

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

**APPLICATION NO. A/FSS/280**

<b><u>Applicant</u></b>	Hong Kong Housing Authority
<b><u>Site</u></b>	Areas 4 and 30 Site 1 and Site 2, Sheung Shui, New Territories
<b><u>Site Area</u></b>	Site 1: about 1.44ha Site 2: about 1.13ha
<b><u>Land Status</u></b>	Government land
<b><u>Plan</u></b>	Approved Fanling/Sheung Shui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/FSS/24
<b><u>Zoning</u></b>	“Residential (Group A)4” (“R(A)4”) (for both Sites 1 and 2)  [Subject to a maximum total plot ratio (PR) of 6.6 and a maximum building height (BH) of 130mPD]
<b><u>Application</u></b>	Minor Relaxation of PR and BH restrictions for Permitted Public Housing Development

**1 The Proposal**

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions for permitted public housing development at the application sites (the Sites) (**Plan A-1**). The Sites comprises two portions, Sites 1 and Site 2 (**Plan A-2**), and both are zoned “R(A)4” on the OZP subject to a maximum total PR of 6.6 and a maximum BH of 130mPD. According to the Notes of the OZP, based on the individual merits of a development proposal, minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions may be considered by the Town Planning Board (the Board) on application under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).
- 1.2 The proposed public housing development mainly comprises three housing blocks and one community hall cum welfare and district health centre block at Site 1 (**Drawings A-1 to A-3**), and three housing blocks and one stand-alone public vehicle park (PVP) block in Site 2 (**Drawings A-5 to A-7**). The piling works for both Sites commenced in November 2020 for building completion in 2025/26 and beyond by phases tentatively. Site 1 is accessible from Choi Fat Street (**Drawing A-2**), while Site 2 is accessible from Ka Fu Close (**Drawing A-6**).

- 1.3 In pursuit of the Government's initiative to increase the maximum domestic PR of public housing sites where their technical feasibility permits, the applicant has reviewed the intensification feasibility of the public housing development at the Sites. Having reviewed the intensification feasibility of the Sites, at which foundation works have been commenced, the applicant proposes to increase the flat production through minor relaxation of the maximum total PR from 6.6 to 7.1 (+0.5/+7.6%) for both Sites 1 and 2, and maximum BH restrictions from 130mPD to 144mPD (+14m/+10.8%) for Site 1 and 149mPD (+19m/+14.6%) for Site 2. After the intensification, the total number of units will increase by 292 (+8.7%) to 3,644 units. A comparison of the current scheme, which is an OZP compliance scheme, and the proposed scheme under the present application are at **Drawings A-1 and A-5**.
- 1.4 The layout plans, sections, Landscape Master Plans (LMPs) and photomontages submitted by the applicant are at **Drawings A-1 to A-14**. The major development parameters of the proposed scheme are tabulated below:

Development Parameters	Proposed Scheme	
	Site 1	Site 2
Site Area (about) <sup>[1]</sup>	1.44ha	1.13ha
PR Restriction under OZP	6.6	6.6
Proposed PR		
- Overall	7.1 (+0.5/+7.6% over OZP PR)	7.1(+0.5/+7.6% over OZP PR)
- Domestic	6.5	6.5
- Non-domestic	0.6	0.6
BH Restriction under OZP	+130mPD	+130mPD
Proposed Maximum BH (main roof level)	+144mPD (+14m/+10.8% over OZP BH)	+149mPD (+19m/+14.6% over OZP BH)
No. of Storey of Housing Blocks	Block 1: 41 storeys Block 2: 45 storeys Block 3: 42 storeys	Block 1: 47 storeys Block 2: 45 storeys Block 3: 40 storeys
Flat Production	2,088	1,556
Design Population <sup>[2]</sup>	4,787	3,773
Site Coverage		
- Below 15m	About 95%	About 70%
- 15m or above	About 12% (non-domestic) + about 36% (domestic)	About 17% (non-domestic) + about 28% (domestic)
Green Coverage	At least 20%	At least 20%
Retail and Commercial (R&C) Facilities	About 400m <sup>2</sup>	About 700m <sup>2</sup>
Education Facilities	One 6-classroom kindergarten	Nil
Recreational Facilities		
- Local Open Space <sup>[3]</sup>	Not less than 4,787m <sup>2</sup>	Not less than 3,773m <sup>2</sup>
- Children Play Area	Not less than 400m <sup>2</sup>	Not less than 302m <sup>2</sup>
- Others	One table tennis table	One basketball court One Badminton court One table tennis table
Social Welfare/ Community Facilities <sup>[4]</sup>	- Community hall - District health centre	Nil

Development Parameters	Proposed Scheme	
	Site 1	Site 2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Day activity centre (DAC)</li> <li>- Residential care home for the elderly (RCHE)</li> <li>- Hostel for moderately mentally handicapped persons (HMMH)</li> <li>- Hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons (HSMH)</li> <li>- Integrated vocational rehabilitation services centre (IVRSC)</li> </ul>	
<b>Ancillary Parking Facilities<sup>[3][4]</sup></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Car Parking Space</li> <li>- Motorcycle Parking Space</li> <li>- Light Goods Vehicle (LGV) Parking Space</li> <li>- Loading/Unloading (L/UL) Bay</li> <li>- Bicycle Parking Space</li> <li>- Others</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 61 (domestic) + 15 (visitor) + 2 (R&amp;C) + 1 (kindergarten)</li> <li>- 15</li> <li>- 8 (domestic)</li> <li>- 3 (domestic) + 1 (R&amp;C) + 1 (welfare) + 1 (community hall) + 1 (kindergarten)</li> <li>- 180</li> <li>- 1 16-seat van parking spaces for exclusive use of the DAC cum HSMH + 1 private light bus parking space for the exclusive use of the RCHE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 56 (domestic) + 15 (visitor) + 4 (R&amp;C)</li> <li>- 14</li> <li>- 8 (domestic)</li> <li>- 3 (domestic) + 1 (R&amp;C)</li> <li>- 144</li> <li>- Nil</li> </ul>
<b>Other Public Transport Facilities<sup>[4]</sup></b>	Public transport interchange (PTI)	Stand-alone public vehicle park (PVP) block (320 car parking spaces + 6 LGV parking spaces)

**Notes:**

<sup>[1]</sup> Subject to detailed survey.

<sup>[2]</sup> Based on actual flat mix.

<sup>[3]</sup> The proposed provision is adjusted in accordance with the design population and flat mix.

<sup>[4]</sup> According to the Notes of the OZP, any floor space that is constructed or intended for use solely as ancillary parking facilities, public vehicle parks, public transport facilities and Government, institution or community facilities, as required by the Government, may be disregarded in determining the maximum PR within the “R(A)4” zone.

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

- (a) Application form received on 25.3.2021 (Appendix I)
- (b) Supporting planning statement enclosing Visual Appraisal (VA), Air Ventilation Assessment Initial Study (AVA IS), Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), Environmental Assessment Study (EAS), Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA), and Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department's (AFCD's) reply on ecological aspect (Appendix Ia)
- (c) Further information (FI) received on 27.4.2021<sup>#</sup> (Appendix Ib)
- (d) FI received on 6.5.2021<sup>#</sup> (Appendix Ic)  
<sup>#</sup> Exempted from publication

## 2 **Justifications from the Applicant**

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed in the supporting planning statement and FIs at **Appendices Ia to Ic**. They are briefly summarized as follows:

### In line with Government's Policy on Intensification of Public Housing Sites

- (a) the Executive Council approved in December 2018 the policy on "Enhancement of the Development Intensity of Public Housing Sites". For sites located in Density Zones 2 and 3 of the Main Urban Areas and Density Zones 1, 2 and 3 of New Towns, the maximum domestic PR of the public housing will be allowed to increase up to 30% (versus by up to 20% as announced in the 2014 Policy Address) where their technical feasibility permits. In line with this policy, the maximum domestic PR for Sites 1 and 2, which is under Density Zone 1 of the New Towns, is allowed to be increased from 6 to 6.5. Together with a kindergarten and other social welfare and ancillary facilities, minor relaxation of maximum total PR and BH restrictions from 6.6 to 7.1 and from +130mPD to +144mPD (for Site 1)/ +149mPD (for Site 2) respectively are therefore proposed;

### Meet Acute Demand for Public Housing

- (b) this application would increase the public housing production, which is in line with the Government's policy to better utilize land resources in order to meet the imminent housing need;

### Optimise Development Potential and Minimize Implications of BH

- (c) the disposition and layout of the housing blocks have been specifically designed in response to site constraints and opportunities to optimise development potential of the Sites as far as practical, while addressing various environmental and technical aspects in minimising their impacts by means of various design measures including adoption of single-aspect layout (i.e. self-protecting block design) in Blocks 1 and 3 in Site 2 (**Drawing A-13**); keeping the domestic storey not exceeding 40 storeys as far as practicable in order to avoid the need for refuge floor etc.;

Compatible with Surrounding Development Context

- (d) taking into consideration of the BH profile of the existing and planned development in the surrounding area, BH variations are proposed in both Sites 1 (**Drawings A-2 and A-3**) and 2 (**Drawings A-13 and A-14**) not only to enhance visual interest, but also echo with the surrounding development context;
- (e) Site 1 is located at the southwest of the East Rail line with the existing Po Shek Wu Estate (maximum BH of +114mPD) to its southeast and low-rise industrial buildings (maximum BH of 25m) to its north and northwest (**Plan A-1**). According to the applicant, in order to echo with the relatively lower building height of the existing industrial buildings to the northwest, a relatively lower BH of +132mPD is proposed for Block 1. With reference to the BH of the existing Po Shek Wu Estate (maximum BH of +114mPD), a relatively higher BH of +144mPD and +142mPD is proposed for Blocks 2 and 3 respectively (**Drawing A-2**). Besides respecting the existing BH profile, such proposed BH variations also create a more vibrant skyline;
- (f) for Site 2, in order to echo with the planned public housing development across Po Shek Wu Road to the southeast (maximum BH of 114mPD), a BH profile descending from Block 1 (+149mPD) in the southeast, and Block 2 (+143mPD) and from Block 3 (+129mPD) in the middle to the PVP block (+46mPD) in the northwest is proposed (**Drawing A-13**);

No Adverse Impacts on Technical Aspects

- (g) the VA submitted by the applicant (**Appendix Ia**) demonstrates that the proposed increase in BH is minor, and as shown in the photomontages (**Drawings A-23 to A-28**), the proposed development would unlikely cause any significant adverse visual impact;
- (h) the AVA IS (**Appendix Ia**) concludes that with wind enhancement measures adopted, including wider building separations and more permeable podium, the proposed scheme would achieve a slightly better wind environment at close proximity within the surrounding area;
- (i) there is no additional trees felling and impact on existing landscape resources/landscape characters incurred compared to the current scheme. The tree planting will meet the provision of minimum of 3 trees per 100m<sup>2</sup> of the total green coverage. Therefore, no adverse landscape impact is anticipated. Local open space and children play areas will be provided according to the ratios and provision in the approved planning brief;
- (j) the updated TIA (**Appendix Ia**) indicates that the proposed development will have no insurmountable traffic impact. Car parking and L/UL facilities are provided with reference to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines requirements, parking demand in the district, and to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T);
- (k) other technical assessments including SIA, EAS and QRA (**Appendix Ia**) conclude that there is no adverse impacts on sewerage, noise and societal risk due to the proposed development at the Sites; and
- (l) besides, no significant adverse ecological impact is anticipated and ecological assessment is not required as advised by AFCD.

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

As the Sites only involve Government land, the “owner’s consent/notification” requirement as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Satisfying the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements under Section 12A and 16 of the Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 31A) is not applicable to the application.

### **4 Previous Application**

There is no previous application at the Sites.

### **5 Similar Applications**

5.1 There are two approved similar applications (Nos. A/FSS/223 and A/FSS/236) for proposed minor relaxation of gross floor area (GFA) and BH restrictions for permitted public housing development within the “R(A)2” and “R(A)1” zones of the same OZP respectively. The applications were approved with conditions by the Committee on 12.9.2014 and 7.8.2015 respectively on grounds that that proposal was in line with the Government policy in boosting housing supply by increasing the development intensity by 20% where feasible; the proposed minor relaxation to increase flat supply could help optimise scarce land resources, meet the community’s imminent demand for housing, which was in the public interest, in line with Government policy and hence had planning merits; the proposed intensity was considered acceptable for the subject location and site context; and the proposed minor relaxation of GFA and BH relaxations of the development would not cause additional problems on the traffic, environmental, landscape, drainage, sewerage, water supplies, geotechnical and fire services aspects.

5.2 Details of the applications are summarized at **Appendix II** and their locations are shown on **Plan A-1**.

### **6 The Sites and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1 and A-4)**

6.1 The Sites:

- (a) are under construction except for the southeast portion of Site 1 which is currently occupied by temporary car park to meet the demand on car parking space until the completion of permanent public vehicle park in Site 2;
- (b) Site 1 is bounded by Po Shek Wu Road, Choi Yuen Street and Choi Fat Street, the vehicular access of Site 1 is proposed at Choi Fat Street; and
- (c) Site 2 is bounded by Po Shek Wu Road, San Wan Road and Ka Fu Close, the vehicular access of Site 2 is proposed at Ka Fu Close.

6.2 The Sites are located at the western side of Po Shek Wu Road, to the northwest of the centre of Sheung Shui New Town, and about 600m from the Sheung Shui MTR Station with East Rail Line lies between Sites 1 and 2 along San Wan Road. The surrounding areas have the following characteristics (**Plans A-2 and A-3**):

- (a) to the east and southeast is the existing/planned residential developments including Po Shek Wu Estate with BH of up to +114mPD, Choi Po Court with BH of +104mPD and planned public housing development at Po Shek Wu Road with maximum BH of +130mPD;
- (b) to the immediate south is Shek Sheung River, to the further south is an existing recognized village known as Tai Tau Leng; and
- (c) to the northwest is a temporary public car park and existing industrial buildings including Alpha Appliances Building, Jumbo Plaza, Advanced Technology Centre and Hi Tech Centre which are subjects of approved planning applications (Nos. A/FSS/208, 209, 234, 241 and 246) for proposed wholesale conversion for shop and services, eating place and office uses (**Plan A-2**); to the further north is a recognized village known as Sheung Shui Heung.

## **7 Planning Intention**

- 7.1 The “R(A)” zone is intended primarily for high-density residential developments. Commercial uses are always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building. The “R(A)4” zones in Sheung Shui Areas 4 and 30 are intended for public housing development.
- 7.2 According to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, minor relaxation of the GFA/PR/BH restrictions for the “R(A)” sub-zones may be considered by the Board on application under s.16 of the Ordinance. Each application for minor relaxation of GFA/PR/BH restrictions will be considered on its own merits.

## **8 Comments from Relevant Government Departments**

- 8.1 The following Government departments have been consulted on the application and the public comments received, and their views are summarized as follows:

### **Land Administration**

- 8.1.1 Comments of the District Lands Office/North, Lands Department (DLO/N, LandsD):
  - (a) the sites are held under short term tenancy and under possession of the applicant for construction of public housing development purposes. His office has no comment on the proposed minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions for the Sites from land administrative perspective; and
  - (b) if the Board approves the application, the planning brief of the public housing development may need to be updated if necessary and as appropriate.

### **Urban Design and Landscape**

- 8.1.2 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape,

Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD):

Urban Design and Visual

- (a) the Sites are surrounded by industrial area (maximum BH up to +32.6mPD) to the northwest and north; existing residential developments including Po Shek Wu Estate (maximum BH up to +114mPD), Choi Po Court (maximum BH up to +104mPD) and planned PRH development at Po Shek Wu Road (subject to maximum BH of +130mPD) to the east and southeast; and village type development of 1 to 3 storeys to the further south and north; and
- (b) with reference to the proposed scheme provided by the applicant, the proposed minor relaxation of maximum PR and BH restrictions would enable the development of six residential blocks of 40 to 47 storeys (up to +149mPD). As illustrated in the submitted photomontages (**Drawing A-9 to A-14**) and visual appraisal (**Appendix Ia**), there will be an increase in building bulk which will slightly block the sky view and reduce visual openness from some selected viewpoints. With incorporation of visual mitigation measures such as BH variations, 15m building separation, vertical greening, etc., the overall visual impact of proposed development is considered slightly adverse as rated by the applicant. Given the surrounding context, the proposed increase in PR and BH is considered generally not incompatible in development scale and height with the neighbouring developments.

Air Ventilation

- (c) he has no comment on the FI (**Appendix Ib**) from the air ventilation perspective.

Landscape

- (d) he has no objection in principle to the application from the landscape planning perspective;
- (e) with reference to the aerial photo (**Plan A-3**), the sites are located in an area of industrial urban landscape character with industrial area, village houses, green belt, existing and planned medium to high-rise residential developments and government/institution or community facilities in the vicinity. The proposed development is not incompatible with the landscape character of the surrounding area; and
- (f) significant adverse landscape impact caused by the proposed development is not anticipated and adequate landscape provisions are proposed to mitigate the landscape impact and improve the landscape quality of the development, he has no objection in principle to the application from landscape planning perspective.

8.1.3 Comments of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD):



- (a) it is noted that the proposed public housing development mainly consist of 6 residential blocks with BH of +129mPD to +149mPD which may not be incompatible with adjacent public housing development at Po Shek Wu Road with BH restrictions of +130mPD;
- (b) 20% greenery within the Sites shall be provided in accordance with PNAP APP-152; and
- (c) for proposed social welfare/community facilities, it is recommended to provide an elderly friendly environment including barrier-free access/facilities.

### **Environment**

#### 8.1.4 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) he has no objection to the application;
- (b) considering that there are practicable noise mitigation measures demonstrated in the EAS report (**Appendix Ia**) to address issues of exceedances in road traffic noise, fixed noise and rail noise, no insurmountable problem is anticipated;
- (c) the applicant is reminded to update the traffic and rail noise assessment for his review when detailed layout plans for other non-domestic facilities, e.g. ancillary facility block, residential care homes for the elderly, integrated vocational rehabilitation services centre, hostel for moderately handicapped persons, kindergarten, estate management office, etc. becomes available at later stage;
- (d) according the prevailing practice for the vetting of environmental aspects of public housing schemes; he trusts that the applicant will submit the required EAS, including the noise impact assessment (NIA) for his agreement in due course. Therefore, he considers approval condition on the submission of NIA and implementation of mitigation measures identified is not required under this s.16 planning application; and
- (e) he has no further comment on the SIA (**Appendices Ia and Ic**).

### **Social Welfare**

#### 8.1.5 Comments of the Director of Social Welfare (DSW):

given that the proposed welfare facilities have been duly included in the proposed public housing development in the application, he has no comment on the proposed minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions from the welfare point of view.

### **Education**

#### 8.1.6 Comments of the Secretary for Education (Secy for Education):

- (a) he has no objection to the application; and
- (b) detailed comments are at **Appendix III**.

### **Fire Safety**

#### 8.1.7 Comments of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS):

- (a) he has no objection in principle to the application subject to water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations being provided to the satisfaction of D of FS;
- (b) detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans; and
- (c) the EVA provision in the Sites shall comply with the standard as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 under the Building (Planning) Regulation 41D which is administrated by the Buildings Department.

### **District Officer's Comments**

#### 8.1.8 Comments of the District Officer/North, Home Affairs Department (DO(N), HAD):

- (a) the locals have been consulted from 12.4.2021 to 3.5.2021;
- (b) two out of three Indigenous Inhabitant Representatives (IIRs) of Tsung Pak Long and the President of Shek Wu Hui Merchants Association Limited supported the application; and
- (c) the Owner's Corporation Chairman of Yuk Po Court, the President of Hong Kong Industrial and Commercial Association (North), the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee, the IIRs and Resident Representative (RR) of Sheung Shui Heung, the remaining IIR and RR of Tsung Pak Long, the RR and IIRs of Tai Tau Leng had no comment.

#### 8.2 The following departments have no comment or no objection to the application:

- (a) Commissioner for Transport (C for T);
- (b) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department (CHE/NTE, HyD);
- (c) Chief Engineer/Railway Development 2-2, Railway Development Office, Highways Department (CE/RD 2-2, RDO, HyD);
- (d) Commissioner of Police (C of P);
- (e) Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD);
- (f) Chief Engineer/ Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD);
- (g) Project Manager/North, Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM/N, CEDD); and
- (h) Chief Building Surveyor, New Territories East, Buildings Department

(CBS/NTE, BD).

## **9 Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period**

- 9.1 On 12.3.2021, the application was published for public inspection. During the 3-week statutory publication periods, four comments were received (**Appendix IV**). Among the four public comments, two comments made by MTR Corporation Limited and an individual provide views on the application, one comment from an individual objects the application and one indicates no comment on the application.
- 9.2 The major grounds of the objection are that there is no detail on the proposed community facilities or the layout and disposition of the open space, and any adverse impact of the increase in height and bulk on the neighbourhood.
- 9.3 The views and comments on the application are summarized as follows:
- (a) the applicant is recommended to obtain the latest information of the rail turnouts with due consideration and address the noise issues, and conduct noise measurement to collect more updated and specific on-site noise source data for the noise assessment. Should the Board approve the application, approval conditions for submission of revised noise assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures should be imposed; and
  - (b) the area of PTI should be increased and some bus routes are proposed to reduce the traffic flow at Sheung Shui Bus Terminus and So Kwun Po Interchange;

## **10 Planning Considerations and Assessment**

- 10.1 The application is for minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions of the Sites, which fall within an area zoned “R(A)4” on the OZP, from 6.6 to 7.1 (+0.5/+7.6%) and from +130mPD to +144mPD (+14m/+10.8%) (for Site 1) and +149mPD (+19m/+14.6%) (for Site 2) respectively for the permitted public housing development.

### *Minor Relaxation of PR Restriction*

- 10.2 The proposed minor relaxation of PR is in line with the Government’s policy of enhancing the development intensity of public housing sites to increase housing supply where their technical feasibility permits. According to the applicant, the proposed minor relaxation of PR would provide additional 292 (+8.7%) public housing flats to meet the pressing demand for public housing units. C for T has no objection to the application from traffic engineering perspective. Other relevant departments including CHE/NTE, HyD, DEP, CE/MN, DSD, CE/C, WSD and D of FS have no comment or no objection to the application. It is anticipated that the proposed minor relaxation of PR would not result in adverse traffic, environmental, drainage and sewerage impacts.
- 10.3 Given that the proposed PR increase is minor in nature (+7.6%), the overall planned provision of the community facilities and open space will be adequate to serve the need of the design population. In this regard, DSW, Secy for Education, CTP/UD&L, PlanD and DO(N), HAD have no adverse comment on the community facilities and

open space provision for the proposed public housing development.

#### *Minor Relaxation of BH Restriction*

- 10.4 The Sites are located to the northwest of the centre of Sheung Shui New Town where high-rise public housing developments can be found in the vicinity, i.e. the existing developments of Po Shek Wu Estate (+114mPD) and Choi Po Court (+104mPD) and the planned public housing development at Po Shek Wu Road (+130mPD), which are zoned “R(A)1”, “R(A)” and “R(A)5” respectively (**Plan A-2**). BH variations are proposed in both Sites 1 and 2 to echo with the BH profile of the surrounding area. The proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction from 130mPD to 144mPD (+14m/+10.8%) for Site 1 and 149mPD (+19m/+14.6%) for Site 2 will keep the BH profile and will not result in substantial change to the character of the locality and is considered not incompatible with the surrounding area.
- 10.5 The additional domestic GFA due to the proposed minor relaxation of PR would mainly be distributed in Blocks 2 and 3 at Site 1 (hence, BH would increase from +130mPD to +144mPD and +142mPD respectively) and Blocks 1 and 2 in Site 2 (BH would increase from +130mPD to +143mPD and +149mPD respectively) which have struck the balance between maintaining the BH profile and the time and cost implication in constructing refuge floor due to the accommodation of additional GFA. The VA submitted by the applicant has concluded that the proposal will only result in slight visual impact and would unlikely cause any significant adverse visual impact. Moreover, according to the AVA IS submitted by applicant, with the wind enhancement measures adopted, including wider building separations and more permeable podium, it is expected that the proposal will achieve a slightly better pedestrian wind environment. In this regards, CTP/UD&L, PlanD and CA/CMD2, ArchSD have no adverse comment on the application from urban design, visual and air ventilation perspectives.

#### *Similar Applications*

- 10.6 There are two similar applications (Nos. A/FSS/223 and A/FSS/236) for minor relaxation of GFA and BH under “R(A)2” and “R(A)1” zones respectively on the same OZP. The applications were approved with conditions by the Committee on 12.9.2014 and 7.8.2015 respectively mainly on grounds as stated in paragraph 5. Approving the current application is in line with the Committee’s previous decisions.

#### *Local Views and Public Comments*

- 10.7 Regarding the local views conveyed by DO(N), HAD and public comments as stated in paragraphs 8.1.8 and 9, the departmental comments and planning assessments as mentioned in the above paragraphs are relevant.

### **11 Planning Department’s Views**

- 11.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 and having taken into account the local views and public comment in paragraphs 8.1.8 and 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 14.5.2025, 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 condition of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members' reference:

Approval condition

- (a) the provision of water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations 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 V**.

- 11.3 There is no strong reason to recommend rejection of the application.

## **12 Decision Sought**

- 12.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant the 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 received by the Town Planning Board on 25.3.2021
<b>Appendix Ia</b>	Supporting planning statement
<b>Appendix Ib</b>	FI received on 27.4.2021
<b>Appendix Ic</b>	FI received on 6.5.2021
<b>Appendix II</b>	Similar applications
<b>Appendix III</b>	Detailed departmental comments
<b>Appendix IIIa</b>	Information of schedule of accommodation for kindergartens
<b>Appendix IV</b>	Public comments received during the statutory publication period
<b>Appendix V</b>	Advisory clauses
<b>Drawing A-1</b>	Comparison of the layout of the current scheme and proposed scheme for Site 1
<b>Drawing A-2</b>	Layout plan for Site 1

<b>Drawing A-3</b>	Section plan for Site 1
<b>Drawing A-4</b>	Landscape Master Plan (LMP) for Site 1
<b>Drawing A-5</b>	Comparison of the layout of the current scheme and proposed scheme for Site 2
<b>Drawing A-6</b>	Layout plan for Site 2
<b>Drawing A-7</b>	Section plan for Site 2
<b>Drawing A-8</b>	LMP for Site 2
<b>Drawings A-9 to A-14</b>	Photomontages
<b>Plan A-1</b>	Location Plan
<b>Plan A-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plan A-3</b>	Aerial Photo
<b>Plan A-4</b>	Site Photos

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
MAY 2021**