

**APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION**  
**UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICATION NO. A/SK-TMT/85**

**Applicant** : Fung Sau Property Company Limited represented by Townland Consultants Limited

**Site** : 8 Fung Sau Road, Tai Mong Tsai, Sai Kung, New Territories

**Site Area** : About 2,588.3m<sup>2</sup>

**Lease** : Lots 285 S.A. RP, 285 S.A. ss.1 and 285 RP in D.D. 252  
(a) held under New Grant No. 6035 restricted for private residential purpose;  
(b) maximum building height (BH) of 2 storeys / 25 feet (about 7.62m) above the mean foundation level;  
(c) maximum built-over area of 15%;  
(d) provision of not less than two car parking spaces for motor vehicles for each flat in the building(s) or each house; and  
(e) carport at or below ground level or on the roof of the building will be permitted in addition to the number of storeys

**Plan** : Approved Tai Mong Tsai and Tsam Chuk Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-TMT/4

**Zoning** : “Residential (Group C) 3” (“R(C)3”) [restricted to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 0.3, a maximum site coverage (SC) of 40% and a maximum BH of 9m with 3 storeys including 1 storey of carport, or the PR, SC and height of the building which was in existence on the date of the first publication in the Gazette of the notice of the draft development permission area (DPA) plan, whichever is the greater]

**Application** : Proposed Minor Relaxation of BH Restriction for Permitted House Development

**1. The Proposal**

1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction from 9m to 11.5m (i.e. +2.5m or +27.8%) for permitted house

development at the application site (the Site), which falls within an area zoned “R(C)3” on the OZP subject to a maximum PR of 0.3, a maximum SC of 40% and a maximum BH of 9m with 3 storeys including 1 storey of carport (**Plan A-1**). According to the Notes of the OZP, ‘House’ is always permitted within the “R(C)3” zone, and minor relaxation of the BH restriction may be considered by the Town Planning Board (the Board) based on the individual merits of a development or redevelopment proposal.

- 1.2 The Site abuts Fung Sau Road which is located on a sloping ground ascending from the western part facing roadside to the eastern part on the hillside with a level difference of about 13.8m (**Plan A-2**). It is currently occupied by two existing three-storey detached houses where one of the houses (namely House A<sup>1</sup>) is on the western end while another house (namely House B<sup>2</sup>) is on the eastern end. The existing BHs of Houses A and B are 10.25m and 10m respectively. House B is the subject of a previous approved planning application (No. A/SK-TMT/21) for proposed minor relaxation of BH from 9m to 10m with details set out in paragraph 4 below. The two existing houses are segregated by an outdoor swimming pool and garden in the middle connected through narrow footpath and staircases (**Plans A-4a to A4-c**).
- 1.3 The applicant proposes to redevelop the Site into eastern and western portions. According to the applicant’s proposal, the proposed development will adopt an integrated design by confining the two proposed houses above a common carport and landscaped platform with an outdoor swimming pool on the eastern portion with overall BHs of 11.5m (up to mean roof level and three storeys). To overcome the level difference and to minimize impact to the existing slope and retaining wall without carrying out extensive excavation and filling, the applicant proposes to largely maintain site formation level of the proposed houses on the hillside at the eastern portion by excavation of about 1.6m in depth. The western part of the Site will incorporate an extensive landscape terrace with garden, a pond and a pavilion such that a 45m-house setback from Fung Sau Road can be provided. The ingress/egress is maintained at Fung Sau Road through a car ramp and driveway leading to G/F carport serving both houses. The non-building areas (NBAs) of 3.05m and 4.57m in width along the lot boundaries required under the lease and adopted Layout Plan (LP) will also be kept to maintain building separation with adjacent developments (**Plan A-2**). While the PR, SC and the number of storeys of the proposed development are within the restrictions of the OZP, the overall BH of 11.5m exceeds the maximum BH stipulated in the OZP, and hence planning permission for minor relaxation of BH restriction is required. The Master Layout Plan (MLP), floor plans, section plan of the proposed development are at **Drawings A-1 to A-3** and the major development parameters of the proposed development are as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> House A was built in 1975 before the publication of Tai Mong Tsai and Tsam Chuk Wan DPA Plan in 2000 comprising three storeys including one storey of carport with a BH of 10.25m (48.96mPD).

<sup>2</sup> House B was built in 2010 comprising three storeys including one storey of carport with a BH of 10m (54.6mPD).

Major Development Parameters	OZP Restrictions [a]	Existing Development	Proposed Scheme [b]	Difference [b] – [a]
Site Area	-	About 2,588.3m <sup>2</sup>		-
PR	0.3	About 0.3	About 0.3 <sup>[1]</sup>	Same
Gross Floor Area (GFA)	-	About 776.115m <sup>2</sup>	About 776.49m <sup>2[1]</sup>	-
SC	40%	About 14.95%	About 40% <sup>[1]</sup>	Same
No. of Residential Blocks	-	2	2	-
No. of Residential Storeys	3 including 1 storey of carport	3 including 1 storey of carport	3 including 1 storey of carport	Same
BH	9m	House A: 10.25m (48.96mPD)  House B: 10m (54.6mPD)	Houses A & B: 11.5m <sup>1</sup> (54.5mPD) (up to mean roof level)	+2.5m (+27.8%) -
No. of Ancillary Car Parking Spaces	-	4	Private Car: 3 Disabled Parking: 1	-
<p><b>Note</b>  [1]: The proposed PR, GFA and SC exclude non-domestic portion including E&amp;M plant rooms, recreational facilities, etc. which are exempted from GFA calculation under Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP2.</p>				

1.4 According to the applicant, the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction is mainly to enable a higher floor-to-floor height (FTFH) to improve the well-being of inhabitants. The proposed FTFHs of domestic storeys of 4.2m at 1/F and 3.3m at 2/F comply with the maximum allowable FTFH of 4.5m for house under PNAP APP-5. The FTFH of carport of 3.5m meets the minimum clear headroom requirement of 2.4m for car parking space in accordance with PNAP APP-111 and allows for a higher ceiling for ventilation duct and associated installations. The proposed houses feature a pitched roof design with both BHs of 11.5m at the mean roof level and 12m up to top roof level (55mPD). No additional roof-top ancillary structure is proposed at roof level except the overrun of common lift serving both houses for barrier-free access. The maximum BH of the proposed development (54.5mPD up to mean roof level) is still lower than the maximum height of existing House B (54.6mPD).

1.5 The applicant has submitted a visual impact evaluation (**Drawings A-5a to A-5d**) of the proposed development in comparison with the existing condition and the OZP-compliant scheme (**Drawing A-6**) to demonstrate that no adverse visual impact is anticipated. According to the Landscape Proposal and Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal (**Drawing A-4**), a total of 47 existing trees were identified within the Site, 18 trees will be retained in-situ, two trees will be transplanted, and 27 trees are proposed for felling due to poor health condition, low amenity value or having direct conflict with the proposed development. Compensatory planting of 28 trees will be provided at a compensatory ratio of about 1:1.03 in terms of quantity

mainly in the western portion of the Site facing Fung Sau Road. The applicant has also submitted a Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) to demonstrate the geotechnical feasibility of the proposed scheme.

- 1.6 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:
  - (a) Application Form and Supplementary Information (SI) received on 19.9.2025 and 26.9.2025 (Appendix I)
  - (b) Consolidated Supporting Planning Statement (SPS) received on 15.1.2026<sup>3</sup> (Appendix Ia)
- 1.7 On 7.11.2025, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board agreed to defer making a decision on the application for two months as requested by the applicant.

## 2. **Justifications from the Applicant**

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed in the consolidated SPS at **Appendix Ia**, which are summarised as follows:

- (a) the proposed development parameters respect the maximum PR and SC restrictions, and maximum BH in terms of number of storeys under the “R(C)3” zone on the OZP and is generally in line with the planning intention of “R(C)” zone;
- (b) to overcome the significant level difference without carrying out extensive excavation and filling or reducing the number of storeys which may lead to underutilising the development potential, the site formation level of the proposed development will be lowered by excavation of about 1.6m in depth. As a result, the BH (54.5mPD) of the proposed houses will not exceed the BH (54.6mPD) of existing houses;
- (c) the proposal seeks to incorporate a more integrated design by placing the two houses adjoining one another over a communal terrace with a landscape deck, outdoor swimming pool and front garden on 1/F;
- (d) the proposed development is carefully designed to significantly setback from roadside which allows an extensive landscaped garden with water pond, landscaped pavilion and buffer planting in the front garden facing Fung Sau Road (**Drawing A-4**) to enhance the visual appeal of the streetscape and visually screen the building bulk of the proposed houses from the street level;
- (e) NBAs of 3.05m and 4.57m in width will be provided along the lot boundaries to maintain building separation with the adjacent developments in accordance with the requirement under the lease and relevant LP (**Plan A-2**);

---

<sup>3</sup> SPS received on 19.9.2025 as well as Further Information (FI) received on 4.12.2025<sup>#</sup> and 7.1.2026\* were superseded and are attached at **Appendices Ib, Ic and Id** respectively.

\* accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirements

# accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirement

- (f) the minor relaxation of BH restriction enables a FTFH for domestic storeys which fully complies with the maximum allowable FTFH under relevant PNAPs to improve the health and well-being of inhabitants by allowing better indoor ventilation;
- (g) the submitted photomontages (**Drawings A-5a to A-5d**) and landscape and tree preservation and removal proposal (**Drawing A-4**) have demonstrated that the proposed scheme will not generate adverse visual and landscape impacts to the surrounding areas; and
- (h) the submitted GPRR has demonstrated the geotechnical feasibility of the proposed scheme. With no increase in the development intensity compared to the existing developments, no additional adverse traffic and sewerage impacts on road capacities and infrastructural provision are anticipated.

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

The applicant is one of the “current land owners”. In respect of the other “current land owner”, the applicant has complied with the requirements as set out in the “Town Planning Board Guidelines on Satisfying the ‘Owner’s Consent/Notification’ Requirements under Sections 12A and 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance” (TPB PG-No. 31B) by obtaining consent of the other “current land owner”. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Member’s inspection.

### **4. Previous Application**

The eastern portion of the Site (i.e. Existing House B) is the subject of a previous s.16 planning application (No. A/SK-TMT/21) submitted by the same applicant for proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction from 9m to 10m, which was approved with conditions by the Committee in 2008 mainly on the considerations that the proposed development was in line with the planning intention of the “R(C)3” zone and was considered compatible with adjacent residential developments which were mainly three-storeys with BHs of mostly above 9m; the proposed BH relaxation was to meet the minimum height requirement for basement carport and to provide a reasonably comfortable headroom to enhance air ventilation/natural lighting; and no adverse impact in terms of landscape character, visual quality, traffic and infrastructural provision were anticipated. The house with relaxed BH was completed in 2010. Details of the previous application are summarised at **Appendix II** and its location is shown on **Plan A-2**.

### **5. Similar Application**

There is no similar application for proposed minor relaxation of BH for permitted house development within the “R(C)” zones on the OZP in the past five years.

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

6.1 The Site:

- (a) abuts Fung Sau Road branching off Tai Mong Tsai Road which serves as a Right-of-Way of the Site and adjoining residential developments;
- (b) is a sloping ground ascending from the roadside at west to the hillside at east; and
- (c) is currently occupied by two existing three-storey detached houses including one storey of carport with BHs of 10m and 10.25m respectively. An outdoor swimming pool, landscaping area and footpath with staircases are found in the middle portion segregating the two houses.

6.2 The surrounding of the Site comprises mainly low-rise and low-density residential developments of two to three storeys including carport with BHs ranging from about 7m to 9.8m (38.6mPD to 47.5mPD) along both sides of Fung Sau Road (**Plan A-5**). Vegetated slopes in the “Green Belt” zone surrounding the residential settlements are located to the further west, north and east respectively. Inner Port Shelter (Sai Kung Hoi) is located to the further south across Tai Mong Tsai Road.

**7. Planning Intention**

- 7.1 The planning intention of “R(C)” zone is primarily for low-rise, low-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Board.
- 7.2 According to the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP, the “R(C)3” sub-area mainly reflects the parameters of the existing and committed developments. The development restrictions are mainly to preserve the existing intensity and character of the developments so as to blend in with the surrounding natural environment and to avoid overtaxing the limited infrastructure in Tai Mong Tsai. Applications for minor relaxation of development restrictions would be considered by the Board based on individual merits, taking into account the site constraints, innovative architectural design and planning merits that would enhance the amenity of the locality.

**8. Comments from Relevant Government Departments**

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

**Land Administration**

- 8.1.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Sai Kung, Lands Department:

- (a) the proposed residential development on Lot 285 in D.D. 252 would not comply with the lease conditions as stipulated in the New Grant including but not limited to the BH and built-over area restrictions;
- (b) if the planning application is approved by the Board, the applicant will need to submit to her office a lease modification or land exchange application with necessary information to effect the proposal. The applicant is reminded that every application submitted to LandsD will be considered on its own merit by LandsD at its absolute discretion acting in its capacity as a landlord and there is no guarantee that such application including the inclusion of government land (if any) 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 fees as the Government considers appropriate; and
- (c) other detailed comments are at **Appendix III**.

### **Traffic**

#### 8.1.2 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) no objection to the application; and
- (b) Fung Sau Road leading to the Site is not under his department's management.

### **Environment**

#### 8.1.3 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection:

- (a) no objection to the application;
- (b) it is noted that the application is to apply for planning permission for minor relaxation of BH restriction from 9m to 11.5m to facilitate a proposed residential redevelopment within an area zoned "R(C)3" on the OZP and located outside water gathering ground. It is noted that the proposed redevelopment scheme would involve two new residential houses with associated pavilion, swimming pool and landscape water pond;
- (c) as the Site is located near Fung Sau Road with limited traffic flow, no adverse environmental impact from air quality and noise perspective is therefore anticipated;
- (d) on sewerage and water quality, it is noted that the applicant would adopt a septic tank system following the design and maintenance requirement of Practice Note for Professional Persons (ProPECC) PN 1/23 for

collecting the domestic sewage and filtration backwash from the proposed swimming pool and landscape pond. Besides, it is also noted the outlet drains of swimming pool and landscape pond would be connected to public storm drain. No adverse water quality impact is therefore anticipated; and

- (e) other advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

### **Nature Conservation**

#### 8.1.4 Comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation:

In view that the subject site has been developed, he has no comment on the application from nature conservation perspective.

### **Drainage and Sewerage**

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

no objection in principle to the application provided that adequate stormwater drainage and sewerage facilities are implemented, with a view to avoid causing any adverse drainage impact to the areas or nuisance to the adjoining areas.

### **Building Matters**

#### 8.1.6 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);
- (b) general guidelines regarding the FTFH are provided in PNAP APP-5. Detailed comments can only be provided at building plans submission stage;
- (c) while there is no guideline or requirement under the BO to govern the height of the E&M zone of the carport, the BD will consider the proposed headroom and the justifications submitted by the Authorised Person on a case-by-case basis;
- (d) detailed comments on GFA and SC calculations can only be provided at building plans submission stage;
- (e) there is no outstanding statutory orders issued requiring removal of unauthorized building works in the Site; and

(f) other detailed comments are at **Appendix III**.

### **Urban Design, Visual and Landscape**

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

#### *Urban Design and Visual*

- (a) the Site is located in Tai Mong Tsai, Sai Kung within a predominantly rural setting characterised by low-rise and low-density settlements. The proposal involves redevelopment of two existing three-storey detached houses into two adjoining three-storey houses with minor relaxation of the building height restriction from 9 m to 11.5 m (i.e. +2.5 m or about +27.8%);
- (b) the applicant has submitted a SPS that includes a visual impact evaluation of the proposed development in comparison with the existing condition and the OZP-compliant scheme (**Drawing A-6**) in accordance with Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41A. Having reviewed the evaluation and photomontages (**Drawings A-5a to A-5d**), and noting the relatively small scale of the proposed development and that the prevailing low-rise and low-density rural character would be maintained, significant adverse visual impact arising from the proposed development is not anticipated;

#### *Landscape*

- (c) with reference to the aerial photo of 2024, the Site is situated in an area of coastal uplands and hillsides landscape character predominated by woodland and house developments. The proposed redevelopment is considered not incompatible with the surrounding landscape character; and
- (d) based on the aerial photo of 2024 and site photos taken in September 2025, it is observed that the Site is occupied by two existing houses and garden areas. Existing trees and vegetation are found within the Site. According to the Supplementary Planning Statement and the Landscape Proposal, it is noted that 18 out of the 47 surveyed trees will be retained, while 2 trees and 27 trees are proposed to be transplanted and felled respectively. 28 new trees will be planted in the redevelopment and majority are native species. Landscaping including pavilion, swimming pool, water pond and buffer planting will be provided.

8.2 The following departments have no objection to/comment on the application. Their advisory comments, if any, are at **Appendix IV**:

- (a) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD);

- (b) Director of Fire Services (D of FS);
- (c) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD);
- (d) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department; and
- (e) District Officer (Sai Kung), Home Affairs Department.

## **9. Public Comment Received During Statutory Publication Periods**

On 30.9.2025 and 12.12.2025, the application was published for public inspection. During the statutory publication periods, one public comment was received from a group of residents along Fung Sau Road objecting to the application on that grounds that the proposed BH will be taller than the nearby houses, the filling and excavation of land will pose risks to geotechnical stability and the proposed development will result in adverse landscape, noise, traffic and air quality impacts during construction stage (**Appendix V**).

## **10. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 10.1 The application is for proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction from 9m to 11.5m (i.e. +2.5m or +27.8%) for permitted house development at the Site which falls within the “R(C)3” zone subject to a maximum PR of 0.3, a maximum SC of 40% and a maximum BH of 9m with 3 storeys including one storey of carport (**Plan A-1**). The applicant proposes to redevelop the two detached houses currently at two ends of the Site segregated by outdoor landscape features in the middle portion into two adjoining houses near the hillside at the eastern portion of the Site, while reserving the western portion for a landscaped garden and buffer planting facing Fung Sau Road (**Drawing A-1**). While the resultant BH of the proposed development will have a BH of 11.5m (i.e. 54.5mPD) up to mean roof level (**Drawing A-3**), the proposed development conforms to the PR, SC and number of storeys restrictions stipulated in the Notes of the OZP.
- 10.2 The Site falls within an area zoned “R(C)3” intended primarily for low-rise, low-density residential developments. According to the ES of the OZP, the “R(C)3” sub-area mainly reflects the parameters of the existing and committed developments. The development restrictions are mainly to preserve the existing intensity and character of the developments so as to blend in with the surrounding natural environment. Given the relatively small scale development, the proposed three-storey houses including one storey of carport with a PR of 0.3, a SC of 40% and a relaxed BH of 11.5m is considered not incompatible with surrounding environment which is a predominantly rural residential neighbourhood of mainly low-rise residential developments of two to three storeys including carport with BHs ranging from about 7m to 9.8m (38.6mPD to 47.5mPD) (**Plan A-5**), and is still in line with the planning intention of the “R(C)3” zone.
- 10.3 Minor relaxation of BH restriction may be considered by the Board based on individual merits, taking into account the site constraints, innovative architectural design and planning merits that would enhance the amenity of the locality. According to the applicant, the proposed development will adopt an integrated design by confining the two proposed houses with a shared landscaped platform and an outdoor swimming pool over a common carport in the eastern portion. From

visual viewpoint, the shifting of the two proposed houses towards the hillside will avoid blocking the views of the neighbouring houses in the northern side (**Plan A-5**).

- 10.4 To overcome the significant level difference of the Site and to maintain slope stability without carrying out extensive excavation and filling or reducing the number of storeys which may lead to underutilising the development potential, the site formation level of the proposed houses on the hillside at the eastern portion will be largely maintained by excavation of about 1.6m in depth. The resultant BH up to a mean roof level (54.5mPD) does not exceed the BH of the existing House B (54.6mPD). In addition, the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction will enable a higher FTFH for domestic storeys (4.2m at 1/F and 3.3m at 2/F) to improve the well-being of inhabitants and provide a sufficient headroom (3.5m) for car parking space and its ventilation duct and associated installations (**Drawing A-3**) which could not be accommodated under the OZP-compliant scheme (**Drawing A-6**). The minor increase in BH for provision of a reasonably comfortable living environment and an operational headroom for car parking with minimal impact anticipated is considered acceptable. CBS/NTE2&Rail, BD has no in-principle objection to the application subject to its compliance with requirements under the relevant PNAPs<sup>4</sup>.
- 10.5 According to the MLP submitted by the applicant, a building setback of about 45m from Fung Sau Road will be provided to allow an extensive landscaped area and buffer planting in the western portion of the Site to enhance the visual appeal of the streetscape and visually screen the proposed houses from street level (**Drawing A-4**). The NBAs along lot boundaries (**Plan A-2**) required under lease and LP will be kept to maintain building separation with the adjacent developments. As demonstrated in the submitted photomontages (**Drawings A-5a** to **A-5d**), the proposed development will have negligible visual impact to the surrounding areas. Having reviewed the visual impact evaluation and photomontages (**Drawings A-5a** to **A-5d**), and noting the relatively small scale of the proposed development and that the prevailing low-rise and low-density rural character would be maintained, CTP/UD&L, PlanD considers that significant adverse visual impact arising from the proposed development is not anticipated. Taking into account two existing trees will be transplanted and 28 new trees will be planted with a compensation ratio of about 1:1.03, and landscaping measures and buffer planting will be provided, CTP/UD&L has no adverse comment from landscape perspective and considers the proposed development is not incompatible with the surrounding landscape character predominated by woodland and house developments.
- 10.6 The applicant submitted a GPRR to demonstrate the geotechnical feasibility of the propose development and indicated that site formation works will be minimal and slope stabilization measures will be implemented to ensure no geotechnical impact on the adjoining slope and retaining wall (**Plan A-2**) will arise from the proposed development. H(GEO), CEDD has no adverse geotechnical comment on the application. Other relevant government departments consulted including C for T, DEP, CE/MS, DSD, CE/C, WSD and D of FS have no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Adverse geotechnical, traffic, environmental, sewerage, drainage, water supplies and fire safety impacts on the surrounding area are not anticipated.

---

<sup>4</sup> The maximum allowable FTFH for house under PNAP APP-5 is 4.5m and the minimum clear headroom for at-grade private car park under PNAP APP-111 is 2.4m.

- 10.7 The planning circumstances of the current application are largely similar to the previous approved application for the existing house in the eastern part of the Site as mentioned in paragraph 4 above in that the proposed development is in line with the planning intention of the “R(C)3” zone and is considered compatible with adjacent residential developments which are mainly two to three storeys including carport, the proposed BH relaxation will provide a reasonably comfortable headroom to enhance air ventilation and living environment of the inhabitants, and no adverse impact in terms of landscape character, visual quality, traffic and infrastructural provision are anticipated. Approval of the current application is in line with the Committee’s previous decision.
- 10.8 Regarding the public concern on the application as detailed in paragraph 9 above, the departmental comments in paragraph 8 and planning assessments in paragraphs 10.1 to 10.7 above are relevant. The applicant stated that dust and noise control measures will be implemented according to relevant guidelines to minimise potential nuisance arising from construction activities.

## **11. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 11.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 10 and having taken into account the public comment in paragraph 9, the Planning Department has no objection to the application.
- 11.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 23.1.2030 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 recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Appendix IV**.
- 11.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, the following reason for rejection is suggested for Members’ reference:

there is no strong planning justification in the submission for the proposed minor relaxation of building height restriction.

## **12. Decision Sought**

- 12.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant permission.
- 12.2 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.
- 12.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant.

### **13. Attachments**

<b>Appendix I</b>	Application Form and SI received on 19.9.2025 and 26.9.2025
<b>Appendix Ia</b>	Consolidated SPS received on 15.1.2026
<b>Appendices Ib to Id</b>	SPS received on 19.9.2025 and FI received on 4.12.2025 and 7.1.2026
<b>Appendix II</b>	Previous Application
<b>Appendix III</b>	Government Department's General Comments
<b>Appendix IV</b>	Recommended Advisory Clauses
<b>Appendix V</b>	Public Comment
<b>Drawing A-1</b>	Master Layout Plan of the Proposed Development
<b>Drawings A-2a to A-2d</b>	Floor Plans of the Proposed Development
<b>Drawing A-3</b>	Section Plan of the Proposed Development
<b>Drawing A-4</b>	Landscape Master Plan of the Proposed Development
<b>Drawings A-5a to A-5d</b>	Photomontages of the Proposed Development
<b>Drawing A-6</b>	Comparison of the OZP-compliant Scheme and Proposed Scheme
<b>Plan A-1</b>	Location Plan
<b>Plan A-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plan A-3</b>	Aerial Photo
<b>Plans A-4a to A-4c</b>	Site Photos
<b>Plan A-5</b>	Existing BHs of the Site and the Surroundings

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
JANUARY 2026**