RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-MP/417A
For Consideration by
the Rural and New Town Planning
Committee on 20.11.2026

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. A/YL-MP/417

Applicant : Ten Choice Development Limited represented by Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited

Premises : Shop Nos. G1-G3 and G5-G8, Palm Springs Plaza, Lot 4750 R.P. (Part) in D.D. 104, Yuen Long

Floor Area : About 973.8m^2

Lease : Lot 4750 R.P. (Part) in D.D. 104
(a) held under the Conditions of Exchange dated 28 September 1990 as modified by relevant modification letters
(b) restricted for private residential purposes and non-industrial development (excluding godown, office, residential, hotel and / or service apartment)

Plan : Approved Mai Po and Fairview Park Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-MP/10
(currently in force)

Draft Mai Po and Fairview Park OZP No. S/YL-MP/9
(at the time of submission)

Zoning : "Residential (Group C)" ("R(C)")
[restricted to a maximum plot ratio of 0.4 and a maximum building height of three storeys (9m) including car park]

[no change to the zoning and development restrictions of the application premises (the Premises) on the current OZP]

Application : Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE))

1. The Proposal

1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for proposed social welfare facility (RCHE) at the Premises, which falls within an area zoned "R(C)" on the OZP (**Plan A-1a**). According to the Notes of the OZP for the "R(C)" zone, 'Social Welfare Facility' is a Column 2 use which requires planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). The Premises, which are located on the G/F of a standalone two-storey commercial centre, namely the Palm Springs Plaza (the Plaza), are currently partly

vacant[1] (shop Nos. G1-G3) and partly occupied by a retail shop (shop Nos. G5-G8) (**Plan A-4**).

1.2 According to the applicant, the Premises on G/F of the Plaza[2] is proposed to be converted to a privately-operated RCHE with a total GFA of about 973.8m^2 (i.e. about 16% of the total GFA of the Plaza)[3], involving 90 bed spaces, two isolation rooms and various ancillary facilities such as reception, office, nursing station, living/dining area, store room, laundry and kitchen. The proposed RCHE at the Premises will not lead to any increase in the existing GFA of the Plaza, as its construction will involve only alteration and addition (A&A) works such as decoration or renovation works to be carried out indoor. There will be 32 staff members working in the proposed RCHE, among which 29 will be working day shift and three will be working night shift (i.e. staying overnight). While the proposed RCHE will be operated 24 hours a day, its visiting hours will be from 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. daily. A maximum of two visitors per bed will be allowed at the same time and prior reservation for the visit is required. The tentative completion year of the proposed RCHE will be in 2027. The indicative layout plan submitted by the applicant is at **Drawing A-1**.

1.3 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted a Supporting Planning Statement (SPS) with technical review/assessment reports including Traffic Review Report (TRR), Air Quality Impact Review (AQIR), Noise Impact Review (NIR) and Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA).

Transport and Traffic

1.4 The Premises are accessible from Palm Springs Boulevard leading to Castle Peak Road – Mai Po (**Plan A-2**). According to the applicant, staff members and visitors will access the proposed RCHE by private car and taxi, as well as other public transport services including bus and green minibus, with the nearest public bus stops along Castle Peak Road – Mai Po located within a 9-minute walking distance (or about 600m away)[4] (**Plan A-1a**). According to the submitted TRR, whilst requirements on parking or loading/unloading (L/UL) facility for RCHE are not specified in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), reference has been made to RCHEs of similar scale to determine the relevant provisions. The applicant proposes the shared use of ancillary car park[5] of the Plaza, consisting of 207 car parking spaces and seven L/UL bays, with other commercial operators of the Plaza. Of these, at least one L/UL bay will be exclusively designated for the pick-up/drop-off and L/UL activities of lorry/light bus/ ambulance serving the proposed RCHE. Given that the combined traffic flow of the proposed RCHE and the remaining commercial operators of the Plaza will be comparable to that under the scenario of a fully-occupied Plaza, the TRR concludes that the traffic

[1] Shop Nos. G1-G3 were previously occupied by a kindergarten (approved under s.16 application No. A/YL-MP/7 on 22.3.1996) cum child care centre (approved under s.16 application No. A/YL-MP/65 on 14.4.2000). The kindergarten ceased operation in July 2025 and its tenancy agreement expired in August 2025. Since then, this portion of the Premises has remained vacant.

[2] According to the applicant, based on the approved general building plan (GBP) submission, the total gross floor area (GFA) of the Plaza is about 6,186.5m^2.

[3] Equivalent to an approximate net operating floor area (NOFA) of not more than 930.5m^2, achieving a minimum of 9.5m^2 bed space per resident as proposed in the Code of Practice for Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) issued by the Social Welfare Department (SWD). The NOFA is indicative and for reference only, which will be subject to changes at detailed design stage when formulating the final internal layout.

[4] According to the applicant, while there are existing shuttle bus services to/from the Palm Springs, they only serve the residents of Palm Springs.

[5] Located outside the Premises and can be accessible from Sunflower Path branching off Palm Springs Boulevard.

impact on the local road network is minimal, and no insurmountable traffic impact on the surrounding road network is anticipated.

Air Quality and Noise

1.5 The air quality and noise aspects of the proposed RCHE have been assessed in the AQIR and NIR respectively, and no adverse impacts are anticipated. On air quality, construction of the proposed RCHE will involve only indoor A&A works with no major dusty construction works, and hoardings will be erected along the external façade of the shop units to minimise potential dust impact on the surrounding areas. Control measures including proper storage of dusty materials in accordance with the Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust) Regulation will be strictly adhered to. Furthermore, the potential odour emissions arising from the operation of the proposed RCHE (such as cooking activities in the ancillary kitchen) will be minimised as far as practicable, taking full account of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD)'s guidelines on Control of Oil Fume and Cooking Odour from Restaurant and Food Business. Additionally, there are no industrial and odour emission sources in the immediate vicinity of the proposed RCHE, and the internal road networks of Palm Springs carry limited traffic flow, with Palm Springs Boulevard maintaining a minimum separation distance of 5m from the proposed RCHE. As such, no adverse air quality impact on or from the proposed RCHE during its construction and operation stages is anticipated. As for noise aspect, the proposed RCHE would not be subject to any adverse air borne or structural borne noise impact from the electrical and mechanical (E&M) system of the Plaza located at a considerable distance. Besides, given the minimum separation distance with Palm Springs Boulevard with limited traffic flow, the proposed RCHE would not be subject to adverse traffic noise impact.

Sewerage

1.6 According to the SIA submitted by the applicant, with the implementation of the proposed RCHE, there will not be an increase in sewage generation as compared to the baseline scenario (i.e. the uses at the Plaza approved in the previous GBP submission). The sewage from the proposed RCHE will be discharged to the existing on-site sewage treatment plant via internal sewers within Palm Springs. In this regard, no adverse sewerage impact arising from the proposed RCHE is anticipated.

1.7 Part of the Premises is the subject of two previous applications (No. A/YL-MP/7 and 65) submitted by different applicants for a kindergarten and a social welfare facility (child care centre) respectively, both of which were approved with conditions by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board in 1996 and 2000 (detailed in paragraph 6 below). Both the kindergarten and child care centre at that portion of the Premises have already ceased operation.

1.8 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:

(a)	Application Form received on 28.7.2026	(**Appendix I**)
(b)	Further Information (FI) received on 29.9.2026[#]	(**Appendix Ia**)
(c)	FI received on 13.11.2026*	(**Appendix Ib**)

#accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirements
**accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirements*

1.9 On 25.9.2026, the Committee 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 Application Form and FI at **Appendices I to Ib**, and can be summarised as follows:

(a) The proposed self-financed private RCHE, comprising 90 bed spaces, is in line with the prevailing policy on promoting "Caring for the Elderly" by contributing to the supply of elderly care facilities, addressing the evolving needs of ageing population in Hong Kong and the local deficit of RCHE beds in Yuen Long (YL) district. The proposed RCHE also responds to the local demand for community and social welfare facilities in the YL district.

(b) The proposed RCHE will not jeopardise the planning intention of the "R(C)" zone, which is primarily for low-rise, low-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Board. The proposed RCHE, being a small-scale RCHE operated on commercial basis, targets to serve and support the local needs of the nearby residential neighbourhood for elderly care facilities.

(c) The proposed RCHE would be implemented through conversion of two of the existing shops of the Plaza with about 16% of the total GFA according to the approved GBP, while its remaining portion (with GFA of about 5,212.7m² or about 84% of the total GFA of the Plaza) will continue to provide various retail provisions, including a supermarket and a convenience store, serving the local neighbourhood and to support their daily needs. Besides, there are still currently numerous vacant premises in the Plaza that allow for additional retail uses subject to market demand. The proposed RCHE will therefore not substantially reduce retail provisions in the Plaza where the Premises are located.

(d) From a wider perspective, there are also several retail facilities in the surrounding YL district (e.g. Fairview Park Town Centre in Fairview Park, Park Circle in Park Yoho, RIVA Shopping Arcade in RIVA, Skycity adjacent to RIVA and those in YL Town Centre area), which are all located within a 10-minute driving distance from the Plaza, acting as alternative and complementary retail provisions, especially for the residents of Palm Springs and Royal Palms.

(e) The proposed RCHE will not alter the existing building bulk of the Plaza but involves only internal conversion of the Premises, and will not lead to any increase in the existing GFA of the Plaza. The Plaza where the Premises are located at remains compatible with the surrounding low-density low-rise rural setting.

(f) As part of the Premises is already vacant, and the retail shop at the Premises will cease operation soon, the Premises are therefore readily available to deliver the proposed RCHE in a timely manner.

(g) Regarding potential issues of overlooking and privacy, the applicant is committed to equipping the windows inside the proposed RCHE with curtains. Staff members will actively manage the opening and closure of curtains for privacy purpose. Besides, since both sides of Sunflower Path adjoining the Plaza are planted with existing trees that provide natural shielding, the potential issues of overlooking and privacy would be minimal.

(h) In view of the existing condition of the Plaza, barrier-free design in the form of ramp will be provided for the proposed RCHE. Details of the barrier-free design will be formulated

during the subsequent GBP submission, and will comply with relevant regulations and requirements, such as the Code of Practice for Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) and the Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008.

(i) Upon reviewing the safety concern of the elderly, the proposed RCHE user would enjoy the outdoor open area within the Plaza accompanied by their family members and/or staff members of the proposed RCHE, where necessary.

(j) Various technical reviews/assessments have been conducted and concluded that the proposed RCHE is technically feasible in terms of traffic, air quality, noise and sewerage aspects. Besides, the proposed RCHE would not impose any impacts on the existing commercial centre and the adjoining residential neighbourhood, as well as the associated local road networks and emergency vehicular access (EVA).

(k) The proposed RCHE will meet all the relevant ordinances, regulations and licensing requirements for RCHE before its operation, such as the Code of Practice for Residential Care Home (Elderly Persons) which specifies that no part of the proposed RCHE will be situated at a height of more than 24m above ground level.

(l) The applicant has committed to carrying out relevant land administrative procedures, if required, for the proposed RCHE at the subsequent stage to the satisfaction of the Lands Department (LandsD).

(m) The applicant commits to maintaining close liaison with relevant stakeholders (including management offices, owners' committees, as well as owners, occupiers and tenants of Palm Springs / Royal Palms). In particular, the applicant will keep close liaison on land-related issues (such as concerns on the Deed of Mutual Covenant (DMC) and/or relevant clauses under lease), daily operation of the proposed RCHE, as well as estate management and maintenance matters.

3. Compliance with the "Owner's Consent/Notification" Requirements

The applicant is the sole "current land owner". Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members' inspection.

4. Town Planning Board Guidelines

The Premises are located within the Wetland Buffer Area (WBA) of the Deep Bay Area (**Plan A-1a**). The Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Application for Development within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' (TPB PG-No.12C) is relevant to the application and the relevant extract of which is at **Appendix II**.

5. Background

The Premises and/or the subject building/lot(s) are not subject to any current planning enforcement action.

6. Previous Applications

Part of the Premises are the subject of two previous applications (No. A/YL-MP/7 and 65) submitted by different applicants for a kindergarten and a social welfare facility (child care centre) respectively, both of which were approved with conditions by the Committee in 1996 and 2000 on the considerations that the proposed development was not incompatible with the surrounding areas; the proposed development was in line with the planning intention of the "R(C)" zone; and relevant government departments consulted had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application or their concerns could be addressed by relevant approval conditions. Both the kindergarten and child care centre have already ceased operation at the Premises. Details of the previous applications are summarised at **Appendix III** and their locations are shown on **Plan A-1b**.

7. Similar Application

There is no similar application within the same "R(C)" zone during the past five years.

8. The Premises and Their Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1a to A-4)

8.1 The Premises are:

(a) currently partly vacant (shop Nos. G1-G3) and partly occupied by a retail shop (shop Nos. G5-G8); and

(b) located at the western part of the G/F of the Plaza, which provides commercial facilities to the existing residential development of Palm Springs and surrounding areas.

8.2 The subject building, i.e. Palm Springs Plaza, is:

(a) a standalone two-storey commercial centre, which is mainly occupied by retail shops (including a supermarket and a convenience store), restaurant, offices, learning centres, a fitness centre and a church;

(b) accessible from Palm Springs Boulevard leading to Castle Peak Road – Mai Po; and

(c) located within WBA of the Deep Bay Area.

8.3 The surrounding areas are sub-urban in character and predominated by low-rise residential dwellings (i.e. Palm Springs and Royal Palms) and ponds.

9. Planning Intention

The planning intention of the "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.

10. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

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

Provision of Social Welfare Facilities

10.1.1 Comments of the Director of Social Welfare (DSW):

(a) no objection to the application from service perspective subject to the conditions that (i) the design and construction of the proposed RCHE shall be in full compliance with prevailing statutory and licensing requirements, and (ii) the proposed RCHE shall incur no financial implication, both in capital and recurrent, to the Government;

(b) no comment on the application from licensing perspective; and

(c) advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

Land Administration

10.1.2 Comments of the District Lands Officer/YL, LandsD (DLO/YL, LandsD):

(a) no objection to the application;

(b) the Remaining Portion of Lot 4750 in D.D. 104 (the Lot) is held under the Conditions of Exchange dated 28.9.1990 (the Conditions) as modified by relevant modification letters, and shall not be used for any purpose other than private residential purposes, and such non-industrial development (of which the total GFA for non-industrial (excluding godown, office, residential, hotel and / or service apartment) purposes shall not be less than 6,000m^2) in accordance with the Master Layout Plan (MLP);

(c) the proposed social welfare facility (RCHE) will be in breach of the Conditions governing the Lot, including but not limited to the user restriction;

(d) having considered the forgoing, if planning permission is given by the Committee, the applicant has to apply for a waiver (or such other land instrument as the Government may consider appropriate) for the proposed RCHE; and

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

Nature Conservation

10.1.3 Comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC):

(a) no comment on the application; and

(b) the Plaza where the Premises are located falls within the WBA. According to TPB PG-No. 12C, planning application for social welfare facility other

than free-standing building exceeding three storeys are exempted from the requirement of ecological impact assessment (EcoIA). As there is no change to the development bulk of the Plaza (which is an existing commercial centre) where the Premises are located, no adverse ecological impact is anticipated.

Traffic

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

(a) no comment on the application from traffic engineering perspective based on the TRR submitted by the applicant that the proposed RCHE with 90 beds will generate limited traffic, and there have been sufficient car parking and L/UL spaces provided at the Palm Springs serving the existing commercial centre; and

(b) advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

10.1.5 Comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (CHE/NTW, HyD):

(a) no in-principle objection to the application from highways maintenance point of view; and

(b) advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

Environment

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

(a) no objection to the application as the proposed RCHE will unlikely cause adverse environmental impacts;

(b) there was no environmental complaint related to the Site in the past three years; and

(c) advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

Drainage

10.1.7 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD):

(a) no in-principle objection to the application, which does not involve modification of the existing drainage facilities, from drainage perspective; and

(b) advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

Building Matters

10.1.8 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings

Department (CBS/NTW, BD):

(a) no objection to the application; and

(b) advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

Fire Safety

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

(a) no in-principle objection to the application subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of D of FS; and

(b) advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

District Officer's Comments

10.1.10 Comments of the District Officer (YL), Home Affairs Department (DO(YL, HAD):

(a) no comment on the application from departmental perspective and no local comment on the application was received;

(b) meetings were held by Palm Springs Owners' Committee on 24.8.2026 and 22.10.2026, with views from concerned owners and residents set out below:

Meeting on 24.8.2026

(i) on the inconsistency with DMC, some owners opined that referring to the DMC of Palm Springs, the Premises is not intended for the purposes of operating a hotel or private care homes. In this connection, the application may be considered as a violation of the DMC of Palm Springs. Attendees consider it inappropriate to proceed with the consultation in such circumstances;

(ii) on the adverse impacts on public facilities and residents' daily life, some residents further mentioned that the application may impose unbearable burdens on the public facilities within the Premises, including but not limited to an increased traffic flow, escalating demand from elderly residents for recreational facilities, additional wastewater treatment requirements within the Premises and complicated security concerns. Accordingly, residents urge the relevant department(s) to take the above concerns into consideration when considering the application;

Meeting on 22.10.2026

(iii) according to his office's observation, the overwhelming majority of residents, even if not all, objected to the establishment of the proposed RCHE at the Premises, with grounds of objection from owners and residents during the meeting summarised as follows;

(iv) internal traffic conditions in Palm Springs have sharply deteriorated, with heavy illegal parking leading to gridlock and recent frequent police ticketing which rarely occurred previously. Introducing the proposed 90-bed RCHE, coupled with additional visitors and vehicular flow will aggravate this existing traffic burden on the private road network;

(v) the private sewage treatment plant and sewer network in Palm Springs can hardly handle specialised or medical-grade wastewater generated by the proposed RCHE. The increase in daily sewage discharge will risk overloading the already-ageing infrastructure and raise public health concerns;

(vi) against the backdrop of unrestricted entry into the Premises by members of the public, the influx of visitors and additional working staff accompanied with the proposed RCHE would widen the security loophole. It was exemplified by two burglary cases recently occurred; and

(vii) converting the commercial centre into the proposed RCHE likely breaches conditions stated in the land lease and DMC of the same area. LandsD and relevant authorities should be urged to investigate into such allegation to safeguard the owners' rights.

10.2 The following departments have no objection to/no comment on the application:

(a) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD);
(b) Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-1, Railway Development Office, HyD;
(c) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS);
(d) Project Manager (West), CEDD; and
(e) Commissioner of Police.

11. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Periods

On 4.8.2026 and 6.10.2026, the application was published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection periods, a total of 2,480 comments including 73 supporting comments from individuals (**Appendix Va**), and 2,407 objecting comments (including 1,751 in standard formats) from Palm Springs and Royal Palms Management Services Offices, Palm Springs Owners' Committee (Arcadia, Paloma and Westwood), Royal Palms Estate Owners' Committee (Phases A and B), members of the Legislative Council, members of the YL District Council (YLDC), with nearby residents and individuals (**Appendix Vb**) were received. The comments received are summarised as follows:

Supporting Comments (**Appendix Va**)

(a) leveraging scarce land resources by converting shops in the existing commercial centre for the proposed RCHE echoes the government's policy on encouraging the provision of RCHE premises in new private developments. The proposed RCHE within the existing residential development could also facilitate promote ageing in place, foster inter-generational integration and bring social cohesion;

(b) the proposed RCHE could meet the imminent demand for RCHE bed spaces arising from the ageing population, easing the burden on hospital beds and stress on carers across the YL district and the wider territories;

(c) the Premises which are situated within a low-density tranquil residential area with close proximity to Pok Oi Hospital is a suitable location for the proposed RCHE. The existing facilities of the Plaza including the ancillary car park, barrier-free facilities and ventilation system, coupled with the availability of internal roads could ensure the smooth operation of the proposed RCHE;

(d) the proposed conversion of the vacant commercial floor areas for the proposed RCHE could optimise the existing social resources and bring employment opportunities and reduce vacancy rate of the existing commercial centre, which could boost the local economy;

(e) compared to a newly-built standalone RCHE that takes five to eight years to complete, the proposed RCHE which could be completed in several months by converting readily available shops is an efficient solution to the deficit in RCHE;

(f) comparing to restaurants and place of entertainment, the proposed RCHE is comparatively more hygienic and less disturbing in terms of noise. The proposed RCHE would also not generate a large influx of visitors as compared to uses such as supermarkets;

(g) as the proposed RCHE would not involve any changes to the existing building height, development bulk and intensity of the Premises, there would not be any adverse impact on the nearby residents;

Objecting Comments (**Appendix Vb**)

Planning Intention, Land Use Compatibility and Provision of GIC Facilities

(h) the proposed RCHE is considered not in line with the planning intention of the "R(C)" zone where commercial uses may be permitted are intended to serve the residential neighbourhood. It is also not in line with the long-term planning intention of the Northern Metropolis and the San Tin Technopole positioned as innovation and technology hub;

(i) the proposed RCHE is not compatible with the low-rise and low-density rural/sub-urban residential character in the area. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar RCHEs, which would adversely affect the tranquil and low-density living environment of the existing residential developments at the "R(C)" zone;

(j) the remote location of the proposed RCHE relative to major healthcare facilities, such as public hospitals, results in inefficient travel time, reducing its overall service efficiency;

(k) the justifications on the deficit of RCHE beds in YLDC area are misleading, as the current application involves self-financing RCHE beds, but not subsidised beds that are under deficit. Furthermore, given the presences of various existing RCHEs in the area, there is no acute shortage of elderly care facilities locally or in its vicinity;

(l) there is no planning gain in support of the conversion of retail spaces to the proposed RCHE. Besides, the living quality of the proposed RCHE is in doubt as there is no outdoor recreational space and greenery area planned for the elderly;

(m) the Premises are not suitable for RCHE development as social welfare facilities of such scale should be placed on land zoned "Government, Institution or Community" or at vacant school premises, instead of an integrated neighbourhood shopping centre which is vital to community cohesion;

Technical Concerns

(n) the applicant has failed to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the proposed RCHE without providing key technical assessments on drainage, sewerage, traffic, air quality, visual, landscape, ecology, water quality and risk aspects, and errors found in the submitted technical review/assessment reports would cast doubt on their reliability. The technical review/assessment reports submitted by the applicant are incomprehensive, deceptive and fundamentally flawed, in an attempt to deceive relevant government departments;

(o) the proposed RCHE will aggravate the existing shortage of parking spaces for residents at Palm Springs, inducing adverse traffic impact and increasing traffic flow at the existing residential development. There appears to be no evidence that the proposed RCHE could mitigate such problem. In a broader context, the existing traffic conditions in the YL district is not conducive to meeting the emergency and operational needs relating to the proposed RCHE;

(p) the proposed RCHE would lead to a detrimental cumulative impact on the internal traffic circulation of Palm Springs. The foreseeable influx of staff members, visitors and trips generated from supply logistics or ambulances etc. would exacerbate the current problem of EVA blockage caused by illegal parking, thereby putting the safety and lives of existing residents at Palm Springs and future uses of the proposed RCHE at risk;

(q) the proposed RCHE would cause nuisances in terms of visual, environmental, noise, odour, air quality, hygiene and waste management aspects to the nearby residential units at Palm Springs. Besides, it would induce adverse ecological impact on the WBA;

(r) there is insufficient information on the details of the proposed RCHE, including the lack of a detailed fire service installations proposal has been submitted to demonstrate that the requisite operational requirements for fire and structural safety can be achieved for the proposed RCHE, a comprehensive management plan detailing the operational arrangements of the proposed RCHE, and how the proposed RCHE will comply with relevant licensing requirement, such as those concerning natural lighting, ventilation, minimum area per residents, etc.;

Land Administration Concerns

(s) the proposed RCHE is in breach of the user term governed by the lease of the existing residential development, as well as the nature of commercial development stipulated in the DMC and the approved MLP;

Other Concerns

(t) the proposed RCHE will deprive the residents of crucial retail and living spaces as well as tranquil living environment, causing mental distress and sleep deprivation. Residents consider it unacceptable to share the existing facilities with future RCHE users;

(u) as the existing environment of the Plaza is already undesirable and lacks maintenance, implementation of the proposed RCHE would only worsen the issue of poor management of the Plaza. Estate management may also not be able to cope with the security concerns and risks brought by the proposed RCHE, for example the walking of dogs by residents of Palm Springs may pose danger to the RCHE users;

(v) the vacancy of the Plaza is the result of aggressive rent hikes and non-renewals over the years, so that the landlord could claim it as vacant to justify the conversion for the proposed RCHE. The proposed RCHE would also impose financial burden to the residents due to increased management and maintenance costs, as well as property devaluation;

(w) the applicant and management company have failed to reach a consensus with the residents over the operational details of the proposed RCHE, with some residents feeling misrepresented by the Estate Owners' Committee;

(x) the submission of 1,584 public comments on the original submission of the application, coupled with frequent police ticketing reflects the saturated traffic capacity in Palm Springs, illustrating the suffering of the community; and

(y) should the application be approved, the co-owners of Palm Springs and Royal Palms would initiate formal legal proceedings including applying for a Judicial Review against the government's decision and seeking an Interlocutory Injunction from the High Court to halt the implementation of the proposed RCHE.

12. Planning Considerations and Assessments

12.1 The application is for proposed social welfare facility (RCHE) at the Premises which fall within an area zoned "R(C)" on the OZP (**Plan A-1**). The "R(C)" zone is primarily intended for low-rise, low-density residential development where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Board. While the proposed RCHE is not entirely in line with the planning intention of the "R(C)" zone, according to the applicant, it could contribute to addressing the local deficit of RCHE beds in YL district. DSW has no objection to the proposed private RCHE, presuming that the proposed RCHE shall incur no financial implication to the Government and be in full compliance with the prevailing statutory and licensing requirements. The applicant also commits to complying with all relevant ordinances, guidelines and licensing requirements associated with the design and operation of the proposed RCHE should the application be approved by the Committee.

12.2 The Premises are located on G/F of the two-storey Plaza, which is predominantly occupied by retail shops, restaurants, learning centres, etc. as mentioned in paragraph 8.1 above. The proposed privately-operated RCHE, occupying two of the shops with a total GFA of about 973.8m^2 (i.e. about 16% of the total GFA of the Plaza) and providing 90 bed spaces, is considered not incompatible with other floor uses within the same building. According to the applicant, since the implementation of the proposed RCHE would involve only internal A&A works, it will not lead to any increase in the existing GFA of the Plaza, and the existing development bulk of the two-storey Plaza would not be altered. Given that there is no change to the existing development bulk of the Plaza, as well as the existing development context and setting of the residential development under the current application, the Premises and the Plaza will remain compatible with the low-rise, low-density residential developments in the same Palm Springs development and the wider

surrounding areas including low-rise residential development in Royal Palms and abandoned ponds upon the completion of the proposed RCHE.

12.3 The Plaza where the Premises are located falls within the WBA in Deep Bay Area under the TPB PG-No. 12C, which specifies that planning applications for social welfare facility other than free-standing building exceeding three storeys are exempted from the requirement of EcoIA. As there is no change to the development bulk of the Plaza upon the completion of the proposed RCHE, DAFC has no comment on the application from nature conservation point of view.

12.4 According to the submitted TRR, staff members and visitors will access the proposed RCHE by private car and taxi, as well as other public transport services along the Castle Peak Road – Mai Po. Whilst requirements on parking and L/UL for RCHE are not specified in the HKPSG, reference has been made to RCHEs of similar scale to determine the relevant provisions and it is proposed to utilise the existing ancillary car park of the Plaza, which provides 207 parking spaces and seven L/UL bays, to serve the proposed RCHE. One L/UL bay will be exclusively designated for the pick-up/drop-off and L/UL activities of lorry/light bus/ambulance for the proposed RCHE. Besides, as proposed by the applicant, the RCHE will operate under a prior reservation system. Given that the combined traffic flow from the proposed RCHE and the remaining commercial operators of the Plaza is comparable to that under the scenario of the fully-occupied Plaza, the TRR concludes that the traffic impact on the local road network is minimal, and no insurmountable traffic impact on the surrounding road network is anticipated. In this regard, C for T have no comment on the application from traffic engineering perspective having considered the limited traffic generated by the proposed RCHE, as well as car parking and L/UL arrangements. CHE/NTW, HyD also has no objection to the application from highway maintenance point of view.

12.5 The applicant has also conducted various technical review/assessments to demonstrate that the proposed RCHE would not impose adverse air quality, noise and sewerage impacts on the surrounding areas. On air quality aspect, the AQIR concludes that taking into account the implementation of mitigation and control measures as mentioned in paragraph 1.5 above, including erection of hoardings during the construction period, proper storage of dusty materials in accordance with relevant regulations, complying with relevant guidelines on oil fume and cooking odour, no adverse quality impact during the construction and operation of the proposed RCHE is anticipated. Besides, as there is no potential industrial, odour and vehicular traffic emission sources in its vicinity, the proposed RCHE will not be subject to any adverse air quality impact. On noise aspect, the NIR reveals that as the proposed RCHE is not located in close vicinity to the E&M system of the Plaza, and with limited traffic flow from the internal road networks (with Palm Springs Boulevard maintaining a minimum separation distance of 5m from the proposed RCHE), it is envisaged that the proposed RCHE will not be subject to adverse noise impact. On sewerage aspect, the SIA concludes that there would not be adverse sewerage impact arising from the proposed RCHE as the discharged sewage will be drained to the on-site sewage treatment plant via internal sewers within Palm Springs and would not exceed the capacity of the existing sewage treatment plant. DEP has no objection to the application from environmental planning perspective. CE/MN of DSD also has no objection to the application from drainage perspective given that the proposed RCHE does not involve modification of the existing drainage facilities. Should the application be approved by the Committee, it is also recommended to advise the applicant to follow relevant environmental-related legislation and guidelines to minimise any

potential environmental nuisances generated by the proposed RCHE on the surrounding areas.

12.6 Other relevant government departments including D of FS, CBS/NTW, BD, DEMS and CE/C,WSD have no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. In particular, the technical requirement of D of FS could be addressed by imposing relevant approval condition for the design and provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting as recommended in paragraph 13.2 below should the application be approved by the Committee.

12.7 Regarding the views of the owners and residents of Palm Springs conveyed by DO(YL), HAD and public comments as stated in paragraphs 10.1.10 and 11 above respectively, the applicant's justifications, departmental comments and planning considerations above are relevant. On the claims that there is no acute shortage of elderly care facilities and misleading calculation over the deficit of RCHE beds despite the applicant's justification regarding the shortfall of RCHE beds in the YL district, it should be noted that the assessment for the planned provision of population-based community facilities, including RCHE, are based on the requirements of the HKPSG as well as inputs from relevant bureau/departments. Furthermore, provision of services/facilities from the private market could help address the demand for social welfare facilities. For the matters related to the land administration aspect, the applicant will be advised to liaise with LandsD to handle such matters should the Committee approve the application. Regarding the comment on the deprivation of retail floor spaces, according to the applicant, the remaining portion of the Plaza outside the Premises (accounting for about 84% of the total GFA of the Plaza) will continue to provide various retail provisions, including a supermarket and a convenience store, serving the local neighbourhood and to support their daily needs. There are also various existing retail outlets in the vicinity of Palm Springs. Moreover, property and rental prices, as well as issues pertinent to the daily operation, estate management and maintenance matters, as well as concerns on DMC, are irrelevant to the planning application and are not material planning considerations of the Committee. Nevertheless, the applicant will also be advised to liaise with relevant stakeholders on these matters, in which the applicant has already committed to doing so, should the application be approved by the Committee.

13. Planning Department's Views

13.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 12 above and having taken into account the views of the owners and residents of Palm Springs conveyed by DO(YL), HAD and public comments mentioned in paragraphs 10.1.10 and 11 above, PlanD has no objection to the application.

13.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 20.11.2030 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 following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members' reference.

Approval condition

the design and provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory clauses

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

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

the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the "Residential (Group C)" zone which is for low-rise, low-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Town Planning Board. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention.

14. Decision Sought

14.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant permission.

14.2 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.

14.3 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.

15. Attachments

Appendix I	Application Form with attachments received on 28.7.2026
Appendix Ia	FI received on 29.9.2026
Appendix Ib	FI received on 13.11.2026
Appendix II	Relevant Extracts of TPB PG-No. 12C
Appendix III	Previous Applications
Appendix IV	Recommended Advisory Clauses
Appendices Va and Vb	Public Comments
Drawing A-1	Layout Plan
Plan A-1a	Location Plan
Plan A-1b	Previous Applications Plan
Plan A-2	Site Plan
Plan A-3	Aerial Photo
Plan A-4	Site Photos

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
NOVEMBER 2026