

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. A/SK-SKT/34

- Applicants** : Boxwin Limited, Jade Spirit Limited, Regenteam Investments Limited, Shingo Development Limited and Tenswin Limited represented by Arup Hong Kong Limited
- Site** : Various Lots in D.D. 221 and adjoining Government Land (GL), Sha Ha, Sai Kung, New Territories
- Site Area** : About 9,041m² (including about 2,590m² (29%) of GL)
- Lease** : (a) All lots except Lot 1696 in D.D. 221: Block Government Lease (demised for agricultural purpose and no structure shall be erected)
(b) Lot 1696 in D.D. 221: New Grant Lot (restricted for threshing floor on which no building shall be erected)
- Plan** : Approved Sai Kung Town Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-SKT/6
- Zoning** : Area shown as ‘Road’
- Application** : Proposed Residential Development and Public Vehicle Park (PVP)

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicants seek planning permission for proposed residential development and PVP at the application site (the Site), which falls within an area shown as ‘Road’ on the OZP. According to the covering Notes of the OZP, all uses or developments within an area shown as ‘Road’ except those specified require planning permission from Town Planning Board (the Board). The Site, currently paved and mainly vacant (**Plans A-2a and A-4**), is immediately adjoining to a planned comprehensive residential development with PVP in the “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) zone to its north which was approved by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board in 2022.
- 1.2 According to the applicants’ submission, the proposed development involves three 10-storey residential towers atop a one-storey basement with a plot ratio (PR) of 1.5 and a gross floor area (GFA) of about 11,421m² providing 280 private housing units. The residential towers are located in the northeastern portion of the Site outside the three visual corridors with widths of 7.5m, 10m and 15m respectively which are extended from the adjoining “CDA(1)” zone (**Drawing A-12**) directed to the waterfront and the planned Town Square to the southeast. The three towers are 10

storeys high (about 46mPD), which can still follow the stepped building height profile of the adjoining comprehensive residential development to the immediate east descending from 10 storeys in the northwest to 4 storeys in the southeast towards the town centre. A 2-storey clubhouse is provided at the southwestern portion of the Site. A strip of land will be reserved at the southern end of the Site to connect with the 6m-wide public pedestrian walkway committed in the “CDA(1)” site connecting to the footpath of Tai Mong Tsai Road and Mei Fuk Street (**Drawing A-12**). A right of access for the Antiquities and Monuments Office’s (AMO’s) excavation works of the “CDA(1)” site from Tai Mong Tsai Road has also been reserved. The PVP with 10 spaces, ancillary car parking spaces for residents and visitors, loading/unloading (L/UL) spaces and motorcycle parking spaces are proposed in the basement (**Drawings A-1 and A-14**). The major development parameters of the proposed development are as follows:

Key Development Parameters	
Gross Site Area	About 9,041m ² (including GL of about 2,590m ²)
Development Site Area ¹	About 7,617m ² (including GL of about 1,144m ²)
PR ²	1.5
GFA ²	About 11,421m ²
Site Coverage (SC)	Not more than 42%
Number of Building Blocks	
- Residential Tower	3
- Clubhouse	1
Building Height (BH)	
- Residential Tower	46mPD
- Clubhouse	20mPD
Number of Storeys	
- Residential Tower	10 (atop a one-storey basement)
- Clubhouse	2
Number of Flats	280
Average Unit Size	About 40.79m ²
Design Population	About 756
Local Open Space ²	Not less than 756m ²
Total No. of PVP Spaces	10
Total No. of Ancillary Parking Facilities	78
- Private Car (Residents)	62
- Private Car (Visitors)	13
- Motorcycle	3
Total No. of L/UL Spaces	3
- Heavy Goods Vehicles	3
Residents’ Clubhouse ³	About 571.05m ²
Greenery Coverage ²	Not less than 20%

1.3 The applicants submit a set of technical assessment reports including Traffic Impact

¹ The boundary of development site covers the areas falling outside the future road extent of Hiram’s Highway Improvement Stage 2 Project (HH2) on the gazetted road scheme. The current gross site boundary includes land which is required for works area and roadside area of widened Tai Mong Tsai Road (e.g. amenity area, noise barrier) of HH2. The exact site boundary will be confirmed at the later land exchange stage.

² The PR, GFA, local open space and greenery coverage calculations are based on the development site area.

³ Assumed not GFA-accountable according to the applicants’ submission.

Assessment (TIA), Environmental Assessment (EA), Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA), Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), tree survey, Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) and Water Supply Impact Assessment (WSIA) in support of the application. The Lot Index Plan showing the land ownership, Master Layout and Vehicular and Pedestrian Access Plan, Landscape Master Plan (LMP), Landscape Section Plans, photomontages and Planning and Design Merits Plan are shown in **Drawings A-1 to A-12**.

Traffic Aspect

- 1.4 In the TIA, traffic surveys at nine junctions/roundabouts and six road links have been conducted for assessing the impact of the proposed development to the existing traffic condition. Taken into account the planned HH2 Project which is scheduled to be completed by 2032, the traffic generated by the proposed development could be absorbed by the nearby road network and would not cause any adverse traffic impact (**Appendix C of Appendix Ia**). The applicants also propose a ‘left-in/left-out’ arrangement for the vehicular access at Tai Mong Tsai Road to minimise the traffic impact to Tai Mong Tsai Road (**Drawing A-2**). The proposed pedestrian crossing at the run-in/out at Tai Mong Tsai Road would be designed and constructed under the own cost of the applicants. After completion, the crossing would be handed over to the Government subject to further liaison with relevant government departments under future land exchange stage.

Environmental Aspect

- 1.5 An EA (**Appendix D of Appendix Ia**) has been conducted to evaluate potential environmental impacts on the proposed development in terms of road traffic noise, fixed noise, air quality and water quality in both operation and construction phases. Fixed glazing windows, acoustic windows or enhanced acoustic balconies (both baffle type) have been proposed to attenuate the road traffic noise impact to the proposed development, which could achieve full compliance with the relevant noise criterion of 70dB(A) stated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Moreover, the proposed development would not be subject to noise exceedance of acceptance level at selected noise sensitive receivers arising from nearby fixed noise sources within 300m including two garages and air conditioning of adjoining school.
- 1.6 There are no industrial use and no emission source such as chimney stack or any other emission like odour and smoke identified within the 200m assessment area. Buffer zone for representative air sensitive uses of more than 10m from Tai Mong Tsai Road and Wai Man Road are proposed. It is envisaged that the proposed development would not be subject to adverse air quality impact. There are chemical storage, forklift repair workshop, metal workshop and storage area for machinery workshop within the Site. Further site appraisal and soil sampling are recommended after the Site is cleared. Contamination Assessment Plan with Contamination Assessment Report, Remediation Action Plan and Remediation Report will be prepared to cover all potential land contaminating area within the Site for relevant department’s approval in later stage.
- 1.7 With the implementation of effective environmental mitigation measures, such as good site practices, close monitoring by resident engineers, use of spray water, dust suppression chemical and scaffolding with dust screens etc., it is envisaged that environmental impacts during construction phase including dust emission, noise,

water quality and waste impacts would be insignificant.

Drainage, Sewerage and Water Supply Aspects

- 1.8 According to the SIA (**Appendix E of Appendix Ia**), the sewage generated by the proposed development would be discharged to Sai Kung Sewerage Treatment Works via Sai Kung Sewage Pumping Station No. 2 with sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional sewage flows. No adverse impact would be induced by the proposed development.
- 1.9 As indicated in the DIA (**Appendix F of Appendix Ia**), the Site is not classified as Flooding Blackspots and runoff from the proposed development would be discharged to the existing downstream drainage network. The existing drainage network still has sufficient capacity to convey the runoff flows. As such, the proposed development would not cause any adverse drainage impact to the existing public drainage infrastructure.
- 1.10 According to the WSIA (**Appendix I of Appendix Ia**), the estimated freshwater demand, firefighting and flushing water demand for the proposed development could be accommodated by the available capacity of Pak Kong Au Fresh Water Service Reservoir. No adverse impact to the existing water supply system would be anticipated.

Archaeological Aspect

- 1.11 According to the archaeological works previously conducted within and in close proximity to the Site, original and in-situ deposit with archaeological significance were not found at the eastern part of the Site. However, a thin cultural layer within archaeological potential dated to Qing dynasty is identified close to the south boundary of the Site while a large part of the Site within the boundary of Sha Ha Site of Archaeological Interest (SAI) remains archaeologically unsurveyed. Therefore, further archaeological action is recommended under the AIA (**Appendix H of Appendix Ia**) where an Archaeological Action Plan should be provided for AMO's agreement at later implementation stage.

Visual and Landscape Aspects

- 1.12 In the VIA, six view points from Wai Man Road, Mei Yuen Street, Mei Fuk Street and Kap Pin Long have been selected for assessing the visual impacts of the proposed development (**Appendix G of Appendix Ia and Drawings A-6 to A-11**). The overall visual impact would be negligible to moderately adverse with mitigation measures including provision of a 10m-wide visual corridor between the residential towers to create a visually permeable development frontage, buffer planting and trees along the site boundaries to partially screen off and soften the building blocks. In conclusion, the proposed development is considered compatible with the surrounding with the implementation of mitigation measures.
- 1.13 According to tree survey conducted, there are 175 existing trees within the Site in which most are of fair to poor health conditions, low amenity value and mainly located at the southern and northern ends of the Site (**Appendix B of Appendix Ia**). No old and valuable tree, no endangered, no rare and precious species were found. According to the LMP, 51 trees are proposed to be retained while 124 trees are

proposed to be felled including 80 trees of undesirable species⁵ (i.e. *Leucaena leucocephala*), 2 dead trees and 42 trees which are in poor health condition and low amenity value, to be conflicted with proposed development and will be affected by the run-in/out of the proposed development and the required 6m-wide public pedestrian walkway connecting Tai Mong Tsai Road and Mei Fuk Street). A total of 44 new trees are proposed to be planted in a compensation ratio of 1:1 in term of quantity. Moreover, a new landscape buffer planting is proposed along the site boundary as far as practicable as screening purpose and to blend the proposed development into the surroundings. Two rows of tree planting facing the “CDA(1)” zone are proposed to create a smooth transition and enhance overall greenery. A combination of native and exotic tree species along with suitable ornamental evergreen species to strengthen greening value will also be considered.

1.14 In support of the application, the applicants have submitted the following documents:

- (a) Application Form received on 25.3.2025 (Appendix I)
- (b) Consolidated Planning Statement dated 31.10.2025⁶ (Appendix Ia)

1.15 On 18.7.2025, the Committee of the Board agreed to the applicants’ request to defer making a decision on the application for two months.

2. Justifications from the Applicants

The justifications put forth by the applicants in support of the application are detailed in the SPS at **Appendix Ia**. They can be summarised as follows:

- (a) the proposed development situated on land no longer required for future road improvement is in line with the Government policy to identify spade-ready site for housing supply in an effective manner. The Site is considered suitable and desirable for residential development;
- (b) with a PR of 1.5 and BH of 10 storeys, the proposed development will be seen as an extension of the comprehensive residential development in the “CDA(1)” site compatible with the surrounding. The planning and design merits committed in the approved “CDA(1)” site, including stepped building height, three visual corridors, PVP spaces and a 6m-wide public pedestrian walkway etc. are also provided in the proposed development to synergise the planning and design merits and support community needs;
- (c) abutting Tai Mong Tsai Road connecting Sai Kung Town Centre with other rural destinations in northern part of Sai Kung, the proposed development would contribute to enhance landscape and visual amenity at the highly visible entrance to Sai Kung Town;
- (d) various technical assessments demonstrate that the proposed development will not

⁵ Compensation is not required for undesirable species ‘*Leucaena leucocephala*’ according to the LAO PN No. 6/2023 ‘Processing of Tree Preservation and Removal Proposals for Building Development in Private Projects – Compliance with Tree Preservation Clause under Lease’.

⁶ Supporting Planning Statement (SPS) received on 25.3.2025 as well as Further Information (FI) received on 16.5.2025[#], 23.5.2025[#], 29.7.2025^{*}, 1.9.2025^{*}, 12.9.2025[#] and 17.9.2025[#] were superseded and are attached at **Appendices Ib to Ie** respectively.

^{*}accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirements

[#]accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirements

bring about any adverse impact on the surroundings. In particular, to minimise adverse traffic impact, the applicants commit that no population intake of the proposed development shall be taken place before the completion of the HH2 Project; and

- (e) the applicants would proactively coordinate with Transport Department (TD) and Highways Department (HyD) on the interfacing with HH2 Project such that there would have no ‘no-man’ land left after the completion of HH2 Project.

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

The applicants are the sole “current land owners” of the private lots of the Site. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection. For the GL portion, the above requirements are not applicable.

4. Background

- 4.1 The Site was partly zoned “CDA(1)”, partly fell within an area shown as ‘Road’ and slightly encroached onto “Green Belt” zone on the first Sai Kung Town OZP No. S/SK-SKT/1 gazetted on 4.3.2005. The maximum PR of 1.5 and BH of 8 storeys were stipulated under the “CDA(1)” zone to ensure compatibility with the surrounding environment (**Plan A-1b**). By that time, the “CDA(1)” zone was separated into two portions by a ‘Road’ area reserved for proposed realignment of Tai Mong Tsai Road. Upon consideration of the objections, amendment to the OZP was proposed to combine the two portions of the “CDA(1)” zone into a single site. The remaining portion of the “CDA(1)” site along Tai Mong Tsai Road was either rezoned to ‘Road’ area reserving for road widening (including the Site) or was rezoned to “Government, Institute or Community” zone. The draft OZP was approved by the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) and the zonings remain unchanged since then.
- 4.2 The road works for HH2 was authorised by CE in C under Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) on 29.10.2021. The future road extent of the realigned Tai Mong Tsai Road under the authorised scheme is outside the Site.

5. Previous Application

There is no previous application at the Site.

6. Similar Application

There is no similar application for residential development within the area shown as ‘Road’ on the OZP.

7. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1a, A-2a and A-2b, aerial photo on Plan A-3 and site photos on A-4)

- 7.1 The Site is:

- (a) located at the northern fringe of Sai Kung Town;
- (b) partly within the works limit of HH2 project and the village ‘environs’ (‘VE’) of Sha Ha;
- (c) paved and mainly vacant and tree groups are found at the northern and southern ends;
- (d) directly accessible at Tai Mong Tsai Road; and
- (e) mostly within the Sha Ha SAI.

7.2 The Site is surrounded by existing and planned residential developments in the fringe of Sai Kung Town including an approved comprehensive residential development with PVP (No. A/SK-SKT/28) with a domestic PR of 1.5 and BH not exceeding 10 storeys (atop two-storey of basement) at the adjacent “CDA(1)” zone, The Mediterranean which is a residential development with a PR of 1.5 and BH not exceeding 8 storeys in the “CDA(2)” zone, and some low-rise, low-density residential developments and village houses across Tai Mong Tsai Road. To the further south is The Hong Kong Academy, Sai Kung Waterfront Promenade and Sai Kung Town Centre.

8. Planning Intention

The area shown as ‘Road’ is reserved for improvement of Hiram’s Highway, Po Tung Road and Tai Mong Tsai Road under the HH2 Project.

9. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

9.1 The following government departments have been consulted and their views on the application are summarised as follows:

Land Administration

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

- (a) no objection to the application from land administration perspective;
- (b) her office cannot verify the area of the Site at this stage. The applicants should ensure the areas stated in the submission are correct;
- (c) the Site comprises the development site and remaining strips of land lying within Simplified Temporary Land Allocation No. STLA-TSK167, which is currently allocated to HyD as works site of the planned HH2 Project;
- (d) a portion of the Site at its northeast side falls within the ‘VE’ of Sha Ha, which is primarily preserved for application for Small House developments;

- (e) it is noted that there are some structures/temporary structures within the Site. Except two structures covered by Squatter Survey numbers (on straddling on Lots 265 S.B RP and 267 in D.D. 221, while the other one straddling on Lots 265 RP, 268 S.A and 268 RP in D.D. 221), the other existing structures erected on the Site are neither covered by short term waivers nor Squatter Survey numbers. Her office has already taken lease enforcement actions against existence of un-tolerated and unauthorised structures on other lots within the Site;
- (f) if the planning application is approved by the Board, the applicants will need to submit to her office a land exchange application with necessary information to effect the proposed development. The applicants are reminded that every application submitted to her office will be considered on its own merit by her office at its absolute discretion acting in its capacity as a landlord and there is no guarantee that such application including the inclusion of GL will be approved by the Government. Such application, if eventually approved, would be subject to such terms and conditions including payment of premium and administrative fee as the Government considers appropriate; and
- (g) other detailed comments are in **Appendix II**.

Traffic

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

- (a) no objection to the application; and
- (b) should the application be approved, it is recommended that the following approval conditions be imposed:
 - (i) no population intake of the proposed development shall take place before the completion of HH2 Project; and
 - (ii) the design, construction and implementation of traffic improvement measures proposed in the traffic impact assessment at the cost of the applicants to the satisfaction of C for T or of the Board.

9.1.3 Comment of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, HyD (CHE/NTE, HyD):

No comment on the application.

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

- (a) no comment from HH2 Project perspective given that the proposed development will only fall within the development site boundary;
- (b) based on the current design scheme, the remaining works area is proposed for road improvement and other related works such as noise barrier construction, slope works, utility diversion and laying works and compensatory planting under the HH2 Project;

(c) given the proximity of the Site to the HH2 works boundary, the applicants are reminded to seek advice from HyD and coordinate with the HH2 contractor on any works related to the application that may interface with the HH2 Project; and

(d) other detailed comments are in **Appendix II**.

Archaeological Aspect

9.1.5 Comments of the Chief Heritage Executive (Antiquities and Monuments), AMO, Development Bureau (CHE(AM), AMO, DEVB):

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application from the archaeological conservation perspective;
- (b) his office noted that an AIA has been conducted by the applicants for the proposed development and the mitigation measures including an archaeological survey are proposed; and
- (c) notwithstanding, should the application be approved by the Board, an approval condition on the submission of a revised AIA and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein is required.

Environment

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

- (a) no in-principle objection the application based on the following basis:
 - (i) on air quality, the EA has demonstrated that sufficient buffer distance of over 5m would be provided between the air sensitive uses within the proposed development and the nearby roads and there is no chimney within 200m from the Site. Besides, the underground carpark would be designed and operated following the Professional Persons Environmental Consultative Committee Practice Notes (ProPECC PN) 2/96 to control the potential air quality impact. Overall, no adverse air quality impact is therefore anticipated;
 - (ii) on noise, the EA has demonstrated that with the implementation of mitigation measures including fixed glazed windows, acoustic windows and acoustic balconies, no adverse traffic impact from nearby roads would be anticipated. Besides, with the provision of acoustic louvers to on-site fixed noise installations, no adverse fixed noise impact arising from and to the propose development would be anticipated. Overall, no adverse noise impact is therefore anticipated;
 - (iii) on water quality and sewerage, the SIA has showed that wastewater arising from the proposed development would be collected and discharged by making connection to the nearby public sewers. Besides, the SIA also concluded a section of existing sewers in the

vicinity of the development site is required to be upgraded to allow for sufficient sewer capacity for the additional sewage flow arise from the proposed development. With the proposed connection to public sewer and implementation of the proposed sewer improvement works, no adverse water quality and no adverse sewerage impact would therefore be anticipated;

- (iv) on land contamination, the EA has concluded that based on the historic land use review, potential land contamination issue may arise at the chemical storage and machinery/metal/forklifts repair workshop within the Site. The applicants have committed in the EA that further land contamination assessment following relevant EPD guideline would be conducted at site investigation stage before development to address the potential land contamination issue and no insurmountable land contamination issue is anticipated;
- (b) notwithstanding, should the application be approved by the Board, the following approval conditions as suggested below are required. In this connection, the applicants are also reminded that the implementation of the proposed local sewerage connection/upgrading/diversion works should meet the satisfaction of DSD:
 - (i) the submission of a revised SIA;
 - (ii) the submission of a NIA and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein to meet HKPSG requirements; and
 - (iii) the submission of land contamination assessment and the implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to the development of the Site.

Drainage and Sewerage

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

- (a) no comment on the DIA and SIA for the application;
- (b) the applicants should review the proposed sewage treatment timely in view of the actual site condition, which may eventually increase the drainage discharge from the Site and may require further review on the DIA;
- (c) it is noted that the SIA suggests upgrading of DSD's existing sewerage networks and proposed sewerage connection to the public sewerage works; and
- (d) should the application be approved by the Board, the following approval conditions are required:
 - (i) the submission of a revised DIA and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein; and

- (ii) the implementation of local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the revised SIA.

Urban Design and Visual

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

- (a) no comment from urban design and visual perspectives;
- (b) several features including tree buffer planting are proposed under the current development scheme to soften the building mass and facilitate the creation of a more pleasant and tranquil walking environment to the neighbourhood. Also, a 10m-wide visual corridor is proposed between residential towers to increase the visual permeability of the development frontage; and
- (c) as illustrated in the photomontages, the proposed development will be largely screened by existing trees and vegetation when viewed from medium and far ranges. For close-range viewers, the proposed development will slightly reduce the visual openness and access to visual resources. In general, the proposed development is considered not incompatible with the surrounding development from urban design and visual perspectives.

Landscape

9.1.9 Comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

- (a) no comment on the application from landscape planning perspective as majority of the Site was already paved and compensatory tree planting in 1:1 ratio is proposed for mitigation;
- (b) given the Site is immediately adjoining the “CDA(1)” site and the proposed development serves as the public frontage along Tai Mong Tsai Road, should the application be approved, an approval condition requiring the submission and implementation of LMP is suggested to be imposed; and
- (c) other detailed comments are in **Appendix II**.

Water Supply

9.1.10 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD):

- (a) no objection to the application from water supply perspective; and
- (b) should the application be approved, an approval condition requiring the submission of a revised WSIA and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein, including but not limited to the implementation of a new DN250 water mains for the proposed development at the applicants’ own expenses upon completion.

Building Matters

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

- (a) no in-principle objection under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) on the application subject to the following comments:
 - (i) the development site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street and emergency vehicular access in accordance with Regulations 5 and 41D of the Building (Planning) Regulations respectively;
 - (ii) if the development site does 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 the Building (Planning) Regulation at the building plan submission stage; and
 - (iii) detailed comments under the BO will be provided at the building plan submission stage.

Fire Safety

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

- (a) no specific comment on the application subject to water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations being provided to his satisfaction; and
- (b) other detailed comments are in **Appendix II**.

Risk Aspect

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

- (a) no objection to the application;
- (b) there is a high-pressure underground town gas pipeline (HP pipeline) running along Tai Mong Tsai Road and Wai Man Road) in the vicinity of the Site;
- (c) the proposed residential development will result in an increase in living population adjacent to the HP pipeline. A Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) conducted by the applicants are required to assess the potential risks associated with the HP pipeline, having considered the proposed development and implement mitigation measures if necessary for compliance with the risk guidelines of the HKPSG; and
- (d) other detailed comments are in **Appendix II**.

District Officer's Comments

9.1.14 Comment of the District Officer (Sai Kung), Home Affairs Department

(DO(SK), HAD):

No comment on the application provided that the relevant safety standards are met and the regulations and guidelines stipulated by the relevant government departments are conformed to.

9.2 The following government departments have no comment on the application, and their advisory comments, if any, are at **Appendix III**:

- (a) Project Manager (East), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD);
- (b) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation; and
- (c) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD.

10. Public Comments Received during the Statutory Publication Periods

10.1 The application and FI were published for public inspection on 1.4.2025, 30.5.2025 and 26.9.2025. During the public inspection periods, a total of 75 public comments were received (**Appendix IV**). Among them, two are supporting views from individuals, 70 are opposing comments and three from the Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd (Towngas), the Hong Kong Academy and an individual are providing views, raising concerns and giving suggestions on the application. The 70 opposing comments are from Sai Kung Rural Committee, the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative and Resident Representative of Sha Ha, Sha Kok Mei Village Office and individuals, where 63 submissions are made in the format of similar standard letters with 47 submitted by the villagers of Sha Kok Mei Village.

10.2 The supporting grounds are mainly that the proposed development could address housing needs, achieve better land utilisation and enhancement of the environment. Towngas comments that a HP pipeline is in the vicinity of the Site and thus the applicants should conduct a QRA to evaluate the potential risk on the future population, determine the necessary mitigation measures, consult Towngas during the design stage, closely coordinate with Towngas during construction stage and provide protective measures. The Hong Kong Academy concerns about if any pedestrian traffic measures would be provided in the future, any mitigation measures during construction would be provided to reduce the nuisance to the nearby schools and any temporary works, laydown and trucking routes for their arrangement of daily operations. An individual suggests that the Site could be used for an MTR station to alleviate the traffic congestion issues in the area.

10.3 The major grounds of objection on the application are:

- (a) the proposed development will exacerbate traffic congestion in Sai Kung and overload the public transport system;
- (b) Government, Institution or Community (GIC) facilities in Sai Kung are insufficient to cope with the growing population;
- (c) the proposed development is too excessive without strong justification and incompatible with the rural character of Sai Kung, which is considered the backyard of Hong Kong;

- (d) the proposed development will induce adverse impacts on visual, landscape, noise, environmental, ecological, historical culture and fung shui aspects; and
- (e) the master layout of the proposed development should be entirely revised to make it compatible with existing heritage and cultural context.

11. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 11.1 The Site falls within an area shown as ‘Road’ on the OZP. The proposed residential development would provide three 10-storey residential towers atop one-storey of basement (about 46mPD) with a PR of about 1.5 providing 280 private housing flats, and a 2-storey clubhouse. A PVP with 10 parking spaces is also proposed in the basement to meet the parking demand in the area.

Planning Intention

- 11.2 The area shown as ‘Road’ was originally reserved for improvement of Tai Mong Tsai Road under the HH2 Project. As confirmed by CE5/MW, MWPMO, HyD, the development site does not encroach onto the works area of HH2 Project. The PR and GFA calculations are also based on the development site. The applicants commit to continue liaising with relevant departments on the interfacing issues between the proposed development and HH2 Project. Given the Site is no longer required for the road improvement works, it is suitable for the proposed residential development which would optimise the use of land resources and increase housing land supply.

Land Use Compatibility and Development Intensity

- 11.3 The Site is located at the northern fringe of Sai Kung Town which is in close proximity to existing and planned medium-density private residential developments including The Mediterranean comprising four residential blocks with PR of 1.5 and BH not exceeding 8 storeys and an approved comprehensive residential development at the “CDA(1)” site with a PR of 1.5 and BH not exceeding 10 storeys (atop a two-storey basement). There are also low-rise residential developments across Tai Mong Tsai Road located on hillside along Chuk Yeung Road including Burlingame Garden and Hunlilar Garden in “R(C)” zones with maximum PR of 0.6 and 0.4 and a maximum BH of 9m and 2 storeys over 1 storey of carport respectively. With a modest scale providing 280 flats, the proposed residential development with PVP is considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses and context (**Plans A-2a and A-3**). With similar development intensity, the proposed development can be considered an extension of the residential development cluster in the northern part of Sai Kung Town.

Technical Aspects

- 11.4 As shown on the photomontages in the VIA (**Drawings A-6 to A-11**), the overall visual impact created by the proposed development is negligible to moderately adverse. In order to enhance the visual permeability of the development frontage, mitigation measures including a 10m-wide visual corridor between residential towers extended from adjoining “CDA(1)” zone and buffer tree planting along periphery of the proposed development have been proposed. According to the LMP, the greenery coverage of not less than 20% complies with the requirements under

relevant guidelines. In the Tree Survey and LMP, a total 44 new trees will be planted which will achieve a 1:1 compensation ratio in terms of number as detailed in paragraph 1.14 above. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no comment from urban design, visual and landscape perspectives and advises that the proposed development is considered not incompatible with the surrounding area from urban design and visual perspectives and significant landscape impact is not anticipated.

- 11.5 According to the TIA, on the assumption that HH2 Project would be completed prior to the population intake, the local junctions and road links would operate within their capacity with the proposed development. CE5/MW, MWPMO, HyD also advises that the tentative completion of HH2 Project would be in 2032 which could tie in the population intake as indicated by the applicants. As such, C for T proposes the imposition of approval condition requiring no population intake shall take place before the completion of HH2 Project. In order to further reduce the impact to Tai Mong Tsai Road, a left-in/left-out arrangement is proposed for vehicular access. Besides the ancillary parking facilities, a PVP with 10 public parking spaces is proposed for supporting community need. C for T has no objection to the application and considers the traffic generated by the proposed development would be acceptable in traffic terms.
- 11.6 A large part of the Site is within the boundary of Sha Ha SAI which remains archaeologically unsurveyed. Moreover, according to the archaeological works previously conducted within and in close proximity to the Site, a thin cultural layer within archaeological potential was identified close to the south boundary of the Site. As recommended in the AIA, the mitigation measures such as an archaeological survey is required at later implementation stage. As such, CHE(AM), AMO, DEVB has no in-principle objection the application and the submitted AIA.
- 11.7 According to the EA, with mitigation measures implemented, there should have no adverse road traffic noise, fixed noise and air quality impacts on the proposed development in both construction and operation stages. The applicants also submit other technical assessments on various aspects in support of the application, including SIA, DIA and WSIA. All relevant government departments consulted including DEP, CE/MS, DSD and CE/C, WSD have no objection to or no adverse comment on the application from land contamination, sewerage, drainage and water supply aspects respectively. The technical requirements of the concerned departments could be addressed through implementation of approval conditions as recommended in paragraph 12.2 below.
- 11.8 Regarding the public comments received, as for the concern over the GIC facilities in the area, the planned provision for GIC facilities in Sai Kung District is generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population. Regarding the concern raised by Towngas on the requirement to conduct a QRA, the applicants have undertaken to coordinate with Towngas on the proposed development and to conduct the QRA and implement mitigation measures at later stage if required. On the opposing views, concerns or suggestions detailed in paragraph 10.3 above, departmental comments and planning considerations and assessments in paragraphs 11.1 to 11.7 above are relevant.

12. Planning Department's Views

- 12.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 above and having taken into account

the public comments mentioned in paragraph 10, the Planning Department has no objection to the application.

- 12.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 7.11.2029, and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members' consideration:

Approval Conditions

- (a) no population intake of the proposed development shall take place before the completion of the Hiram's Highway Improvement Stage 2 project;
- (b) the design, construction and implementation of traffic improvement measures proposed in the traffic impact assessment at the cost of the applicants, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the submission of a revised archaeological impact assessment and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Chief Heritage Executive (Antiquities and Monuments), Antiquities and Monuments Office, Development Bureau or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the submission and implementation of Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (e) the submission of a revised water supply impact assessment and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein, including but not limited to the implementation of a new DN250 water mains proposed in the water supply impact assessment for the proposed development at the cost of the applicants, to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the Town Planning Board upon completion;
- (f) the submission of a revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (g) the submission of a revised drainage impact assessment and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (h) the implementation of local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works identified in the revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (i) the submission of a noise impact assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (j) the submission of a land contamination assessment and implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to the development of the application site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental

Protection or of the Town Planning Board; and

- (k) the submission of a quantitative risk assessment related to the high-pressure town gas pipeline in the vicinity of the application site and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory Clauses

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

- 12.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, the following reason for rejection is suggested for Members' reference:

the proposed residential development with public vehicle park is not in line with the planning intention of 'Road' area which is reserved for road improvement works. There is no strong planning justification in the application for a departure from the planning intention.

13. Decision Sought

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

14. Attachments

Appendix I	Application Form dated 25.3.2025
Appendix Ia	Consolidated SPS dated 31.10.2025
Appendices Ib to Ie	Further Information received on 16.5.2025, 23.5.2025, 29.7.2025, 1.9.2025, 12.9.2025 and 17.9.2025
Appendix II	Government Departments' General Comments
Appendix III	Recommended Advisory Clauses
Appendix IV	Public Comments
Drawing A-1	Lot Index Plan
Drawing A-2	Vehicular and Pedestrian Access Plan
Drawing A-3	Landscape Master Plan
Drawings A-4 and A-5	Landscape Section Plans
Drawings A-6 to A-11	Photomontages at Selected Viewpoints
Drawing A-12	Planning and Design Merits Plan
Plans A-1a and A-1b	Location Plans
Plans A-2a and A-2b	Site Plans

Plan A-3

Plan A-4

Aerial Photo

Site Photos

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
NOVEMBER 2025**