

**Proposed Rezoning of the “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” Site to “Residential (Group B)13”, “Residential (Group B)14” and “Recreation” and Amendment to the Building Height Restriction on the “Government, Institution or Community” Site from 2 storeys to 8 storeys for Residential Development(s) with Retail, Public Vehicle Park and Social Welfare Facilities Various Lots in D.D. 11 and Adjoining Government Land, Fung Yuen, Tai Po, New Territories
(S12A Amendment of Plan Application No. Y/TP/40)**

– Further Information No.2 –

Item	Comments	Our Responses
1	Comments from Shatin, Tai Po and North District Planning Office, Planning Department (Responsible Officer: Ms. WU Kit Shan, Sandy; Tel: 2158 6381) Received on 31 October 2025	
1.1	<p>General Comments</p> <p>The proposed development should not create land locking and should ensure appropriate access to adjacent private lots at all times. The applicant should provide information on the existing and planned pedestrian/ vehicular connection (including emergency vehicular access) to the adjacent private lots.</p>	<p>The proposed layout has been carefully designed to avoid any land locking issues or problems. While there is no existing vehicular access to the third party lots within the Development Site, appropriate internal footpath will be provided for pedestrian access to these lots. In case of emergency situations, the Applicant will discretionarily permit/allow emergency vehicles to the adjacent private lots. Please refer to the figures below.</p> <div data-bbox="1137 831 1926 1437"> </div> <p>(* For reference only and subject to detailed design)</p> <p>⑨ Footpath connection to the neighbourhoods</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
1.2	Strong concerns from DC members and a considerable number of local objections were received for the application No. Y/TP/38. Please consider engaging in dialogue with locals to address their concerns.	The concerns from DC members and locals for the on-going Application No. Y/TP/38 have been considered while formulating this Planning Application. This includes the reduction of development intensity, more buffer distance from existing village and the provision of private open space for the enjoyment of public and residents. The revised development proposal has been carefully designed and in general addressed their concerns.
1.3	Please provide the floor plans (including typical floor and basement) of the proposed developments for TPB's reference.	Floor plans have been provided in Figures 5a, 5b and 5c of the Noise Impact Assessment.
1.4	<p><i>Specific Comments</i></p> <p><u><i>Supporting Planning Statement</i></u></p> <p>Table 3.4 – it is noted that 1% of the southern portion is private land owned by others (29m²). The applicant should clarify whether the implementation of the proposed social welfare complex would not be affected since the location of the private lot is not indicated in the submission.</p>	The 1% private land owned by others is Lot 860 in D.D. 11 to the north of the proposed social welfare complex. The implementation of the proposed social welfare complex would not be affected regardless of the inclusion of this Lot 860 in D.D. 11. (Annex B refers)
1.5	Para. 5.4.8 – please indicate the proposed 3m and 5m building setbacks from the existing watercourse and the eastern development site boundary respectively for clarity.	Figure 5.4 of the Supporting Planning Statement (SPS) (Annex A refers) has been added to indicate the proposed building setbacks.
1.6	Para. 5.5.3 and Figure 5.6 – It is noted that the potential area for private open space of not less than 1,000m ² for public use covers the roadside area. Please ensure that the open space should be functional for recreation and easily accessible to the general public.	Demarcation on the figures is indicative only to allow flexibility for future detailed design. Within the indicative area, not less than 1,000m ² open space will be dedicated for public use. The design of which will be functional for recreation such as accommodate landscape sitting-out areas, leisure lawn and lookout deck for the users and easily accessible.
1.7	Para. 5.4.9 – According to Appendix 2 of the Air Ventilation Assessment, there is also one 20m-wide building separation. Please update accordingly.	Para. 5.4.9 of the SPS has been updated.
1.8	Para. 5.5 – Please extract information on existing tree condition, proposed tree felling, compensation, etc. in the planning statement from Landscape Proposal.	Section 5.5 of the SPS has been updated.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
1.9	Para. 6.1.2 (Proposed “R(B)13” zone) – Please consider imposing PR instead of GFA restriction to ensure that the development right of the third party lots (about 15% of Area A with remote prospect in land acquisition according to the Planning Statement) will be respected.	GFA instead of PR restriction proposed for “R(B)13” zone is with reference to the GFA restriction on the latest “R(B)” sub zones on the prevailing Tai Po OZP. Given the fact that there are also third part lots in these “R(B)” sub zones, imposing GFA restrictions of 110,377m ² (for Area (A) Phase I and II) (based on the total lot area of the sites of 31,854m ² including third party lots at a domestic PR of 3.44) shall not jeopardise the development right of the third party lots.
1.10	Para. 6.1.4 (Proposed “R(B)14” zone) – It is understood that the proposed restriction on GFA of 87,356m ² is adopted from the approved GFA under the application No. A/TP/333 and land lease of TPTL 183, which has been fully materialized as residential development Mont Vert (嵐山). Considering that there are remaining third party lots within the proposed “R(B)14” zone (about 11% of the Northern Portion according to Table 3.1 of the Planning Statement), please carry out a sensitivity test to take into account the infrastructural impacts of potential developments on these lots, so as to ascertaining the feasibility of the rezoning proposal. Furthermore, it is noted that the proposed non-domestic GFA of 376m ² is for ‘Shop and Services’ use while it is adopted from the GFA of kindergarten as mentioned in the footnote. Please clarify what will be the future use of the non-domestic portion.	<p>A sensitivity test has been carried out to assess the infrastructural impacts of potential developments at the third party lots within the proposed “R(B)14” zone. The sensitivity test shows that the anticipated impact is minimal and significant adverse impact to the local infrastructure from traffic, drainage, sewerage and water supply points of view is not anticipated.</p> <p>It is clarified that the future use of the non-domestic portion are commercial uses including but not limited to kindergarten and shop and services. The maximum non-domestic GFA of 376m² is proposed based on the size of the current kindergarten portion at Mont Vert.</p>
1.11	Para. 6.1.5 and Figure 6.3 (Proposed “REC” zone) – Please explain what structures the maximum non-domestic GFA of 600m ² refers to.	The structures refer to the current Management Office and covered walkway of the Agricultural Portion of TPTL 183.
1.12	Para. 6 – It is observed that the proposed schedule of uses under the proposed “R(B)13”, “R(B)14” and “REC” zones are slightly different to the Master Schedule of Notes adopted by TPB. Explanation/justifications should be provided.	<p>For the proposed “R(B)13” zone, retail facilities and public vehicle park have been proposed under the indicative development proposal. Always permitting these uses on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-design non-residential portion of a building is considered more appropriate.</p> <p>For the proposed “R(B)14” zone, the current kindergarten portion at Mont Vert is located at a standalone purpose-design building. Always permitting commercial uses on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-design non-residential portion of a building is considered more appropriate.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
		The proposed “REC” zone for Tai Po OZP mainly covers the Agricultural Portion under TPTL 183 which is fully implemented in accordance with the planning approval under Application No. A/TP/333. To reflect the as-built condition and its unique planning background, the schedule of uses of proposed “REC” zone on the Tai Po OZP has been appropriately tailor-made. A more stringer GFA and building height restriction of 600m ² and one storey have been proposed as compared with the PR and building height restrictions of 0.2 and 2 storeys (6m) recommended in the Master Schedule of Notes of the “REC” zone.
1.13	Sections 6 & 7 – The applicant should elaborate the realization of the AGR Portion (including existing land use condition/development in the four functional areas)	The realisation of the AGR Portion has been supplemented in para. 6.1.5 of the SPS.
1.14	It is noted from para. 3.4.3 of the Planning Statement that the site area of the Western Portion (i.e. about 35,959m ²) is different from our calculation. Please kindly clarify in your FI submission.	The site area of the Western Portion is 31,854m ² . Para. 3.4.3 of the SPS has been revised.
2	Comments from Social Welfare Department (Responsible Officer: Ms. LAW Ka Yi, Christina; Tel: 2537 0709) Received on 18 November 2025	
2.1	<i>Service Perspective (RCHE)</i> The proposed 150-p RCHE cum 30-p DCU is located in an 8-storey social welfare complex with a BH of 36mPD. As stipulated in Para 5.3.2 of the Code of Practice for Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) (June 2024 Revised Edition) (CoP), “...No part of an RCHE shall be situated at a height more than 24m above the ground floor...”. In this regard, the applicant should ensure that the 24m height restriction as set out in the CoP is fully complied. While detailed layout plan of the proposed RCHE is not available and it is understood that detailed layout plan would be provided for comment in the later detailed design stage, we are unable to comment on the proposed RCHE design at this moment.	Noted.
2.2	Subject to the consideration of the Town Planning Board and relevant government departments, we, from service perspective,	Noted with thanks.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	<p>generally have no objection-in-principle to the proposed RCHEs under the s.12A planning application on the conditions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the subject RCHEs shall incur no financial implication, both capital and recurrent, to the Government; and (b) the design and construction of the RCHEs shall be in full compliance with relevant prevailing Ordinances, Regulations, and Codes of Practice enforcing in Hong Kong and any licensing requirement issued by the Social Welfare Department. 	
3	<p>Comments from Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) (Responsible Officer : Mr. SIT Yiu, Season; Tel: 2150 6953) Received on 18 November 2025</p>	
3.1	<p>Given that the development site of this application is the same as that set out in the pre-submission proposal submitted in June 2025, our previous comments are still valid and is extracted below for your easy reference. We have no comment on the responses to our comments provided during the pre-submission stage.</p> <p><i>'The agricultural (AGR) portion (viz. TPTL 183 S.A ss.1 and 183 S.A ss.2) of Master Layout Plan under application No. A/TP/333 possesses potential for agricultural rehabilitation as farming activities are very active in the vicinity and agricultural infrastructures such as road access and water source are also available. Thus, the agricultural portion is worthy of preservation. The proposed private residential development within the agricultural portion and the associated rezoning proposal (i.e. from "CDA(1)" to "R(B)") are not supported from an agricultural perspective.'</i></p>	<p>Indeed, according to the approved Master Layout Plan of the approved application no. A/TP/333, TPTL 183 S.A ss.1 and S.A ss.2 which are located to the west of Fung Yuen Road are part of the agricultural (AGR) portion of the subject "CDA(1)" zone. With reference to the landscape master plan of the approved application, these private lots areas owned by the Applicant are proposed to be the farmers' enclave at TPTL 183 S.A. ss1 in the south; and woodland meadows / nurseries at TPTL 183 S.A. ss2 in the north.</p> <p>The Applicant has been paying efforts throughout the years to reactivate the use of these two portions, however, due to the inherent physical and development constraints, they have remained as status-quo. For the woodland meadows / nurseries at TPTL 183 S.A ss2, it is primarily a low-lying plain, the health conditions of the vegetations and trees have always been poor due to excessive rainwater overland flow. Whilst, for the farmer's enclave at TPTL 183 S.A ss1, the stringent development restrictions imposed under the "CDA(1)" zoning of the Site, the area is not attractive enough to users and operators due to the lack of sheltered support facilities. Yet, as it is difficult to consolidate the land ownership in the subsequent phase to enable the remaining development (please refer to Chapter 2 of the Supporting Planning Statement with regard to the development history), the Applicant has reviewed again the development</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
		<p>potential of the overall “CDA(1)” zone and the possibility to reshuffle the themed areas. With the Applicant’s continuous efforts in land assembling, more private lots over 9,600m² have been acquired and integrated in the eastern AGR portion to enhance the function and comprehensiveness at the AGR portion.</p> <p>Whilst, as for the nearby farming activities, it is understood that farming activities are common in villages in the New Territories, usually at the front-door sites of their houses for own consumption or small-scale retail. The Applicant fully respect the farming activities performed by the villagers to support the local agricultural economy, which the Proposed Development is carefully formulated to minimize the disturbance to them. Besides, the Proposed Development would also enhance the external connectivity of the villagers with pedestrian accesses.</p> <p>Note least, the Application Site <u>does not</u> fall within the proposed Agricultural Priority Areas by the Environment and Ecology Bureau and AFCD promulgated in December 2024.</p>
4	Comments from Drainage Services Department (DSD) (Responsible Officer : Ms. HO Mei Yung, Karen; Tel: 2300 1364) Received on 18 November 2025	
4.1	<p><i>Drainage Impact Assessment</i></p> <p>R to C Item No. 97 refers. Based on Table 4.2, the flooding situation at certain locations are worsened due to the development (such as control point 6 under 50A and 50B cases), resulting in floodwater overflow into adjacent area. Please propose appropriate measures to address the backwater effect/floodwater overflow accordingly.</p>	<p>It is noted that the predicted water levels at Control Point 6 under the proposed condition with both Area (A) Phase I and Phase II are minor increased for 16mm and 6mm under 50A and 50B as compared with existing condition.</p> <p>The affected adjacent areas are mainly local vegetation area and the majority affected surrounding areas are owned by the Applicant (Annex B refers) . The Applicant expressed the increased flood depth are tolerable. In view of the above, taking account the proposed works in association with the proposed development will bring along with significant improvement to the upper section of the existing stream course, DSD could consider accept the DIA.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
4.2	Appendix K refers. Please update the development site boundary and provide a section showing the minimum clearance between the building in Area (A) Phase II and the existing streamcourse.	The development site boundary in Appendix K of the DIA (Annex C refers) is revised with an additional section (i.e. Section 8-8) showing Area (A) Phase II.
4.3	<i>Sewerage Impact Assessment</i> R to C Item No. 103 refers. Please provide the proof of in-principle agreement from Environmental Protection Department for our reference.	Noted.
5	Comments from Electrical & Mechanical Services Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. WONG Yu Hong, Simon; Tel: 2808 3229) Received on 18 November 2025	
5.1	<i>Town Gas Safety</i> Please note that the Application Site and the proposed rezoned areas therein fall within the consultation zone surrounding the Tai Po Gas Production Plant of the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Ltd. (HKCG).	Noted.
5.2	It is noticed from the supporting planning statement that a previous application Y/TP/38 was submitted for the same Application Site in 2022. In this regard, any previously conducted quantitative risk assessment (QRA) shall be updated to reflect the latest development parameters and population layout.	The application site is at the periphery and partially within the 1km consultation zone of TPGPP which is a PHI. Similar to the previous application (No. Y/TP/38), the applicant commits to conduct the QRA for submission to the CCPHI for approval. While the application site is quite distant apart from TPGPP, mitigation measures will be proposed and implemented where necessary for compliance with the risk guidelines.
5.3	If a QRA had never been conducted, the project proponent/occupant is required to conduct a QRA to assess the potential risks, having considered the proposed development and implement mitigation measures if necessary for compliance with the risk guidelines of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. The QRA should be completed as soon as practicable and submitted to the Coordinating Committee on CCPHI for their consideration and endorsement before the construction of development.	The applicant has committed to prepare the QRA for CCPHI submission in later stage in the previous application (Y/TP/38), and has liaised with and would appoint P-Tech (a subsidiary of The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited) to do so after approval of the application. Similarly, in this application, the applicant also commits to prepare the QRA for CCPHI submission in later stage after approval of the application. Endorsement from the CCPHI on the QRA will be obtained before the construction of the development.
5.4	The project proponent / occupant is required to observe the relevant requirements of the Electrical and Mechanical Services	Noted and will strictly follow.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	Department's "Guidance Note on Quantitative Risk Assessment Study for High Pressure Town Gas Installations in Hong Kong" for carrying out the QRA. The guidance note can be downloaded via the following weblink: https://www.emsd.gov.hk/en/gas_safety/publications/guidance_notes/index.html .	
5.5	The project proponent/occupant should liaise with the HKCG in respect of the exact locations of existing and planned gas pipes/gas installations in the vicinity to the site and any required minimum set back distance away from them during the planning, design and construction stages of any related works.	Noted and will strictly follow.
6	Comments from Fire Services Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. QIU Yi; Tel: 2733 5845) Received on 18 November 2025	
6.1	We have no specific comment on the proposal subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services.	Noted with thanks.
6.2	Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of the formal submission of general building plans.	Noted.
6.3	The provision of emergency vehicular access in the subject work shall comply with the requirements as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011.	Noted.
7	Comments from Highways Department (HyD) (Responsible Officer: Mr. LI Tsz Yau, Roy; Tel: 2762 4948) Received on 18 November 2025	
7.1	Please seek comments from Transport Department (TD) on your proposed run-in/out, if any, at Fung Yuen Road. If the proposed run-in/out is approved by TD, the applicant shall construct the run-in/out according to the latest version of HyD Standard Drawings no. H1113 and H1114, or H5133, H5134 and H5135, whichever set is appropriate to match with the existing adjacent pavement.	TD's comment on the proposed run-in/out has been sought. It is anticipated that further details of the ingress/egress will be in the next stage of the detailed design upon approval of this S12A Amendment of Plan Application. The run-in/out will be constructed according to HyD standards.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
7.2	The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) report and the conclusion made therein should be reviewed and agreed by TD.	The TIA has been circulated to TD for comments.
7.3	If the off-site traffic improvement schemes (e.g. for Junction A, B, C, D and E) recommended in your TIA study are considered necessary by TD, they shall be implemented to the standard and satisfaction of TD and this Department by the applicant at his own costs.	Noted.
7.4	The management and maintenance parties of the proposed roadworks, e.g. the proposed bus layby with bus turn-around facility, should be clarified.	The proposed bus layby with bus turn-around facility will be built by the Applicant and handover to the Government for management and maintenance.
7.5	Adequate drainage measures shall be provided to prevent surface water running from the Application Site to the nearby public roads and drains.	Noted.
7.6	For the Tree Survey Report, should there be any vegetation/tree currently maintained by HyD and will be affected by your project, please highlight the items for our further comments.	There is no vegetation/tree currently maintained by HyD and will be affected by proposed development at this rezoning stage. At later stage, if there is any vegetation/tree currently maintained by HyD which found affected by proposed development at detailed design stage, the applicant will seek for relevant departments for approval of relevant tree treatment/works in due course.
7.7	With reference to your area demarcations drawings, the Application Site includes part of SIMAR feature no. 7NW-B/R35, 7NW-B/C631, 7NW-B/R345 etc. are currently maintained by this Office. The above part of the SIMAR feature should no longer be maintained by this Office once the Application Site is granted to the applicant. The applicant should be responsible for the application, liaison and co-ordination with GEO of CEDD and LandsD for the modifications of the concerned SIMAR feature including the updating of as-built drawings and maintenance manuals to delineate clearly the updated feature boundary/extent.	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
8	Comments from Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division, Transport Department (Responsible Officer: Ms. LI Oi Yin, Yanny; Tel: 2399 6936) Received on 18 November 2025	
8.1	Table 2.2 - There were 597 ancillary private car parking spaces proposed in the pre- submission, however, the parking spaces in this submission is reduced to 470. Please clarify.	<p>This issue was responded in the previous Plan Application No. Y/TP/38 that not high end of parking provision is provided.</p> <p>With the limited site area, various site constraints and irregular configuration of the Rezoning Site, the Proposed Development has already accommodated 3 levels of basement for car park. Besides, the constraints imposed by the 3m-wide buffer zone of existing watercourse, building structures and essential and ancillary supporting facilities, such as E&M facilities, lift shafts, staircases for fire escape, box culvert and underground packaged sewage treatment plant, make it not practical to accommodate more parking space within the development site.</p>
8.2	Table 2.2 – Please clarify the type of goods vehicle (GV) loading/unloading (L/UL) spaces to be provided. L/UL spaces for M/HGV shall be considered at the commercial facilities and the corresponding swept path analysis shall be provided.	<p>As the access of the commercial building are near the priority junction at Fung Yuen Road, one ingress and egress accesses are proposed. However, under this arrangement, HGV cannot manoeuvre out from the minor road due to site constraint.</p> <p>Also, the commercial facilities will be used by local store / convenience store. LGVs will be used instead of MGV/HGVs for goods delivery.</p> <p>Anyway, a HGV L/UL bay will be provided at the residential portion near Tower T5 and the commercial building to facilitate the L/UL, in case delivery by HGV is required. Figure 2.2 of the TIA report (Annex D refers) indicates the proposed location of the HGV bay.</p>
8.3	Para. 2.4 – The applicant shall be responsible for the access management for the ingress and egress. The access control measures shall be demonstrated. In addition, please overlay the proposed access layout on the existing road with road marking with the proposed road layout with traffic signs and road markings for review of the practicability. Swept path analysis and sightline assessment shall be provided for the access connecting the	<p>The applicant will responsible for the access management for the ingress and egress. The road traffic signs and road markings could be used to control accesses for ingress/egress only. Traffic signs are used to prohibit vehicles over 7m length to enter the site.</p> <p>The proposed layout with traffic signs, road markings are shown in Figures 2.3 and 2.4. Swept path are shown in Figures 2.3 (SP) and 2.4 (SP).</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	commercial building and PVP and also the access connecting to the residential area.	Sightlines are shown in 2.3 (SL) and 2.4 (SL). There is no manoeuvring and sightline issue.
8.4	Table 2.3 – It is noted that SWD provided comments on the parking spaces and L/UL spaces in his email to KTA on 31 July 2025 which are different from the table. Appropriate private car parking spaces for visitor shall be provided. Please advise whether the 6 private car parking spaces are for staff use only or share with visitors. Appropriate loading/unloading spaces for general traffic, e.g. private car and taxi, shall also be provided. Please note that all the ancillary parking spaces for the Residential Care Home for the Elderly Day Care Unit shall be provided within the site Area B. The access of the Social Welfare facilities shall be indicated for review.	<p>SWD have no further comment in the latest email on 1 August 2025. The email is attached in Annex E for your reference.</p> <p>All staff will use public transport to travel to the RCHE. All the 6 nos. private car parking spaces will be reserved for the visitors. Assessment on 6 nos. of PV is added in Section 2.3 of the TIA report.</p> <p>Due to the small development scale and low trip generation of the RCHE, the general pick-up/drop-off could simply be carried out at the internal access road of the RCHE. Thus, no additional loading/unloading space will be provided.</p> <p>All the ancillary parking spaces for the RCHE will be provided within the site Area B.</p> <p>The access of Social Welfare facilities is shown in Figure 2.5 of the TIA report. Swept path and sightlines are shown in Figures 2.5 (SP) and 2.5 (SL)</p>
8.5	Table 4.3 – The applicant shall confirm the commissioning/population intake of the committed developments, e.g. the residential development at 36 Lo Fai Road (Villa Lucca) population intake is not completed and hence the additional traffic due to the development have not been fully taken into account in the traffic survey conducted on 14 April 2025.	Based on the information from the website of real estate agent, about 56% of Villa Lucca was sold. With further checking by on-site observation, the traffic survey conducted on 14 April 2025 has taken account the traffic generated by 40% population intake of Villa Lucca as a conservative approach. The traffic induced by the remaining 60% population intake has been assessed in the latest TIA report.
8.6	Table 4.8 and Figure 4.5 – The existing bicycle parking spaces at Fung Yuen Road near Ting Kok Road will be affected by the proposed road improvement works. The bicycle parking spaces shall be reprovided by the applicant.	Noted. The bicycle parking spaces will be reprovided as shown in Figure 4.5.
8.7	Table 6.1, 6.3 & 6.5 – There is no footpath along section K and the total footpath width for critical sections E is less than 2m, the applicant shall check the actual footpath width along Fung Yuen Road and revise accordingly.	Noted. Section K is deleted. Narrowest section of Section E is about 1m, assessment is revised based on this assessment. Figures 6.1 to 6.5 of the TIA report were revised accordingly.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
8.8	Since there is no footpath along some section of Fung Yuen Road southbound, the applicant shall assess the pedestrian travelling route. The applicant is also reminded that the design of footpath/walkways shall comply with the requirement stipulated in the Hong Kong Standards and Guidelines and other guidelines. Building set back or other means shall be considered for footpath widening to meet the relevant requirements.	The pedestrian travel route is shown in Figure 6.6 of the TIA report. For Section E, the narrow section (min. about 1m width) is proposed to be widened to min. 2m to match with the existing footpath as shown in Figure 6.5 of the TIA report which comply with the HKPSG and TPDM requirement.
8.9	Figure 4.4 – Please consider to enhance the connectivity of the cycle track at Ting Kok Road westbound by connecting the proposed and existing cycle track with provision of a pedestrian crossing.	Noted. The connectivity of the cycle tracks is revised as shown in Figure 4.4.
8.10	Figure 4.5 – Please review if the cycle track connectivity at Ting Kok Road eastbound can be enhanced by connecting the proposed and existing cycle track. Please also review the cycle track connectivity at Ting Kok Road westbound near the signalized controlled pedestrian crossing.	Noted. The connectivity of the cycle tracks is revised as shown in Figure 4.5. However, due to the present of existing staircase, house and bus stop near Fung Yuen Playground, it is not possible to further improve the cycle track connectivity at Ting Kok Road eastbound.
8.11	Appendix II – Junction D (2033 DESIGN TRAFFIC FLOWS (Improvement)) – It is noted that the proportion of turning traffic at Yuen Shin Road NB are -26% and -35% for AM and PM scenario. Please check your calculation and review whether two right turn traffic lanes and two straight ahead traffic lanes are sufficient.	Noted. After review, two right turn traffic lanes and two straight ahead traffic lanes at Yuen Shin Road NB are sufficient in the latest assessment. Therefore, no widening of the receiving lane of Dai Fat Street is required. The RC could reach 32% and 46% for AM and PM peak in the Design case with improvement. Figures 4.7, 4.7 (SP1) and 4.7 (SP2) were updated in the revised TIA report.
8.12	We understand the proposed road improvement works layout are preliminary and the detailed design will be further developed in the later stage. We reserve our comments on the detailed design to be submitted by the applicant in the later stage.	Noted.
8.13	The proposed road improvement works involve the resumption of government land allocation and extensive engineering works including the slope works. The applicant shall ascertain the feasibility of the proposed improvement. In addition, the programme may be optimistic. The applicant shall seek PlanD's and LandsD's comments on the appended programme to ensure its feasibility.	Noted. PlanD's and LandsD's comments would be sought
8.14	The applicant shall complete the road improvement works before population intake and Occupation Permit (OP) in order to alleviate	Noted. The applicant will complete the road improvement works as agreed by the relevant departments including TD before population intake and

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	the traffic impact arising from the development. Undertaking letter shall be provided by the applicant reflecting the above. In support of the S12A application, the above undertaking should be recorded in the meeting minutes of RNTPC Meeting.	Occupation Permit. Undertaking is also stated in Section 4.8.6 of the TIA report.
9	Comments from Transport Operation (NT) Division, Transport Department (Responsible Officer: Ms. LEE Siu Ping, Sonia; Tel: 2399 2442) Received on 18 November 2025	
9.1	In view of the difference in the number of units and estimated population of the revised s.12A planning application No. Y/TP/40 is minimal compared with the previous application No. Y/TP/38, the previous comment on public transport aspect for No. Y/TP/38 are still applicable, i.e. item 36 to 38 of the R-to-C on Pre-application enquiry (S3066a) in October 2025.	Noted
	<u>Previous 36</u> Refer to paragraph 2.4 Public Transport Services in the Vicinity of the Proposed Development of Appendix 9 of TIA, please note apart from the mentioned existing public transport services, there is Residents' Service, NR533 (Mont Vert - Tai Wo Station (Circular)), as supplementary transport service, serving the population of Mont Vert at Fung Yuen Road.	Residents' Service NR533 was added in Table 2.4 of the TIA report.
	<u>Previous 37</u> Refer to paragraph 5.17 of Appendix 9 of TIA, noted there will be shortage of GMB and bus services for the reference case in year 2033 indicated in Table 5.2. Agreed to enhance the public transport services, including both GMB and bus services, by increasing the frequency during the AM peak. Please keep close communication with TD and public transport service providers for the request on service enhancement.	Noted. We will keep close communication with TD and public transport service providers.
	<u>Previous 38</u> The previous comments from transport operation point of view of the TIA report submitted in 11th FI of planning application No. Y/TP/38 in the below are still valid.	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	<p>I. Please provide the swept path analysis for 12.8m-vehicle of the proposed bus layby for both northbound and southbound in Figure 5.2.</p> <p>II. Refer to para. 5.2.7, it is assumed that the proposed bus layby will have same bus routes as Fung Yuen Bus Terminus. Please keep close communication with TD and bus company for application on adding en-route stops of respective bus routes.</p> <p>III. Refer to para. 5.2.2, the estimated number of flats is around 1759 and the size of population of the proposed development is around 4750 in 2030, agreed to enhance the existing public transport services (including both bus and GMB services) by increasing the frequency during the AM peak period as per suggestion in para. 7.1.9. Please keep close communication with TD and public transport service providers for the request on service enhancement.</p>	<p>Swept paths are provided and shown in Figures 5.2 (SP) of the TIA report. There is no manoeuvring issue.</p> <p>Noted. We will keep close communication with TD and public transport service providers</p> <p>Noted. We will keep close communication with TD and public transport service providers</p>
9.2	<p>It is noted that the spare capacity of some of the existing public transport services in morning peak would be insufficient to cater to the future demand by Year 2033. It is agreed to enhance the GMB and bus services by introducing additional trips during the morning peak subject to the resources deployed by public transport service provider. Please maintain close communication with TD and public transport service providers for the requests for service enhancement.</p>	<p>Noted. We will keep close communication with TD and public transport service providers.</p>
10	<p>Comments from Landscape Unit, Urban Design & Landscape Section, PlanD (Responsible Officer: Mr. CHUI Wai Lun, Martin; Tel: 3565 3947) Received on 18 November 2025</p>	
10.1	<p><i>Landscape Planning Perspective</i></p> <p>A total of 684 trees are surveyed, 60 trees to be retained, 10 trees to be transplanted, 496 trees to be felled (due to conflict with the proposed development/ site formation works/ drainage improvement works/ tree health and structural condition), and 118 undesirable species (<i>Leucaena leucocephala</i>) to be felled. No registered Old and</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	Valuable Tree (OVT) and Champion Trees are recorded in the site. While three <i>Dalbergia odorifera</i> , listed under Cap.586 of Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), and 7 trees <i>Lagerstroemia speciosa</i> , listed under Cap 96 of rare and protected trees, are proposed to be felled within Area A Phase I, it is noted that most of these trees are cultivated species (except A48A). Provided that the applicant could confirm that the aforesaid tree is cultivated species, we have no adverse comment on the proposed tree treatment.	
10.2	Advisory Comments The applicant should be advised that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting and felling. The applicant is reminded to seek approval for any proposed tree works from relevant departments prior to commencement of the works.	Noted.
10.3	For compliance of site coverage of greenery requirements under PNAP APP-152, submission should be made separately to Building Department (BD) for comments and approval.	Noted.
11	Comments from Urban Design Unit, Urban Design & Landscape Section, PlanD (Officer: Mr. KO Chun Ki, Jason; Tel: 3565 3941) Received on 18 November 2025	
	Visual Impact Assessment	
11.1	Figure 6.3 – the proposed social welfare complex should appear to be taller (i.e. Phase I developments) in the photomontage.	Figure 6.3 of the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) (Annex F refers) has been revised.
11.2	Para. 6.3.3 – according to Town Planning Board Guideline (TPB-PG) No. 41, the effects of the visual changes can be graded qualitatively in terms of magnitude as substantial, moderate, slight or negligible . The term “ None ” is not of the threshold of effect of the visual changes, and should be revised to read “ negligible ”.	Para 6.3.3 of the VIA has been revised.
11.3	Para. 7.1.9 – according to TPB-PG No.41, “ acceptable ” is not one of the thresholds of the visual impact. There is no need to include	Para. 7.1.9 has been revised.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	<u>“..... which is considered acceptable and would be fully compatible to the surrounding visual context”.</u>	
11.4	<i>Air Ventilation Assessment – Expert Evaluation</i> Para 1.3.4 and table 2.2 – the range of Fu Tip Estate’s BHs should be about 48mPD to 157mPD.	The range of Fu Tip Estate’s BHs are revised in Para 1.3.4 and Table 2.2.
12	Comments from Environmental Protection Department (EPD) (Responsible Officer: Ms. TANG Wing Yee, Winnie; Tel: 2835 1096) Received on 18 November 2025	
12.1	<i>General and Environmental Implications</i> R to C Item 47: The previous comments have not been addressed. Instead of stating that the works are “minor” and do not constitute a Designated Project, please include a brief assessment in the submission demonstrating why the junction improvements are not a Designated Project (e.g. whether it constitute a material change to an existing Designated Project or exempted project).	The junction improvement works proposed in the TIA of the Application are minor in respect of any physical or structural operations involved. The scale is small and duration of the works are short, and gazetted under section 5 of the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance is not required. Adverse environmental impacts due to these improvement works are not anticipated. Hence, there is no material change to an existing Designated Project.
12.2	Discrepancies have been identified between the project boundary used in the technical assessments and that in the Planning Statement. Please review, clarify, and update the technical assessments as appropriate.	The Planning Statement indicate the Application Site. As some parts of the Application Site are proposed to reflect the “completed” parts of CDA(1)” zones according to their as-built conditions. No new developments is proposed in these completed parts. The Development Site consists of two areas: Area (A) and Area (B). All the technical assessments considered the Development Site only.
12.3	<i>Air Quality</i> It is noted that the Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) does not cover the entire Application Site in the planning statement. Please clarify the difference. Please be reminded that AQIA should cover the entire Application Site unless sufficient justifications are provided.	The project boundary refers to the “Development Site”, solely cover the western and southern portion of the “Application Site”, which are immediately available for development. The remaining northern and eastern portions of the “Application Site” are in “as-built” condition, hence, it is not covered in the “Development Site”.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
12.4	Section 3.4: Please provide the details of the weather during the site survey. Please check with regional office of EPD for any complaint record for the odour sources.	The details of the weather during the site survey are provided in Section 3.4 of the Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) (Annex G refers). Enquiry regarding odour complaint record for Tin Sam Sewage Pumping Station has been sent to EPD's Regional Office (North), their reply will be provided once available.
12.5	Section 5.2 and Table 5.1: Kindly note that air quality monitoring data for year 2024 has been published. Please update accordingly.	Section 5.2 and Table 5.1 of the AQIA are revised.
12.6	Table 5.1 - Notes (ii) and Table 5.2 – Notes [5]: Please revise to read “number of exceedances allowed per calendar year”.	Table 5.1 – Notes (ii) and Table 5.2 – Notes [5] of the AQIA are revised.
12.7	Table 5.2 – Notes [4]: Please rectify the typo O3 .	Table 5.2 – Notes [4] of the AQIA is revised.
12.8	Table 6.1 and Figure 1b: Please review whether the following locations are relevant representative construction phase ASRs: Village houses of no. 63, 78-79A and 69-77 of Fung Yuen, office of Tai Po Community Green Station, Fung Yuen Playground, Cinderella Farm and Butterfly Valley.	Table 6.1 and Figure 1b of the AQIA are revised to include more relevant representative construction phase ASRs.
12.9	Section 8.8 and Appendix 5: As with comment #3, air quality monitoring data for year 2024 has been published. Please update accordingly.	Section 8.8 and Appendix 5 of the AQIA are revised. Predicted cumulative annual average NO ₂ concentrations are also updated.
12.10	Section 9.1: Please confirm whether any new chimneys have been installed that are not already listed in the previous report.	It is confirmed that no new chimneys have been installed.
12.11	Section 10.4: Please be reminded that TD's endorsement on the traffic data should be available before we express no further comment on the AQIA.	TD's endorsement on the traffic data will be provided once available.
12.12	Section 10.7: Please provide a map showing all bus and PLB termini within the 500m assessment area, and indicate their distances to the project site to support the broad-brush approach. Please identify and discuss the following bus termini or goods vehicle parking: Fung Yuen (Mont Vert) Terminus, Tai Po Nethersole Hospital Terminus, and car park near Yue Kok Village Sitting-Out Area (which provide goods vehicle parking).	The locations of the identified depots, PTI, terminus and car park with good vehicles parking and their separation distances to the ASRs of the proposed Development are illustrated in Figure 7 of the AQIA. Fung Yuen (Mont Vert) Terminus, Tai Po Nethersole Hospital Terminus, and car park near Yue Kok Village Sitting-Out Area are also included in Section 10.7 and Figure 7 of the AQIA.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
12.13	Please present the “Road Segment” worksheet for open road emission in the Appendix. The required reporting contents are detailed in page 10 of Good Practices on Report and Model Submission (https://aqia.epd.gov.hk/doc/Good%20Practices%20on%20Report%20and%20Model%20Submission.pdf).	Noted, the “Road Segment” worksheet is presented accordingly.
12.14	Appendix 4 – CHP at Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital: Please note that the NOx emission factor of IC Engine in AP-42 Section 2.4 has been updated in May 2025. Please consider to update the emission accordingly.	The NOx emission factor of CHP at Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital is updated. Hence, the calculation of NOx chimney emissions is updated.
12.15	<i>Non-fuel Gas Dangerous Goods Risk</i> We have no objection from non-fuel gas dangerous goods risk perspective. However, because the PHI concerned is a gas production plant, the applicant should also consult EMSD for their view from fuel gas risk perspectives.	Noted.
12.16	<i>Noise</i> <u>Noise Impact Assessment (NIA)</u> Section 5.2: The traffic data adopted in the road traffic noise impact assessment should be endorsed by the Transport Department and the TD’s endorsement should be appended in the NIA report.	TD's endorsement on the traffic data will be provided once available.
12.17	Section 6.6: Please state that as a conservative approach, an assumption of 4 dB(A) noise reduction is used for the performance of the acoustic window (baffle type), to align with the conclusion in Appendix 8.	Section 6.6 of the Noise Impact Assessment (Annex H refers) is revised accordingly.
12.18	<u>Supporting Planning Statement</u> Section 7.9.3: Please revise as: “A Noise Impact Assessment has been conducted for the Proposed Development (Appendix 4 refers).	Para. 7.9.3 of the SPS has been revised.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	According to both daytime and night time noise measurements, it is confirmed that noise impact from Tai Po Industrial Estate on the Proposed Development would be negligible. Noise from fixed noise sources in the vicinity of the Proposed Development is inaudible. For fixed noise impact, assessment results indicate that the predicted fixed noise levels at all the residential flats in Area (A) and the social welfare facilities in Area (B) will be within the stipulated noise limits."	
12.19	<i>Water Quality</i> <u><i>Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA)</i></u> Table 3.5: Suggest to review peaking factor under "Total" column.	According to EPD/TP 1/05 table T-5 (b), the peaking factor for new sewerage for sewage treatment works under 10000 population shall be 3.
12.20	<u><i>Supporting Planning Statement</i></u> Section 7.9.11 (R to C Item No. 54): suggest to review if our previous comment has been addressed.	Para. 7.9.10 (former para. 7.9.11) of the SPS has been revised.
12.21	<i>Sewerage</i> Please be reminded that DSD's views on the SIA should be sought as treated effluent from the proposed STP would be discharged to nearby main stream.	Noted. DSD has no specific comments on the SIA except the following (Item 4.3 refers): <i>"Proof of in-principle agreement from EPD shall be provided to substantiate the provision of on-site sewage treatment plant, proposed sewage treatment process and the discharge of treated effluent to the "existing streamcourse running across the application site" is technically feasible and environmentally acceptable from government viewpoint."</i> Please advise any comment on the agreement.
13	Comments from Buildings Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. YUNG Chun Wai, Amen; Tel: 2626 1434) Received on 18 November 2025	
13.1	<i>Advisory Comments</i> Before any new building works are to be carried out on the application site, the prior approval and consent of the Building	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	Authority (BA) should be obtained unless they are exempted building works, designated exempted works or minor works commenced under the simplified requirements under the Buildings Ordinance (BO). Otherwise they are Unauthorized Building Works (UBWs). An Authorized Person should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO.	
13.2	For UBW erected on the leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the BA to effect their removal in accordance with Buildings Department's enforcement policy against UBWs as and when necessary. The granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any existing building works or UBWs on the application site under the BO.	Noted.
13.3	The sites for Area (A) and Area (B) shall be provided with emergency vehicular access under regulation 41D of Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R).	Noted.
13.4	Presumably the application site will abut on specified street(s) of not less than 4.5 wide, the development intensity shall not exceed the permissible under the First Schedule of B(P)R. Otherwise, if the sites for Area (A) and Area (B) do not abut on a specified street of not less than 4.5m wide, its permitted development intensity shall be determined under regulation 19(3) of B(P)R.	Noted.
13.5	In view of the size of the sites, area of any internal streets/ roads required under section 16(1)(p) of the BO should be deducted from the site area for the purpose of plot ratio (PR) and site coverage (SC) calculations under the BO.	Noted.
13.6	Each phase of the development for Area (A) should be self-sustainable under the BO.	Noted.
13.7	If the proposed PR is based on the assumption that Gross Floor Area (GFA) exemption will be granted for green/ amenity features and non-mandatory/ non-essential plant room, etc., the pre-requisites under Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-151 and APP-152 should be complied with.	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
13.8	Recreation facilities may be exempted from GFA calculation under BO if they comply with the requirements under PNAP APP-42 and APP-104.	Noted.
13.9	The proposed residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) may be subject to the issuance of a license. Please be reminded that any proposed building works on the application site intended to be used for such purpose is required to comply with the building safety and other relevant requirements as may be imposed by the licensing authority.	Noted.
13.10	The RCHE which is for habitation is domestic use under the BO. The modification of Regulations 19, 20, 21, 22 and 25 of the B(P)R for treating RCHE as a non-domestic building for the purpose of SC, PR calculation and provision of open space may be granted subject to the compliance with the requirements under PNAP APP-172.	Noted.
13.11	Disregarding carparking spaces, loading & unloading lay-by from GFA calculation under BO will be considered on the basis of the criteria set out in PNAP APP-2 and APP-111 during building plans submission stage.	Noted.
13.12	We reserve the comment on the high headroom of over 5m for the ground floor of residential blocks and first floor of commercial & public vehicle park 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.	Noted.
13.13	The discharge of foul water and surface water shall comply with regulations 40 & 41 under Building (Standards of Sanitary Fitments, Plumbing, Drainage Works and Latrines) Regulations.	Noted.
13.14	Detailed checking under the BO will be carried out at building plan submission stage.	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
14	Comments from Water Services Department (WSD) (Responsible Officer: Ms. WONG Sin Yan, Kathy; Tel: 2152 5752) Received on 18 November 2025	
14.1	<p>Existing water mains inside the proposed site as shown in the MRP may be affected. The applicant is required to either divert or protect the water mains found on site.</p> <p>If diversion is required, existing water mains inside the proposed site areas are needed to be diverted outside the site boundary of the proposed site to lie in Government land. A strip of land of minimum 1.5m in width should be provided for the diversion of existing water mains. The cost of diversion of existing water mains upon request will have to be borne by the applicant; and the applicant shall submit all the relevant proposal to WSD for consideration and agreement before the works commence.</p> <p>If diversion is not required, the following conditions shall apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Existing water mains are affected as indicated on the site plan and no development which requires resiting of water mains will be allowed. (b) Details of site formation works shall be submitted to the Director of Water Supplies for approval prior to commencement of works. (c) No structures shall be built or materials stored within 1.5 metres from the centre line(s) of water main(s) shown on the plan. Free access shall be made available at all times for staff of the Director of Water Supplies or their contractor to carry out construction, inspection, operation, maintenance and repair works. (d) No trees or shrubs with penetrating roots may be planted within the Water Works Reserve or in the vicinity of the water main(s) shown on the plan. No change of existing site condition may be undertaken within the aforesaid area without the prior agreement of the Director of Water Supplies. Rigid root barriers may be required if the clear distance between the proposed tree 	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	<p>and the pipe is 2.5m or less, and the barrier must extend below the invert level of the pipe.</p> <p>(e) No planting or obstruction of any kind except turfing shall be permitted within the space of 1.5 metres around the cover of any valve or within a distance of 1 metre from any hydrant outlet.</p> <p>(f) Tree planting may be prohibited in the event that the Director of Water Supplies considers that there is any likelihood of damage being caused to water mains.</p>	
14.2	<p>As shown in Attachment 1, please clarify whether your proposed development in the site area overlapped with our lower indirect water gathering ground. Please also find for your advance information "Conditions for Working within Water Gathering Ground" (See Attachment 2).</p>	<p>It is clarified that the proposed development does not overlap with WSD's lower indirect water gathering ground. The proposed development only takes place in the Western and Southern Portions of the Application Site.</p>
14.3	<p>Appendix 12 – WSIA: Section 5.1.1 – Please optimize the size of proposed fresh water main DN200mm for Area (A) Phase 1 and DN100 fresh water main for Area (A) Phase II respectively, and proposed flushing water main DN100mm for Area (A) Phase 1 and DN80 fresh water main for Area (A) Phase II respectively.</p>	<p>The proposed fresh water mains for Area (A) Phase I and Area (A) Phase II are optimized and reduced to DN150 and DN80 respectively. Besides, the proposed flushing water main for Area (A) Phase I and Area (A) Phase II are reduced to DN80 and DN50 respectively.</p> <p>Sections 4.1.1, 5.1.1 and Appendix D of the Water Supply Impact Assessment (Annex I refers) are revised accordingly.</p>
15	<p>Comments from Lands Department (LandsD) (Responsible Officer: Ms. LAM Sau Wai, Jade; Tel: 2654 1186) Received on 2 December 2025</p>	
15.1	<p><i>The Western Portion and Southwestern Portion</i></p> <p>Pursuant to SC(11)(b) of the Lease, the Agricultural Portion (i.e. TPTL 183 Section A) is restricted to agricultural uses or such other purposes as may be approved by the Director. TPTL 183 Section A, subsequently carved out into "TPTL 183 S.A ss.1", "TPTL 183 S.A ss.2" and "TPTL 183 S.A RP", is still held by the Applicant as required under SC(28)(b) of the Lease. The uses, development and details of the management and maintenance of the Agricultural Portion are governed by the "Detailed Maintenance and Management Plan"</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	approved under SC(15)(a)(i) of the Lease and the Grantee shall continue implementation of the approved Detailed Maintenance and Management Plan.	
15.2	There would be concern as to whether the Applicant would adversely affect the management and maintenance of the remaining of the Agricultural Portion (i.e. TPTL 183 S.A RP). Apparently, modification of the Lease and consequential amendment to the approved Detailed Maintenance and Management Plan relating to TPTL 183 S.A would be necessary if carve out of TPTL 183 S.A ss.1 and TPTL 183 S.A ss.2 from the Agricultural Portion for private residential development is acceptable to the relevant departments.	Noted.
15.3	The land status of the Yellow Areas of TPTL 183 is unleased Government land being landscaped and managed by the Grantee until such area is re-delivered on demand under the Lease to the Government. According to SC(9)(k) of the Lease, “the Government may dispose of the Yellow Areas ... for such purposes (including private residential use) as the Government shall at its own absolute discretion determine”.	Noted.
15.4	An indicative development proposal showing the intended development within the Development Site is illustrated in Appendix 1 of the Supporting Planning Statement (SPS) but no implementation arrangement is provided in the SPS. Given that the Yellow Areas with an area of about 1 hectare is of reasonable size serving with vehicular access, this Government land (GL) is considered as reasonably capable to be separately alienated.	<p>Please note that the delineation of this “Yellow Area” can be traced back to the planning approval back in early 2000.</p> <p>Back in 1980, the Fung Yuen Site (comprising the Development Site) was infested with car repair workshops, open storage and illegal petrol filling stations. In 1982, the area was zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Redevelopment Area” (“OU(CRA)”) for the intention of harnessing resources of the private sector to get rid of these “black spots”. Pursuant to the then “OU(CRA)” zoning, the Applicant commenced assembling the private lots and committed tremendous time and resources in clearing the environmentally undesirable uses within the area since 1987. In 1999, the Fung Yuen Site was subsequently rezoned to “CDA(1)” for comprehensive development / redevelopment in the area.</p> <p>After spending more than 13 years since 1987 in assembling the land and clearing the black spots within the “CDA(1)” zone by the Applicant, first</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
		<p>planning approval for the MLP of the entire “CDA(1)” zone was granted to the Applicant in 2000 (Planning Application No. A/TP/256) with the second approval granted in 2004 (Planning Application No. A/TP/333).</p> <p>With the surrender of the Applicant’s private lots within the “CDA(1)” zone (including those previously also falling within the Yellow Area), the said Yellow Area had been reserved for Subsequent Phase Development which could only take place when the Applicant has been able to acquire ALL the remaining private lots scattered within the “CDA(1)” zone within the “CDA(1)” zone.</p> <p>This had been clearly indicated in the Tai Po District Lands Conference held on 2 Jan 2003 and the approval MLP of Planning Application No. A/TP/333 (deposited in the Land Registry) that the Applicant has been expected to further acquire ALL the remaining private lots within the “CDA(1)” zone, followed by a land exchange, to enable the implementation of the Subsequent Phase Development on the Yellow Area. Prior to the materialisation of land exchange for the Subsequent Phase Development, the Tai Po District Lands Conference had no objection to allow the Applicant to maintain the Yellow Area.</p> <p>For the implementation of Subsequent Phase Development, the Applicant has never thought of giving up and has made persistent efforts in land acquisition. After spending another 25 years since the 1st planning approval in 2000, for assembling all the remaining piecemeal private lots, the prospect for implementation of the Subsequent Phase Development is very remote, if not impossible, due to absentee ownership, too long and land title problems. With a total land assembly time of 38 years, the acquisition of ALL remaining private lots within the “CDA(1)” zone in order to exchange land for implementation of Subsequent Phase Development is therefore pessimistic.</p> <p>The Applicant has therefore taken the first step to put forward this S12A Amendment of Plan Application to include those land owned and newly acquired by the Applicant together with the Yellow Area to resolve the</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
		<p>dilemma on landownership. We believe that this will be a better alternative proposal for a comprehensive residential development with the aim of providing more housing unit supply without jeopardising the original planning intention of the “CDA(1)” zone, which is also in line with Government’s policy of optimising the use of developable land as far as practicable.</p> <p>With the approval of this application by the TPB and the rearrangement of the land for the Subsequent Phase Development based on the remaining private lots development potential within the “CDA(1)” zone at the south of the proposed Tower 6 or north of Tower 1, the development potential of the Development Site can be unleashed to meet the urgent housing needs.</p>
15.5	<p>Given the comments in Item 4 above, the Government reserves all rights to dispose the GL within the Development site and should not in anyway be bound by the indicative development proposal. Further, according to para. 3.6.3 of the SPS, only 52% of the Western Portion is owned by the Applicant and its sister company. In this connection, the Applicant is requested to advise the implementation arrangement and our comments on the same is hereby reserved.</p>	<p>Land exchange application will mainly include all the land owned by the Applicant plus the adjoining intervening Government land, as considered appropriate. Project implementation programme will be attached to the land exchange application for consideration.</p> <p>For the justification of including the adjoining Government land (i.e. Yellow Area) into the Development Site, please refer to our response Item 15.4 above. We believe that this subject comprehensive development proposed which has taken into account the complicated land ownership issues / problems in a holistic manner, is a sensible solution and would help to unleash the development potential of the yellow area.</p>
15.6	<p><i>The Northern Portion and Eastern Portion</i></p> <p>Should the Application be approved by the Town Planning Board, applications for land exchange and lease modification would be required for implementation of the proposed developments. The land owner is reminded that every application submitted to LandsD will be considered on its own merits by LandsD at its absolute discretion acting in its capacity as a landlord and there is no guarantee that the land exchange and lease modification applications will eventually be approved. If the applications for land exchange and lease modification be approved, they will be subject to such terms and</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	conditions as may be imposed by LandsD at its absolute discretion, including payment of premia and administrative fees.	

Encl.

Annex A – Revised Supporting Planning Statement

Annex B – Land Status Plan of the Adjacent Area

Annex C – Replacement Pages of Drainage Impact Assessment

Annex D – Revised Traffic Impact Assessment

Annex E – Email Dated 1.8.2025 from Social Welfare Department

Annex F – Replacement Pages of Visual Impact Assessment

Annex G – Revised Air Quality Impact Assessment

Annex H – Revised Noise Impact Assessment

Annex I – Replacement Pages of Water Supply Impact Assessment

Compiled by: KTA

Date: 10 December 2025

File Ref: 20251210_S3066a_FI-2_R-to-C