

**Proposed Rezoning of the Site from “Industrial (Group D)”, “Residential (Group A)” and “Agriculture” to “Residential (Group A)1”
for Residential Development at Various Lots and Adjoining Government Land in D.D. 107, Fung Kat Heung, Yuen Long
(S12A Amendment of Plan Application No. Y/YL-KTN/7)**

– Further Information No.1 –

Item	Comments	Our Responses
1	Comments from Water Supplies Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. HO Ho Yuan; Tel: 2152 5778) Received on 1 December 2025	
1.1	Existing water mains will be affected as shown on the plan. The cost of any necessary diversion shall be borne by the proposed development.	Noted.
1.2	In case it is not feasible to divert the affected water mains, a waterworks reserve within 1.5 metres from the center line of the water main shall be provided to WSD. No structure shall be built or materials stored within this waterworks reserve. 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.	Noted.
1.3	No trees or shrubs with penetrating roots may be planted within the Waterworks Reserve or in the vicinity of the water main shown on the plan	Noted.
1.4	Government shall not be liable to any damage whatsoever and howsoever caused arising from burst or leakage of the public water mains within and in close vicinity of the site.	Noted.
2	Comments from Civil Aviation Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. LAW Yue Hei, Andy; Tel: 2910 6979) Received on 3 December 2025	
2.1	Given the proposed site's proximity to the Shek Kong Airfield, the project proponent is reminded of the following: - <u>Control of Hazardous Lights</u>	

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	All lights, including those installing during construction or for maintenance after the completion of the construction works, shall not be projected skyward and from a source of glare or in any way affect pilots in flight.	Noted.
2.2	<u>Aircraft / Helicopter Noise</u> Although the aircraft / helicopter operations at the Shek Kong Airfield may not demonstrate a regular pattern, due to the quiet ambience of the site and relatively lower flying altitude of those aircraft / helicopter operations, aircraft / helicopter noise may be experienced and have an impact on nearby residential areas.	Noted.
2.3	We therefore suggest assessments on potential aircraft noise issues arising from operations at the Shek Kong Airfield should be conducted, and appropriate noise mitigation measures (e.g. using acoustic insulation, etc.) be implemented to enhance the indoor living environment. It is also suggested that future residents be alerted of the potential aircraft / helicopter operations at the Shek Kong Airfield.	Noted. Future residents will be alerted of the potential aircraft / helicopter operations at the Shek Kong Airfield. Considering the long distance between the proposed development and the Shek Kong Airfield of ~2.6 km, and the future glass panel thickness of at least 6mm applied at façade to provide a better insulation, potential aircraft/ helicopter noise issues are not anticipated.
3	Comments from Environmental Protection Department (Contact Person: Mr. WONG Kin Wa, Kelvin ; Tel: 2835 1117) Received on 10 and 15 December 2025	
	General	
3.1	It is noted that there are some sections in the planning statement summarizing the information from the environmental assessment and sewage impact assessment, please be reminded to ensure the consistency of information.	Sections 4.2 and 4.4 of the Supporting Planning Statement have been revised.
3.2	RtC (1) - Please be reminded to supplement the road type of the road proposed to be widened before and after the proposed road works with TD's endorsement when available in S.1.4.15.	The Project Traffic Consultant is seeking the confirmation from TD. TD's endorsement will be provided once it is available.
3.3	Please highlight/indicate all changes for ease of review.	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
3.4	<p>Air Quality</p> <p>Sections 1.4.1, 2.2.1 and 2.2.2</p> <p>a. Please clarify whether survey(s) have/has been carried out in this year. If negative, please carry out updated site survey to verify the findings since the surveys have been carried out more than a year ago.</p> <p>b. In addition, please note that the assessment area should be 500m from the boundary of the subject site instead of 200m. Please review and supplement as appropriate.</p>	<p>It is clarified that the latest survey was conducted before on 24 June 2025. Moreover, additional site survey was conducted on 19 December 2025. Sections 1.4.1, 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 of the Environmental Assessment (EA) have been updated accordingly. Appendix 2.2 – 2.4 are also revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted. Relevant sections and Figure 2.2 of the EA have been revised accordingly.</p>
3.5	<p>Section 2.3.2 - It is noted that Miu Kwok Monastery was closed for the visit of public until September 2025. Please carry out updated survey if it has been re-opened.</p>	<p>Noted that Miu Kwok Monastery has been re-opened. An additional survey has been conducted on 19 December 2025 for updating the latest condition of Miu Kwok Monastery. According to the observations, the condition of Miu Kwok Monastery is the same as before. Therefore, the previous findings are considered as valid. Similar to the observation before, the movable small-scale burning container was not in use during onsite survey. Therefore, no photo of the movable small-scale burning container could be recorded.</p>
3.6	<p>Section 2.3.3 - Please clarify whether survey(s) have/has been carried out in this year. If negative, please carry out updated site survey to verify the findings since the surveys have been carried out more than a year ago. In addition, please advise any operations/processes of the recycling workshop if there was no processing of waste cooking oils observed.</p>	<p>It is clarified that the latest survey has been conducted on 24 June 2025 before. Moreover, an additional survey has been conducted on 19 December 2025.</p> <p>According to the observations during the onsite surveys, the workshop is mainly for the storage of “waste cooking oils” collected. And no operations/processes of the “waste cooking oils” could be observed. Section 2.3.3 of the EA has been revised accordingly.</p>
3.7	<p>Section 2.3.4 - Please review and consider if “as far as practicable” should be added at the end of the last bullet.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 2.3.4 of the EA has been revised accordingly.</p>
3.8	<p>Section 2.3.5 - Please supplement the purpose of comparison of the odour impact assessment results of the approved EIA Report (AEIAR-207/2017).</p>	<p>Noted. Section 2.3.5 of the EA has been revised accordingly.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
3.9	<p>Section 2.4.1</p> <p>a. Re. R-t-C #6, please provide TD's confirmation on the road type of Fung Kat Heung Road and access roads once available.</p> <p>b. In addition, please provide justification to support feeder road is comparable to local distributor therefore 5m buffer distance can be applied.</p>	<p>The Project Traffic Consultant is seeking the confirmation from TD. TD's endorsement will be provided once it is available.</p> <p>As mentioned in Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM) Volume 2 Chapter 3.2 published by TD, Feeder Roads are lowest level of road under Rural Road Types. They are roads connecting villages or more remote settlements to Rural Roads. Local Distributors are lowest level of road under Urban Road Types. They are roads within Districts linking developments to the District Distributor Roads. Therefore, feeder roads are comparable to or even lower than local distributor and therefore 5m buffer distance can be applied.</p>
3.10	Section 2.4.3 - Please review and consider if "as far as practicable" should be added at the end of this section.	Noted. Section 2.4.3 of the EA has been revised accordingly.
3.11	Section 6.1.2 - Please revise "generated" in the 2nd last line to "anticipated".	Noted. Section 6.1.2 of the EA has been revised accordingly.
3.12	<p>Noise</p> <p>The applicant has committed during the pre-submission stage that an updated noise impact assessment will be submitted under the land administration mechanism (i.e., land lease). As such, please suitably document such commitment in the Environmental Assessment report. The applicant is also advised to note our advisory comments preparing an updated NIA at a later stage:</p> <p>a. As the proposed development may face substantial I/R interface problems against "Industrial("I(D)") zone as well as the existing/planned industrial activities/facilities nearby, a comprehensive fixed noise sources impact assessment which shall take into account fixed noise sources (e.g, open storage & warehouses and other industrial facilities) within the assessment area at the time of assessment, with the support of</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. A comprehensive fixed noise sources impact assessment will be carried out in the updated NIA in later stage.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	<p>sufficient site surveys and/or confirmations from the relevant operators as well as proper documentation of the surveys' findings, shall be carried out in the updated NIA and propose mitigation measures as necessary.</p> <p>b. Appendix 4.1 – The noisy equipment (e.g. forklift) is found in Site Survey Photos 4 and 6. All existing fixed plant noise sources within the 300m study area should be included in the fixed plant noise impact assessment. Therefore, the consultant should critically clarify, review and update the fixed noise impact assessment and propose mitigation measures to alleviate fixed plant noise impact on the planned NSR(s) if necessary.</p> <p>c. Please document TD's agreement on the traffic forecast data in the report once available. In case TD has no comment on the methodology for traffic forecast only, the consultant should provide written confirmation from the respective competent party (e.g. traffic consultant) that TD's endorsed methodology has been strictly adopted in preparing the traffic forecast data, and hence the validity of traffic data can be confirmed.</p>	<p>Noted. A comprehensive fixed noise sources impact assessment will be carried out in the updated NIA in later stage. Noise mitigation measures will be proposed to alleviate potential fixed plant noise impact on the planned NSR(s) if necessary.</p> <p>Noted. The document will be supplemented once available.</p>
3.13	<p>Sewerage</p> <p>RtC item 17 & Section 2.3.3 – Please note that the previous comment suggested revising Section 2.3.3 as "...would only be opted for under certain circumstances as stated below". Please revise accordingly and revert the 2nd bullet under Section 2.3.3 as "...under Preferred Option".</p>	<p>Noted and revised.</p>
3.14	<p>RtC item 18 – Please conduct the hydraulic assessment of the proposed sewage disposal scheme i.e. from the proposed site to SPSPS to demonstrate the proposed development has no adverse impact to the existing/planned sewerage system. Please revise relevant sections and appendices accordingly.</p>	<p>The hydraulic assessment has been included in the SIA.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	Waste Management	
3.15	S.5.5.2 Please revise and clarify whether the third bullet point refers to chemical wastes.	The concerned bullet point refers to chemical waste. S.5.5.2 of the EA is revised.
3.16	S.5.5.28 Please clarify whether the trip-ticket system will be applied.	Trip-ticket system will be applied. S.5.5.28 of the EA is revised for a better presentation.
3.17	S.5.5 Please include waste assessment and mitigation measures for operation phase.	S.5.6 of the EA is added to include the waste assessment and mitigation measures for operation phase.
	Land Contamination	
3.18	S.5.6.9 Please clarify whether there is clear evidence of land contamination from the past operations of Soy and Sauce Factory.	According to the aerial photos within the year that the Soy and Sauce Factory was in operation and been demolished in Appendix 5.1 of the EA , no land-contamination related feature would be spotted. Also, given the nature of soy and sauce factory, potential land contamination from the Factory is not anticipated.
4	Comments from Housing Projects 1 Unit, Civil Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (Contact Person: Mr. TSE Chit Hei, Jordan; Tel: 3919 8612) Received on 11 December 2025	
4.1	This office would like to point out that the applicant made various made assumptions on the provision of roadworks, junction improvement works (including PTI) and other infrastructure works under SPPHD. The applicant also assumed the works at SPPHD would be completed by 2031. As advised by HB, the policy bureau of SPPHD, SPPHD forms part of the NDA around Au Tau Station (please refer to 2025 Policy Address). As such, the development programme of Sha Po Public Housing Development is dependent on the outcome of the land use review pertinent to the Sha Po area and the overall planning of the NDA.	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
5	Comments from Housing Department (Contact Person: Mr. CHUNG Wing Hong, Leo; Tel: 2761 5458) Received on 11 December 2025	
5.1	<p><u>General Comments</u></p> <p>The site boundary proposed by the Applicant has encroached onto the boundary of the “Residential (Group A)” zone which was rezoned for the Sha Po public housing development. CEDD is conducting an IDC Study under Agreement No. CE 8/2022 (CE). CEDD should be consulted on the development and implementation programme, interface issues, infrastructural capacity, etc. for Sha Po public housing development and its associated infrastructure works.</p>	<p>It is noted that CEDD is conducting an engineering investigation, design and construction study under Agreement No. CE 8/2022 (CE). CEDD has been consulted on the interface issue between Sha Po public housing development and the proposed development under the application. CEDD’s comment on the site boundary proposed by the Applicant is as follows:</p> <p><i>“Presumably, the development boundary of the subject applicant would not encroach upon the proposed land resumption boundary of “Site Formation and Infrastructure Works for Public Housing Developments at Sha Po” (SPPHD) as shown on Figures 2.3 – Land Status Plan and 3.1 – Latest Proposed Land Resumption Plan of the applicant’s submission.”</i></p> <p>As such, we confirm that our application site has specifically taken into account and does not encroach upon the Sha Po Public Housing Site Boundary.</p> <p>It is understood that the proposed infrastructure works under CEDD’s IDC study for Sha Po Public Housing Development Project were designed specifically for supporting the housing development at Sha Po. The technical assessments for the proposed development in this rezoning application have been conducted with reference to the proposed design for the Sha Po Public Housing Development Project. The proposed development would result in a slight increase in cumulative discharge originally planned under the Sha Po Public Housing Development Project. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated provided the recommended improvement measures in the study of this rezoning application are implemented.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
5.2	It is noted that the anticipated completion of Applicant's proposed development will be in 2035 and that its implementation relies on relevant road improvement and infrastructural works (i.e. drainage, sewerage and water supply) associated with/reserved for Sha Po public housing development. HD is of the view that the Applicant should ensure self-sustained infrastructural capacities for their proposed development and should not rely on the infrastructural capacities reserved for the Sha Po public housing site	Noted. In the event that the development programme of the Sha Po public housing development is postponed, the target completion year of the proposed development will be reviewed.
5.3	The Applicant shall ensure the proposed development will not result in insurmountable impacts to the planned public housing development at Sha Po.	Noted.
5.4	It is observed that the Applicant has adopted the information from the public domain at rezoning stage of the Sha Po public housing site. The proposed layout, facilities, implementation programme etc. for the public housing site are indicative only and are subject to detailed design and further changes.	Noted.
5.5	<u>Para. 3.4.1 & Figure 3.2</u> The proposed road widening of the local access road should not encroach into the Sha Po public housing site.	The proposed road widening of the local access road would not encroach into the Sha Po public housing site.
6	Comments from Urban Design Unit, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Planning Department (Contact Person: Ms. LEE Wing Ki, Nicole; Tel: 3565 3945) Received on 19 December 2025	
6.1	Please have the following observations/comments from visual and air ventilation perspectives: Visual The subject site is located adjacent to the planned public housing development in Sha Po with maximum building height of 185mPD. According to the indicative scheme, the proposed development mainly comprises 2 residential towers with building height of 156mPD. As demonstrated by the visual impact assessment	Noted with thanks.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	submitted, the visual impacts of proposed development would range from 'negligible' to 'slightly adverse'. We considered that significant adverse visual impact arising from the proposed development is not anticipated.	
6.2	<u>Comments on VIA</u> For VP Nos. 6 to 9, since the proposed development is visible at these VPs and would result visual obstruction, the overall visual impact should be rated as 'slightly adverse'.	The assessment of visual impact for VP6, VP7, VP8 and VP9 have been revised.
6.3	Air Ventilation The proposed development with site area of not more than 2 hectares and overall PR of not more than 5. In view of the scale of the proposed development, we considered that significant adverse air ventilation impact on the surrounding pedestrian wind environment is not anticipated.	Noted with thanks.
7	Comments from Lands Department (Contact Person: Mr. CHAN Ming Yiu, Cliff; Tel: 2443 3356) Received on 22 December 2025	
7.1	The Application Site comprises various private lots, namely Lot Nos. 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554 S.A & S.B, 556,557 S.A & S.B, 558, 559,560 S.A, 561 S.A, 562 RP, 563 RP, 564, 565 RP and 566 all in D.D. 107 ("the Lots"). The Lots are old schedule agricultural lots held under Block Government Lease and no structure is allowed to be erected without the prior approval of the Government.	Noted.
7.2	The actual site area, land status, ownership particulars etc. of the private lots and G.L. involved under application have to be verified at the land exchange stage if any land exchange is applied for by the Applicant to Lands Department (LandsD).	Noted.
7.3	According to the records of Land Registry, the Lots are currently owned by different registered owners. The ownership particulars of	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	the Lots forming the Application Site have to be examined in details at the land exchange application stage.	
7.4	In the event the subject application under S.12A of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) is accepted or partially accepted by the Town Planning Board (TPB) with a set of clear development parameters (including but not limited to the proposed user, gross floor area and car parking provisions, as appropriate) defined / firmed up and further submission to the TPB (including application(s) for permission under S.16 of the TPO after the corresponding amendment to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) has been made) is not required, the land owner(s) may submit request for streamlined processing of land exchange application. Depending on the circumstances of each case, LandsD at its sole and absolute discretion may, upon receipt of such valid request and subject to payment of the administrative fee(s) (including fee payable to the Legal Advisory and Conveyancing Office, if required) by the land owner(s), commence the streamlined processing of the land exchange application on a without prejudice and non-committal basis while Planning Department (PlanD) is taking forward the relevant OZP amendment.	Noted.
7.5	The land owner(s) is/are reminded that once the accepted or partially accepted proposal is reflected in the OZP and approved under S. 9 of the TPO, a formal application for land exchange by land owner(s) to LandsD is still required. 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 application will eventually be approved by LandsD. If the application for land exchange is approved by LandsD, it will be subject to such terms and conditions as may be imposed by LandsD at its absolute discretion, including payment of premium and administrative fee(s).	Noted.

Encl.

Annex A – Revised Supporting Planning Statement

Annex B – Revised Environmental Assessment

Annex C – Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment

Annex D – Revised Visual Impact Assessment

Compiled by: KTA

Date: 31 December 2025

File Ref: 20251231_S3066a_FI(1)_R-to-C