²⁾	40% ⁽²⁾	B	Yu Tung Road/ Chung Yan Road (With Junction Modification)	Signalized	17% ⁽²⁾	43% ⁽²⁾	16% ⁽²⁾	38% ⁽²⁾	C	Chung Yan Road/ Tung Chung Road North (With Junction Modification)	Roundabout	0.28	0.25	0.34	0.26	D	Tung Chung Road North/ Access Road to Chung Yan Road/ Yat Tung Street	Priority	0.54	0.47	0.54	0.52	E	Chui Kwan Drive/ Chung Yan Road	Priority	0.34	0.19	0.34	0.19	
Ref.	Junction				Method of Control	Year 2036 RC / RFC ⁽¹⁾																																														
						Reference Scenario		Design Scenario																																												
		AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak		PM Peak																																														
A	Yu Tung Road / Shun Tung Road (With Junction Modification)	Signalized	17% ⁽²⁾	41% ⁽²⁾	16% ⁽²⁾	40% ⁽²⁾																																														
B	Yu Tung Road/ Chung Yan Road (With Junction Modification)	Signalized	17% ⁽²⁾	43% ⁽²⁾	16% ⁽²⁾	38% ⁽²⁾																																														
C	Chung Yan Road/ Tung Chung Road North (With Junction Modification)	Roundabout	0.28	0.25	0.34	0.26																																														
D	Tung Chung Road North/ Access Road to Chung Yan Road/ Yat Tung Street	Priority	0.54	0.47	0.54	0.52																																														
E	Chui Kwan Drive/ Chung Yan Road	Priority	0.34	0.19	0.34	0.19																																														
8	<p>Comments from Transport Operations (NT) Division, Transport Department (Responsible Officer: Ms. YEUNG Yuk Shan, Doris; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 30 April 2026</p>																																																			
8.1	<p>In general, given that the estimated population has decreased in the revised submission (from 812 to 754 persons), the public transport trips generated by the proposed development are unlikely to increase compared with the original planning assumptions. However, it should be noted that no internal public transport facilities such as bus or minibus laybys are proposed within the development; therefore, no such franchised or shuttle services can be provided to connect residents to the nearby MTR station or public transport interchange.</p> <p>The report relies on public transport services on Shun Tung Road and Tat Tung Road, claiming they lie within a 500-metre radius. In reality, the walking route from the site via Tung Chung Road North and Chui Kwan Drive includes a slope and exceeds 500 metres, so these services should not be considered accessible to residents. Without a shuttle connection, residents will most likely use the bus stop on</p>	<p>Noted.</p>																																																		

Item	Comments	Responses
	Chung Yan Road outside North Lantau Hospital. A proper assessment of the capacity of bus services at that stop, and the capacity of the bus layby should additional trips need to be introduced to serve the new population, is therefore required. The TIA should be updated to examine this stop and ensure it can accommodate the latent demand.	
9	Comments from Civil Aviation Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. SHUM Ka Lung, Sam ; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 28 April 2026	
9.1	We noted that the applicant has included their assessment results on aircraft/helicopter noise in the R-t-C table, as well as the installation of acoustic insulation as the noise mitigation measures. We therefore suggested that the aforementioned aircraft noise assessment results and noise mitigation measures be reflected in the Supporting Planning Statement / Environmental Assessment Report.	The aircraft noise assessment results and noise mitigation measures have been reflected in paras. 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 of the SPS (Annex A refers) and Section 1.4.6 to 1.4.8 of the EA (Annex E refers).

Encl.

Annex A – Updated Supporting Planning Statement

Annex B – Revised Landscape Plans

Annex C – Updated Schematic Architectural Drawings

Annex D – Response-to-Public Comment Table

Annex E – Updated Environmental Assessment

Annex F – Replacement Page of Sewerage Impact Assessment

Annex G – Updated Visual Appraisal

Annex H – Replacement Page of Traffic Impact Assessment

Compiled by: KTA

Date: 30 April 2026

File Ref: 20260430_S3176_FI(2)_R-to-C