

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

**APPLICATION NO. A/YL-MP/344**

- Applicant** : Profit Point Enterprises Limited represented by Masterplan Limited
- Site** : Lots 50 S.A and 77 in D.D. 101, Wo Shang Wai, Mai Po, Yuen Long
- Site Area** : About 207,408m<sup>2</sup>
- Lease** : Lot 50 S.A – Block Government Lease as modified for maintenance and  
management as restored wetland area  
Lot 77 – New Grant No. 22875 for private residential purpose
- Plan** : Approved Mai Po and Fairview Park Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-  
MP/6
- Zoning** : “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include  
Wetland Restoration Area” (“OU(CDWRA)”)   
  
[maximum plot ratio (PR) of 0.4 and maximum building height (BH) of 6  
storeys including car park]
- Application** : Proposed Comprehensive House and Wetland Habitat Development with  
Filling and Excavation of Land (Amendments to an Approved Scheme)

**1. Proposal**

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission to amend an approved scheme for a proposed comprehensive house and wetland habitat development with filling and excavation of land at the application site (the Site) which falls within an area zoned “OU(CDWRA)” on the approved Mai Po and Fairview Park OZP (**Plan A-1**). According to the Notes for “OU(CDWRA)” zone of the OZP, ‘House’, ‘Wetland Habitat’ and filling and excavation of land require planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). The proposed amendments involve revision mainly on the layout for the residential portion of the previously approved scheme under application No. A/YL-MP/229, with increase in the number of houses and reduction in average house size; increase in the BH and car parking spaces; and changes to the use of a permanent (instead of an interim) sewerage treatment plant (STP). Other major development parameters, including PR, gross floor area (GFA), site coverage, wetland restoration area (WRA), as well as the extent of filling and excavation of land, remain unchanged.
- 1.2 The Site is the subject of four previously approved Applications No. A/YL-MP/166, 185, 229 and 291 submitted by the current applicant for the same uses but of varied

schemes. All applications were approved with conditions by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board between 2008 and 2020. The approved scheme under Application No. A/YL-MP/229 has been commenced in 2016 with general building plan (GBP) approved. According to the applicant, the wetland habitat at the WRA in the northern part has been completed while the site formation works for the residential portion in the southern part are in progress (**Plans A-3a to A-3d**). A comparison of the major development parameters of the approved scheme under application No. A/YL-MP/229 with the current amendment scheme is tabulated below:

| Major Development Parameters                       | Approved Scheme (No. A/YL-MP/229) (A)                 | Current Amendment Scheme (No. A/YL-MP/334) (B)        | Difference                      |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------|
|  |   |   | (B) – (A)                       |
| <b>Gross Site Area (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>             | 207,408 (about)                                       | 207,408 (about)                                       | No change                       |
| <b>Residential (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>                 | 160,008 (77.15%)                                      | 160,008 (77.15%)                                      |                                 |
| <b>- WRA (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>                       | 47,400 (22.85%)                                       | 47,400 (22.85%)                                       |                                 |
| <b>Plot Ratio (PR)</b>                             |   |   | No change                       |
| <b>- Gross site</b>                                | 0.4   | 0.4   |                                 |
| <b>- Net site (excl. WRA)</b>                      | 0.52  | 0.52  |                                 |
| <b>Maximum Domestic GFA (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>        | 82,963.2  | 82,963.2  | No change                       |
| <b>Site Coverage (%)</b>                           | 25  | 25  | No change                       |
| <b>Extent of Excavation</b>                        | 69,204m <sup>2</sup> in area and 1 to 2.9m in depth   | 69,204m <sup>2</sup> in area and 1 to 2.9m in depth   | No change                       |
| <b>Extent of Filling</b>                           | 90,804m <sup>2</sup> in area and 4 to 5.2m in depth   | 90,804m <sup>2</sup> in area and 4 to 5.2m in depth   | No change                       |
| <b>Number of Houses</b>                            | 400   | 789   | +389 (+97.3%)                   |
| <b>Number of Storeys</b>                           | 2 to 3 storeys above ground                           | 2 to 3 storeys above ground                           | No change                       |
| <b>BH</b>  | (7.8m to 11.3m/ 15.6mPD to 19.1mPD)                   | (9m to 13.5m/ 16.8mPD to 21.3mPD)                     | +1.2m to 2.2m (+15.4% to 19.5%) |
| <b>Average House Size (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>          | 207.4   | 105.2   | -102.2 (-49.3%)                 |
| <b>House Size Mix</b>                              | 2-storey houses: 248<br>3-storey houses: 152          | 2-storey houses: 749<br>3-storey houses: 40           | ---                             |
| <b>Estimated Population</b>                        | 1,200   | 2,210   | +1,010 (+84.2%)                 |
| <b>Clubhouse Floor Area (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>        | 3,000 (3.6% of domestic GFA)                          | 3,000 (3.6% of domestic GFA)                          | No change                       |
| <b>Clubhouse BH</b>                                | 3 storeys (including basement) (17mPD)                | 3 storeys (including basement) (17mPD)                | No change                       |
| <b>Communal Landscape/ Greenery and Open Space</b> | 24,022 (including 13,066m <sup>2</sup> of open space) | 31,763 (including 12,221m <sup>2</sup> of open space) | +7,741 (+32.2%)                 |
| <b>Private Garden (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>              | 60,697  | 49,827  | -10,870 (-17.9%)                |

| Major Development Parameters                  | Approved Scheme (No. A/YL-MP/229) (A) | Current Amendment Scheme (No. A/YL-MP/334) (B) | Difference                |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
|   |                                       |  | (B) – (A)                 |
| <b>No. of Car Parking Spaces</b>              | 835                                   | 1,583  | +748<br>(+89.6%)          |
| - Residents                                   | 829                                   | 1,578  | +749<br>(+90.3%)          |
| - Visitor                                     | 6 (including 1 for the disabled)      | 5 (including 1 for the disabled)               | -1<br>(-16.7%)            |
| <b>No. of Motorcycle Parking Spaces</b>       | 42                                    | 37   | -5<br>(-11.9%)            |
| <b>Loading/Unloading (L/UL) Bay</b>           | 1                                     | 1  | No change                 |
| <b>Mean Site Formation Level</b>              | 6.8mPD                                | 6.8mPD   | No change                 |
| <b>On-site STP</b>                            | 1 (interim)                           | 1 (permanent)                                  | From interim to permanent |
| <b>Anticipated completion year and phases</b> | By 2025 in 4 phases                   | By 2028 in 4 phases                            | N/A                       |

1.3 The major amendments proposed in the current application are as follows:

- (a) revised house size mix with increase in the number of houses from 400 to 789, reduction in average house size (GFA) from 207.4m<sup>2</sup> to 105.2m<sup>2</sup> and increase in number of car parking spaces from 835 to 1,583;
- (b) increase in BH from a range of 7.8m to 11.3m (15.6mPD to 19.1mPD) to 9m to 13.5m (16.8mPD to 21.3mPD) due to increase in Floor-to-Floor-Height (FTFH) from 3.5m to 4.5m up to a permitted 4.5m based on current building standards;
- (c) relocation of clubhouse buildings to suit the revised housing sites and internal road layout with BH of the clubhouse buildings remain unchanged;
- (d) revised landscape design with provision of a large open space at the centre of the Site and pockets of landscaped open space at various locations, and adjustment to the visual corridors. The total area of communal landscape and open space would be increased from 24,022m<sup>2</sup> (including 13,066m<sup>2</sup> of open space) to 31,763m<sup>2</sup> (including 12,221m<sup>2</sup> of open space), while the area of private garden would be decreased from 60,697m<sup>2</sup> to 49,827m<sup>2</sup>. The area of WRA remains the same at 47,400 m<sup>2</sup>;
- (e) change of the on-site STP from an interim measure to a permanent facility, and removal of the proposed noise barrier at the site entrance based on updated technical assessments; and
- (f) change in the anticipated completion year from 2025 to 2028.

1.4 The Master Layout Plan (MLP), basement plan, phasing plan, communal

landscape/open space plans/sections, house floor plans/sections and Landscape Master Plan (LMP) are at **Drawings A-1 to A-9b**. The applicant has submitted Environment Assessment (EA), Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA), Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA), Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), and Landscape Master Plan (LMP) with Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal (TPRP) in support of the current application.

#### Environment and Ecology

- 1.5 According to the applicant, the current amendment submission would not result in adverse air quality impact with all facilities designed in accordance with relevant standards and guidelines. On the noise impact, the revised EA demonstrated that with the implementation of noise mitigation measures, including noise reduction design at source; adoption of acoustic windows at the affected façades of relevant houses; and 5.5m-high noise barrier integrated with E&M building (**Drawing A-11**), the proposed development would not be subject to adverse noise impact from the noise sources nearby. Besides, as the E&M buildings and STP of the proposed development are small in scale and entirely enclosed and confined, no adverse noise impact will be anticipated.
- 1.6 On the ecological aspect, the wetland habitat at the WRA under the approved scheme has been completed, and no change is proposed under the current amendment submission. The WRA will continue to serve its ecological function and act as a buffer between the residential development and the fishponds in Deep Bay area (**Drawings A-6a and A-6c**). While there is an increase in the number of houses and a slight increase in BH which may result in high visibility of human activities at the Site boundary and within the WRA, no significant adverse ecological impact is anticipated with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures including setback of the two-storey houses adjacent to the WRA to offset the disturbance to the wetland habitat and the use of a 2m high solid wall with buffer tree/shrub planting between the WRA and the residential portion of the Site. The BH of detached houses abutting the WRA will be reduced from 3 storeys (11.3m) to 2 storeys (9m). (**Drawing A-5b**) In addition, a 3m-high site hoarding will be placed between the WRA and the residential portion of the Site during the construction period and good site practices will be adopted to reduce disturbance. The EcoIA demonstrated that no additional adverse impact to the ecological function of the WRA is anticipated and the WRA will continue to serve as a buffer between the proposed residential development and the fishponds in the Deep Bay area.

#### Long-term Maintenance and Management of the Wetland Restoration Area

- 1.7 The applicant confirms that there will be no change to the Maintenance and Management Plan (MMP) approved in 2015 for the approved scheme, and the MMP would still be compiled with for the current amendment submission. Based on the approved MMP, the applicant would take up the long-term maintenance and management of the WRA in accordance with the funding agreement with the Environment and Conservation Fund (ECF) signed on 26.1.2021. The conservation agent has been carrying out the MMP and the funding agreement is continued to be fully applicable to the current amendment submission.

### Water Quality, Sewerage and Drainage

- 1.8 With a change in circumstances, there is no plan for construction of the Ngau Tam Mei trunk sewer. In this regard, as opposed to the provision of the on-site STP as an interim operation arrangement in the approved scheme, the proposed tertiary STP in the current amendment scheme will be constructed as a long-term on-site sewage treatment facility to treat the sewage from the Site and reuse the treated water for local flushing and irrigation. The applicant will be responsible for the maintenance of all sewers and on-site sewage treatment facility. The SIA demonstrates that as all sewage generated from the proposed development will be fully reused on-site, it will not cause any net increase in pollution flow and load to Deep Bay area; therefore, no adverse sewerage and water quality impacts will be incurred as a result of the proposed development.
- 1.9 On the drainage aspect, similar to the previously approved scheme, the surface runoff from the catchment within the Site will be drained via the drainage system of the proposed development (**Drawing A-10**). As such, no adverse drainage impact arising from the proposed development to the surrounding area is anticipated. Besides, drainage system of the WRA is independent from that of the residential portion of the Site. No runoff generated from the residential portion of the Site will be discharged to the WRA or vice versa even during severe rainstorm event.

### Traffic and Transport

- 1.10 Same as the previously approved scheme, the Site is accessible from Castle Peak Road – Mai Po via an access road. Car parking spaces and L/UL bays are provided at the basement of the proposed development (**Drawing A-2**) in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and conditions of the approved Lands Exchange application. Compared with the approved scheme, the proposed scheme under the current amendment submission will have greater trip generation due to increase in number of car parking spaces. The existing junction at Castle Peak Road – San Tin/Shek Wu Wai Road is proposed to be upgraded to a roundabout junction (**Drawing A-12**) by the applicant. If the improvement works at the junction at Fairview Park Interchange is not completed by other parties, the applicant will take up the junction improvement works, if necessary. Taking into account the proposed junction improvement works to be implemented by the applicant and other planned road improvement works in the vicinity, the TIA demonstrates that the proposed development will not cause significant traffic impact on the road network.

### Landscape and Visual

- 1.11 The LMP of the previously approved scheme has been updated according to the revised layout proposed under the current amendment submission. Similar to the previously approved scheme, the proposed development will setback from the roads to maximise the provision of landscaping. Landscape elements including street tree planting, buffer planting and communal greenery with feature paving, landscape garden, open lawn at various locations will be provided in the proposed development (**Drawings A-6a to A-6b**). The greenery area accounts for no less than 30% of the Site. According to the TPRP, among the 203 existing trees located within the residential portion of the Site, 187 trees are proposed to be felled and the remaining 16 trees would be transplanted to the southeastern periphery of the

residential portion of the Site. In addition, 1,200 new trees will be planted within the residential portion of the Site (**Drawings A-8a to A-8b**).

- 1.12 The intention of providing visual corridors through the Site has been respected in the proposed scheme under current amendment submission. The aggregate widths of the visual corridors have been increased as compared to the previously approved scheme. The alignment of the visual corridors has been adjusted to correspond to the revised open space, building sites and road alignment. The visual corridors will continue to provide vista to the WRA, communal open space and individual garden courtyards, and to enhance air ventilation and visual permeability across the Site (**Drawing A-7**).
- 1.13 To minimise potential visual impact on the adjacent areas and vice versa, a 3m wide landscape buffer is proposed at the perimeter of the Site same as the previously approved scheme. To avoid disturbance to the WRA, an approximately 5m wide buffer planting, i.e. 2.5m alongside the WRA and 2.5m within the residential portion of the Site, will be provided as per the previously approved scheme. (**Drawings A-5a and A-5b**)
- 1.14 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:
- |     |   |                        |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| (a) | Application Form received on 23.5.2023 and Supplementary Information received on 1.6.2023 | ( <b>Appendix I</b> )  |
| (b) | Planning Statement  | ( <b>Appendix Ia</b> ) |
| (c) | Further Information (FI) dated 21.8.2023*   | ( <b>Appendix Ib</b> ) |
| (d) | FI dated 27.9.2023 and 29.9.2023*   | ( <b>Appendix Ic</b> ) |
| (e) | FI dated 15.11.2023*  | ( <b>Appendix Id</b> ) |
| (f) | FI dated 19.1.2024*   | ( <b>Appendix Ie</b> ) |
| (g) | FI dated 9.2.2024   | ( <b>Appendix If</b> ) |
- [\* not exempted from publication requirement]*
- 1.15 On 14.7.2023, the Committee agreed to defer a decision on the application for a period of two months, as requested by the applicant's representative, to allow more time to prepare FI in support of the application.

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

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed in the Planning Statement and FI at **Appendices Ia to If**. They can be summarised as follows: -

- (a) The proposed development is in line with the planning intention of the "OU(CDWRA)" zone. The proposed development parameters are comparable to the previously approved scheme (No. A/YL-MP/229) by maintaining the same PR, GFA and SC while improving communal landscape/greenery and open space provision. The scheme under the current amendment submission with revised layout, house types and BH/FTFH aims to respond to the housing market situation to increase housing supply and current building standards. It is also in line with the Northern Metropolis Development Strategy in attracting innovation and technology professionals to this area which is near to the future San Tin Technopole.

- (b) The scheme under the current amendment submission embodies enhanced amenity for future residents. A main communal open space has been designed and integrated with the previously adopted tree-lined pedestrian pathways networks. Future residents will enjoy healthy lifestyle and social opportunities. The relocation of the communal clubhouses will maximise the residents' appreciation and educational opportunity to the natural environment, while preventing visual and noise disturbance to the WRA.
- (c) Same as the previously approved scheme (No. A/YL-MP/229), the scheme under the current amendment submission respects the natural and built neighbourhood. With appropriate boundary treatment, the proposed development will not have adverse impact on the visual amenity, noise and air quality. There is no change to the WRA which has been completed in 2010 and under management for conservation purpose. The proposed development will not result in adverse impact to the Deep Bay area and is consistent with the Town Planning Board Guidelines (TPB-PG) No. 12C. There will be no change to the MMP approved in 2015 and the applicant has taken up the long-term maintenance and management of the WRA in accordance with the funding agreement with the ECF in 2021. The funding agreement is fully applicable to the current amendment submission.
- (d) Technical assessments in support of the application confirm that there will not be adverse impacts arising from the proposed development. There will be adequate infrastructural capacity to serve the proposed development, including road network, carpark, drainage and sewerage facilities with mitigation measures proposed. The applicant also commits to implement the proposed junction improvement works for specific junctions as recommended in the TIA.
- (e) In response to the public comments, the applicant stated that the Hong Kong China Gas Company Limited (HKCGCL) will be consulted in the design and construction stages of the proposed development concerning the high-pressure gas pipeline at San Tin Highway in the vicinity of the Site; the conservation agent of the applicant has been carrying out the long-term maintenance and management of the WRA in agreement with ECF; the completed WRA will not be affected by the proposed development; and the requirements of TPB-PG No. 12C will continue to be met.

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

The applicant is the sole “current land owner” of the Site. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection.

### **4. Town Planning Board Guidelines**

Town Planning Board Guidelines for “Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area” (TPB PG-No. 12C) are relevant to this application. The Site falls within the Wetland Buffer Area (WBA) of Deep Bay Area under TPB PG-No. 12C and relevant extract of the Guidelines is at **Appendix II**.

### **5. Background**

- 5.1 The Site fell within an “Unspecified Use” area on the draft Mai Po and Fairview Park Interim Development Permission Area (IDPA) Plan No. IDPA/YL-MP/1

gazetted on 17.8.1990. In the southern part was largely a piece of vacant formed land with a pond, while an open storage yard for trailers was in the northeast. The Site was then zoned “Conservation Area” (“CA”) on the draft Mai Po and Fairview Park Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-MP/1 gazetted on 3.6.1994. An aerial photo taken at that period showed that the Site was largely a piece of vacant formed land with vegetation and an open storage yard for trailers remained at the northeast. During the plan exhibition period, there was an objection against the “CA” zoning for the Site as the objector’s future development plan thereon would be jeopardised by the “CA” zoning. The objector proposed to rezone the site from “CA” to “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”). After giving preliminary consideration to the objection and taking into account the findings of the Fish Pond Study completed in 1997, which recommended to preserve all contiguous fish ponds, the Board in 1999 decided to propose amendments to the draft OZP to partially meet the objection by rezoning portion of the objection site and its adjoining area from “CA” to “OU(CDWRA)” zone to allow an appropriate level of residential/recreation development in order to provide incentive for the removal of the existing open storage and container related uses and encourage the restoration of wetland then existed in the area. The draft Mai Po and Fairview Park OZP (and re-numbered as S/YL-MP/2) was approved on 18.5.2001 and the subject “OU (CDWRA)” zone has remained unchanged since then.

- 5.2 At the time when the first application covering the Site (Application No. A/YL-MP/166) was approved (i.e. September 2008), the Site was mostly vacant with the northeastern portion being occupied by open storage of new tractors/coaches/vehicle parts and converted containers. According to the then submitted EcoIA supporting that application, the Site comprised grassland, seasonal marsh, freshwater marsh/reedbed (considered as low to moderate significance) and there was no pond within the Site. The WRA proposed in that application was subsequently imposed as an approval condition.
- 5.3 Following approval of application No. A/YL-MP/166, the WRA at the northern part of the Site was completed in 2010. The MMP submitted for compliance of approval condition regarding submission of MMP under application No. A/YL-MP/229 was approved in 2015. Based on the approved MMP which set out details of maintenance and management of the WRA, funding agreement with the ECF on the long-term maintenance and management of the WRA was signed on 26.1.2021.
- 5.4 The Site is not a subject of active planning enforcement action.

## **6. Previous Applications**

- 6.1 The Site is the subject of four previous planning applications submitted by the current applicant for the same use with WRA but with varied schemes approved with conditions by the Committee between 2008 and 2020.
- 6.2 Application No. A/YL-MP/166 was approved with conditions on 19.9.2008 mainly on the considerations that the proposed development was in line with the planning intention of “OU(CDWRA)” zone and the BH restriction; concerned departments had no objection to the application; the applicant undertook the long-term management responsibility of the wetland; and there was no fundamental interface problem with the Express Rail Link (XRL) project. The planning permission



eventually lapsed on 19.9.2012.

- 6.3 Application No. A/YL-MP/185, involving amendments to the previously approved application No. A/YL-MP/166, was approved with conditions on 21.10.2011 mainly on the considerations that the WRA under the previously approved scheme had already been implemented; the proposed development would not worsen than the previous approved scheme; and the proposed development was in line with TPB PG-No. 12B. Subsequently, application No. A/YL-MP/185-1 mainly relating to minor change in disposition of houses and BH of clubhouses was approved with conditions by the Director of Planning under the delegated authority of the Board on 19.7.2012. The permissions under both applications No. A/YL-MP/185 and 185-1 eventually lapsed on 21.10.2015.
- 6.4 Application No. A/YL-MP/229 was approved with conditions on 27.2.2015. The application involved amendments to the previously approved scheme under application No. A/YL-MP/185 and mainly included increase in number of houses and decrease in average house size. The application was approved mainly on the considerations that the proposed development was in line with the planning intention of “OU(CDWRA)” zone; and there was no change in PR and SC. Approval conditions on the interface arrangement for XRL project, submission of revised LMP, revised DIA, revised SIA and maintenance and management plan for the WRA, design and provision of improvement measures at junction of Palm Springs Boulevard and Castle Peak Road – Mai Po, as well as design of parking and L/UL facilities, access connection between the development and the public road and visual mitigation measures of the noise barriers had already been complied with. The corresponding building plan was then approved on 6.5.2016 and the proposed development is regarded as commenced. According to the applicant, the current application is an amendment to the approved scheme under application No. A/YL-MP/229.
- 6.5 Application No. A/YL-MP/291 was approved with conditions on 10.7.2020. The application involved amendments to the previously approved scheme under application No. A/YL-MP/229 and mainly included revision to the approved residential layout, number of houses, car parking spaces, house size mix and BH. The application was approved mainly on the considerations that the proposed development was in line with the planning intention of “OU(CDWRA)” zone; and there was no change in PR, GFA and SC as well as the WRA was already completed. The submission part of the approval conditions on revised LMP, revised DIA, revised SIA, design of vehicular access, car parking and L/UL facilities and access connection had already been complied with. Nonetheless, the applicant has yet to implement/provide the various facilities under the aforesaid conditions. The planning permission is valid until 10.7.2024.
- 6.6 Details of these previous applications are summarised at **Appendix III** and their locations are shown on **Plan A-1**.

## **7. Similar Application**

There is no similar application within the same “OU(CDWRA)” zone.

**8. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1 to A-4b)**

**8.1 The Site:**

- (a) falls within the WBA of the Deep Bay area;
- (b) is accessible via Mai Po South Road off Castle Peak Road – Mai Po; and
- (c) is largely vacant and partly covered with wild grass and partly paved. The completed WRA is in the northern part of the Site.

8.2 The surrounding areas are predominated by low-rise, low density residential dwellings (such as Palm Springs and Royal Palms) and village settlement (such as Mai Po San Tsuen and Mai Po Lo Wai), as well as fish ponds extending to the Mai Po Nature Reserve. Existing infrastructures in the vicinity include MTRC's Mai Po Ventilation Building for the XRL project, Castle Peak Road – Mai Po and San Tin Highway.

**9. Planning Intention**

9.1 The "OU(CDWRA)" zone is intended to provide incentive for the restoration of degraded wetlands adjoining existing fish ponds through comprehensive residential and/or recreational development to include WRA. It is also intended to phase out existing sporadic open storage and port back-up uses on degraded wetlands. Any new building should be located farthest away from Deep Bay.

9.2 To ensure that development and/or redevelopment would be developed in a comprehensive manner, an applicant should submit to the Board a development and/or redevelopment proposal in the form of a comprehensive development scheme to include a layout plan with supporting documents, including an environmental impact study which should include, inter alia, an EcoIA and a visual impact assessment; and traffic, drainage and sewerage impacts study reports as well as information on programming, phasing and implementation schedule of the development. The applicant should also submit a wetland restoration and/or creation scheme, including its detailed design, wetland buffer proposals to mitigate the potential impact on the nearby existing wetland, a maintenance and management plan with implementation details, arrangement of funding and monitoring programme to ensure the long-term management of the restored wetland. The EcoIA should demonstrate that any negative ecological impacts on the area could be fully mitigated through positive measures. The submission should demonstrate that the development and/or redevelopment would not cause a net increase of pollution load into Deep Bay.

9.3 To be in line with the rural setting which is mainly low-rise residential developments and village houses, to minimise visual impact and to take into account the capacities of local road network and infrastructure in this area, development and/or redevelopment shall not result in a total development or redevelopment intensity in excess of a total plot ratio of 0.4 and a maximum BH of 6 storeys including car park. Minor relaxation of these restrictions may be considered to provide flexibility for innovative design adapted to the characteristics of particular sites.

## **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, their advisory comments in the Recommended Advisory Clauses are provided in **Appendix IV**:

### **Land Administration**

10.1.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department (DLO/YL, LandsD):

- (a) The Site comprises two private lots namely Lots 50 S.A and 77 in D.D. 101. Lease modification for the WRA are at Lots 50 S.A in D.D. 101 and land exchange for private residential at Lot 77 in D.D. 101 based on the approved scheme under Application No. A/YL-MP/229 were both executed on 29.1.2021.
- (b) Lot 50 S.A in D.D. 101 is held under Block Government lease as modified by a Modification Letter dated 29.1.2021 which requires the Lessee to maintain and manage the lot in accordance with the Maintenance and Management Plan for conservation of the lot as restored wetland area in all respects to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC).
- (c) Lot 77 in D.D. 101 is held under New Grant No. 22875 dated 29.1.2021 which restricts the lot to the use of private residential purposes, a maximum GFA of 82,963m<sup>2</sup> and such parking, L/UL requirements in connection with the aforesaid permitted purposes.
- (d) According to the Supplementary Planning Statement (**Appendix Ia**), there is no change in the site area and maximum domestic GFA, and the proposed parking provisions are based on the lease requirements. Provided that the proposal would not result in exceeding the permitted GFA and parking provisions under lease, he has no comment from the land lease perspective.
- (e) The LMP and Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal should be subject to separate application to be submitted for prior approval before implementation of the development proposal.

### **Traffic**

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

- (a) She has no objection-in-principle to the application from traffic engineering point of view.
- (b) Should the application be approved, the following conditions should be incorporated:
  - (i) the design and provision of vehicular access, parking and loading/unloading facilities for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the C for T or of the Board;

- (ii) the design and provision of improvement measures at the junction of Castle Peak Road - San Tin and Shek Wu Wai Road before the occupation of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the C for T or of the Board; and
- (iii) the design and provision of improvement measures at the junction of Fairview Park Interchange, if deemed required by Transport Department, before the occupation of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the C for T or of the Board.

10.1.3 Comments of the Chief Highway Engineer, Highways Department (CHE/NTW, HyD):

- (a) HyD is not and shall not be responsible for the maintenance of any access connecting the Site and Castle Peak Road – Mai Po;
- (b) if any road improvements are considered necessary by TD due to the proposed development, they shall be implemented by the applicant to the satisfaction of TD and HyD at the applicant's own cost;
- (c) HyD shall not be responsible for the maintenance of any internal transport facilities within the Site; and
- (d) adequate drainage measures should be provided at the site access to prevent surface water flowing from the Site to nearby public roads or exclusive road drains.

**Environment**

10.1.4 Comments of the Secretary for the Environment and Ecology (S for EE):

Noting that the applicant confirms that there will be no change to the MMP approved in 2015 and the MMP would be compiled with for the current amendment submission, he has no adverse comment on the application.

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

- (a) He has no objection to the application from environmental planning perspective.
- (b) The applicant has submitted SIA (**Appendix Ia** and **Ib**) and EA (**Appendix Ie**) to support the application. The SIA and EA demonstrated that with implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed development would unlikely cause/subject to adverse environmental impacts exceeding the HKPSG's criteria. The key mitigation measures proposed in the SIA/EA are highlighted below:
  - (i) provision of an on-site tertiary STP (adopting Membrane Bioreactor technology) for sewage treatment and the reuse of treated effluent;
  - (ii) adequate setback distance stipulated in the HKPSG would be provided to ensure that there is no adverse air quality impact from vehicular emissions on the proposed development;

- (iii) the on-site STP will be properly designed (with inlet chamber and wet well will be located underground and enclosed with covers) and installed with de-odourization unit (with H<sub>2</sub>S removal efficiency of at least 99.5%) with a forced ventilation system to minimise odour impact from the STP; and
  - (iv) provision of noise mitigation measures (including acoustic windows and noise barrier integrated with E&M building).
- (c) Based on the above consideration, he has no objection to the application. To address possible changes on the proposed development and the required environmental mitigation measures during design stage, he makes reference to the approval conditions imposed under the last application (No. A/YL-MP/229) and suggests that the following approval conditions be imposed:
  - (i) the submission of a revised SIA to the satisfaction of the DEP or of the Board; and
  - (ii) the implementation of sewage disposal arrangement identified in the revised SIA including the on-site STP and the reuse of treated effluent, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the DEP or of the Board.
- (d) The applicant is advised to note the observations/comments on the revised EA at **Appendix IV** to ensure that the on-site STP of the development would be properly designed and implemented.
- (e) The proposed house development under application is covered by the Environmental Permit (EP-311/2008/E) issued under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO). The applicant should be advised to observe and ensure that the development in the current application will comply with all the statutory requirements under the EIAO.

### **Nature Conservation**

#### **10.1.6 Comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC):**

- (a) As compared with the previously approved planning application No. A/YL-MP/229, although the total number of houses would be increased in the current application, the houses abutting the WRA would change from 3-storeys to 2-storeys and it would also be further set back from the WRA. Subject to the implementation of the ecological mitigation measures recommended under the approved application No. A/YL-MP/229 including a 2m high solid wall with buffer planting between the residential portion and the WRA, he has no objection to the application from the nature conservation perspective as it is considered that the revised scheme would not result in additional wetland loss; and
- (b) Should the application be approved, the following approval condition

should be imposed:

the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the ecological impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the Town Planning Board.

### **Landscape**

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

- (a) According to aerial photo of 2022, the Site is located in a rural inland plains landscape character comprising vacant land, ponds, scattered tree groups and low-rise residential buildings within the “R(C)” zone to its south. The proposed development of two to three storey houses with BH not more than 13.5m is not incompatible with the surrounding landscape character.
- (b) With reference to the aerial photo of 2022, the WRA at the northern part of the Site is observed while the remaining areas are mostly vacant and covered with vegetation and tree groups. Based on the Tree Preservation Proposal, a tree survey was conducted in April 2023. A total of 203 existing trees of common and undesirable species are identified within the Site. 16 of the trees are proposed to be transplanted and the remaining 187 trees are proposed to be felled. No Old and Valuable Tree (OVT)/potential OVT/rare and precious species was identified. Loss of existing landscape resources arising from the proposed development is anticipated.
- (c) With reference to Section 5.2 of Appendix 7 – Landscape Master Plan and Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal and the LMP (Dwg. No. 2023202-LMP-01) (**Drawing A-6a**), new landscape treatment to mitigate the landscape impact, including planting of 1,200 new trees; 3m wide greening buffer zone along the perimeter; landscape garden, open lawn with seating, vertical green wall; and 5m wide buffer planting alongside the WRA are proposed. Not less than 30% greenery coverage will be provided and 12,221m<sup>2</sup> of communal open space is proposed and not less than 1m<sup>2</sup> of open space per person will be provided. Having considered the applicant’s submission including the FIs, she has no objection to the application from landscape planning perspective.
- (d) Should the application be approved by the Board, planning conditions for the submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Board should be included in the planning approval.

### **Visual**

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

- (a) The Site is set within an area characterised by low-rise, low-density residential developments up to three storeys. The proposed residential development comprises 789 houses of two to three storeys (excluding one storey of basement), with a PR of 0.4.
- (b) As compared with the previously approved scheme under Application No. A/YL-MP/229, the current amendment scheme maintains the same PR and does not affect the completed WRA. The BH (above ground) maintains up to three storeys above ground while the absolute BH is proposed to increase from 7.8m/11.3m to 9m/13.5m due to increase in FTFH. The number of houses is also increased from 400 to 789 due to smaller average unit size. According to the Planning Statement, the visual corridors and inherent design merits in the approved scheme have been retained in the current proposed scheme. It is noted that proposed PR and BH do not exceed the development restrictions as stipulated on the OZP. Judging from the scale of the proposed development, it is considered not incompatible with the surrounding context and no significant visual impact is anticipated.

### **Drainage**

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

- (a) He has no objection in principle to the proposed development from drainage operation and maintenance point of view.
- (b) After completion of the required drainage works, the applicant shall provide DSD for reference a set of record photographs showing the completed drainage works with corresponding photograph locations marked clearly on the approved drainage plan. DSD will inspect the completed drainage works jointly with the applicant with reference to the set of photographs.
- (c) His advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

### **Fire Safety**

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

- (a) He has no objection in principle to the application subject to the fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to his satisfaction.
- (b) Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans.
- (c) As no details of the emergency vehicular access (EVA) are provided in the application, the EVA provision in the Site 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 (B(P)R) 41D which is administered by the Buildings Department.

**Building**

10.1.11 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (CBS/NTW, BD):

- (a) Presumably the Site will abut on specified street(s) of not less than 4.5m wide and may be disregarded as a Class A site. Its permitted development intensity shall be determined under the First Schedule of the Building (Planning) Regulations) at the building plan submission stage.
- (b) Detailed checking under BO will be carried out at the building plan submission stage.
- (c) His advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

**Others**

10.1.12 Comments of Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS):

- (a) He has no particular comment on the application from electricity supply safety point of view.
- (b) It is noted a public comment is received from the HKCGCL requesting a Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) for the proposed development. Upon reviewing the QRA results of other proposed developments in the region received by DEMS, and the submitted MLP (**Drawing A-1**) which shows that buildings within the proposed development are locating over 150m away from the town gas high pressure pipeline, it is considered that QRA for assessing the potential risks associated with the pipeline for this proposed development is not a compulsory requirement from a town gas safety point of view.
- (c) In the interest of public safety and ensuring the continuity of electricity supply, the applicant/parties concerned with planning, designing, organising and supervising any activity near the underground cable or overhead line (OHL) under the subject application should approach the electricity supplier (i.e. CLP Power) for the requisition of cable plans (and OHL alignment drawings, where applicable) to find out whether there is any underground cable and/or OHL within and/or in the vicinity of the Site. The applicant should also be reminded to observe the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation and the “Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines” established under the Regulation when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.

10.2 The following Government departments have no objection to/no adverse comment on the application and their advisory comments, if any, are in **Appendix IV**:

- (a) Commissioner of Police;
- (b) Chief Engineer/Railway Development 2-2, Railway Development Office, Highways Department (CE/RD2-2, RDO, HyD):



- (c) Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department (CA/ASC, ArchSD);
- (d) Project Manager (West), CEDD (PM(W), CEDD);
- (e) Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD;
- (f) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (g) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene; and
- (h) District Officer (Yuen Long), Home Affairs Department.

## **11. Public Comments Received During the Statutory Publication Periods**

11.1 The application and FI were published for public comments on 6.6.2023. Subsequent FIs submitted by the applicant were published four times for public comments. During all relevant statutory publication periods, a total of 18 public comments were received, including 16 objecting comments and one comment providing views. Their major views are summarised as follows:

### **Objecting Comments (Appendix Va)**

11.2 17 objecting comments were submitted by from the San Tin Rural Committee, Village Representatives of Mai Po Tsuen, two green groups (viz. Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation and The Conservancy Association) and four individuals raising objection and concerns on the application as follows:

- (a) there is no justification for such significant increase in the housing units and car parking spaces as compared to the previous approved scheme under Application No. A/YL-MP/291 in view of the cramped layout in the current scheme and there is no merit in the landscape design;
- (b) the proposed scale of development is larger than the approved application (No. A/YL-MP/291) which would potentially induce adverse off-site disturbance impacts on the adjacent wetland in the Wetland Conservation Area, and thus the proposed development is not in line with the TPB PG-No. 12C and the planning intention of WBA;
- (c) the proposed development will adversely affect the wildlife habitat within the conservation area in Mai Po and cause nuisance to the local residents;
- (d) the area is facing development pressure from existing developments, on-going government projects and applications, the proposed development will pose cumulative impact to the already fragile Deep Bay ecosystem;
- (e) the proposed development with significant increase in the number of residential units, car parking provision and traffic trips in the area will further aggravate the traffic congestion problem at the nearby road network and affect pedestrian safety in the area. Recreation facilities in the area are not adequate; and
- (f) the long-term management of the wetland restoration area of the proposed development should be clarified.

Providing Views (Appendix Vb)

- 11.3 The remaining comment was submitted by the HKCGCL providing views that the proposed development is in close proximity to the high-pressure gas pipeline at San Tin Highway, a QRA should be undertaken to evaluate the potential risk and mitigation measures if required, and the applicant should consult HKCGCL at the design and construction stage of the proposed development.

**12. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

*Planning Intention and Land Use Compatibility*

- 12.1 The applicant seeks to amend an approved scheme (No. A/YL-MP/229) for proposed comprehensive house development and wetland habitat development with filling and excavation of land. The proposed development is for a residential development (about 16 ha or 77.15% of the Site) at the southern part of the Site with a PR of 0.4 and a BH of 2 to 3 storeys (i.e. 9m to 13.5m (16.8mPD to 21.3mPD)) on top of basement car park floor, an implemented WRA (about 4.7 ha or 22.85% of the Site) at the northern part of the Site, and filling (about 90,804m<sup>2</sup> in area and 4 to 5.2m in depth) and excavation (about 69,204m<sup>2</sup> in area and 1 to 2.9m in depth) of land.
- 12.2 Compared with the previously approved scheme (No. A/YL-MP/229), the proposed amendments are mainly for revision to the layout of the residential portion of the approved scheme, with the location and area of the implemented WRA remain unchanged and completed. The current proposal involves increase in the number of housing units (from 400 to 789), reduction in average house size (from 207.4m<sup>2</sup> to 105.2m<sup>2</sup>) and change in house size mix, and increase in proposed BH (15.6mPD/19.1mPD to 16.8mPD/21.3mPD) and FTFH (from 3.5-4.5m to 4.5m), change in internal layout with seven house types comprising detached, semi-detached and terraced houses, increase in overall communal landscape/greenery/open space provision (from 24,022m<sup>2</sup> to 31,763m<sup>2</sup>), and increase in parking provision (from 835 to 1,583). There is no change to the overall PR, GFA and SC of the proposed development. Taking into account the revised technical assessments submitted by the applicant and relevant government bureaux/departments' comments, the current amendment submission is considered technically acceptable. The proposed development is considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which are predominated by low-rise, low density residential dwellings/village settlement.
- 12.3 The proposed development is in line with the planning intention of the "OU(CDWRA)" zone which is intended to provide incentive for the restoration of degraded wetlands adjoining existing fish ponds through comprehensive residential and/or recreational development to include WRA. In fact, the WRA under the previously approved scheme had already been completed, and no change is proposed under the current amendment submission. Besides, developments within the "OU(CDWRA)" zone are restricted to a maximum PR of 0.4 and a maximum BH of 6 storeys including car park. The proposed development conforms to the PR and BH restrictions as stipulated in the Notes of the OZP.
- 12.4 According to the applicant, the increase in the number of houses by 389 houses (i.e. from 400 houses to 789 houses) and smaller house size (with an average house size

decreasing from 207.4m<sup>2</sup> to 105.2m<sup>2</sup>) and higher BH (adopting a maximum FTFH of 4.5m) is responding to the market situation to increase housing supply. Design features like visual corridors and inherent design merits in the previously approved scheme have been retained in the current amendment submission. CTP/UD&L, PlanD noted that the proposed development is not incompatible with the surrounding context and no significant visual impact is anticipated. From the landscape planning perspective, the proposed landscape treatment including planting of 1,200 new trees, 3m wide greening buffer zone along the perimeter, communal open space of 12,221m<sup>2</sup> including landscape garden, open lawn with seating and vertical green wall, and a 5m wide buffer planting alongside the WRA are proposed. As such, she has no objection to the application from visual impact and landscape design perspectives. Besides, CA/ASC, ArchSD has no comment on the application from architectural and visual impact perspectives.

### *Ecological Impacts and TPB-PG No. 12C*

#### *Ecological Consideration and Long-term Maintenance and Management of the WRA*

- 12.5 The Site falls within the WBA under the TPB PG-No. 12C requiring EcoIA submission and provision of ecological and visual buffer to the WCA, and observing the principles of no-net-loss in wetland and no net increase in pollution load to Deep Bay. Although there are increase in number of houses, the total GFA remains unchanged and no significant adverse ecological impact is anticipated with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures including 2m-high solid wall with buffer tree/shrub planting between the WRA and residential area; reduced BH of the detached houses abutting the WRA with greater setback; a 3m-high site hoarding to be erected between the WRA and the residential area during the construction period; and good site practices to be adopted. The completed WRA will continue to serve its ecological function including being a buffer between the residential development and the fishponds in Deep Bay. Subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures, DAFC has no objection to the application from the nature conservation perspective and considers that the proposed revised scheme would not result in additional wetland loss. The applicant confirms that there will be no change to the MMP approved in 2015 for the previously approved scheme, and the MMP would be compiled with for the current amendment submission. Besides, the applicant is taking up the long-term maintenance and management of the WRA in accordance with the agreement with the ECF and the funding arrangement is fully applicable to the current amendment submission. As such, S for EE and DEP have no adverse comment on the application in terms of long-term maintenance and management of the WRA.

#### *No Net Increase in Pollution Load to the Deep Bay area*

- 12.6 As there is no plan for construction of the Ngau Tam Mei trunk sewer, the applicant proposes that, as opposed to the interim on-site STP originally proposed in the previously approved scheme, the on-site STP in the current scheme will be constructed as a long-term on-site sewage treatment facility to treat the sewage from the Site and to reuse the treated water for local flushing and irrigation. The SIA concludes that since all sewage generated from the proposed development will be fully reused on site, it will not cause any net increase in pollution load to the Deep Bay area. DEP considers that with the implementation of environmental

mitigation measures including the provision of the on-site STP and the reuse of treated effluent on-site, the proposed development would unlikely be subject to or cause adverse environmental impacts. An approval condition is recommended requiring the applicant to implement the sewage disposal arrangement including the on-site STP and the reuse of treated effluent. Besides, the applicant is reminded to observe and ensure that the development will comply with all statutory requirements under the EIAO.

### Traffic

- 12.7 As compared to the approved scheme, the current amendment scheme will have greater trip generation due to the increase in number of car parking spaces consequential to the increase in number of housing units. The TIA demonstrated that with the proposed junction improvement works to be implemented by the applicant and other planned road improvement works in the vicinity, the current amendment scheme will not cause significant traffic impact to the road network. C for T has no objection-in-principle to the application from traffic engineering point of view.

### Other Technical Considerations

- 12.8 Various mitigation measures are proposed to be incorporated into the indicative layout to mitigate the traffic and fixed noise impacts on the proposed development, including acoustic windows and noise barriers. DEP has no objection to the application from environmental planning perspective. The applicant has submitted various technical assessments in support of the current application. Concerned Government departments have no objection to or no adverse comment on the application and their technical requirements and concerns could be addressed by imposing relevant approval conditions as recommended in paragraph 13.2 below should the application be approved.

### Previous Applications

- 12.9 The Site is the subject of four previously approved applications submitted by the current applicant for the same use of residential development with WRA as detailed in paragraph 6. The current applicant is seeking amendment to the previous Application No. A/YL-MP/229 which was approved by the Committee in 2015. The corresponding GBP was approved in 2016 and the proposed development is regarded as commenced. Approval of the application is in line with the Committee's previous decision.

### Public Comments

- 12.10 Regarding the public comments as detailed in paragraph 11, the planning assessment and departmental comments above are relevant. DEMS considers that conducting a QRA for assessing the potential risks associated with the gas pipeline is not a compulsory requirement. The applicant has also responded to the public comments as summarised in paragraph 2 above.

### **13. Planning Department's Views**

13.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 12 and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 11 above, the Planning Department 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 16.2.2028, 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 Conditions

- (a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan to take into account conditions (b) to (i) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the implementation of drainage proposal identified in the accepted Drainage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Ecological Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the Town Planning Board;
- (e) the design and provision of vehicular access, parking and loading/unloading facilities for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (f) the design and provision of improvement measures at the junction of Castle Peak Road - San Tin and Shek Wu Wai Road before the occupation of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (g) the design and provision of improvement measures at the junction of Fairview Park Interchange, if deemed required by Transport Department, before the occupation of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (h) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (i) the implementation of sewage disposal arrangement identified in the revised SIA including the on-site sewerage treatment plant and the reuse of treated effluent, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board.

### Advisory Clauses

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

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

## **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**

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Appendix I</b>             | Application Form received on 23.5.2023   |
| <b>Appendix Ia</b>            | Planning Statement   |
| <b>Appendix Ib</b>            | FI dated 21.8.2023   |
| <b>Appendix Ic</b>            | FI dated 27.9.2023 and 29.9.2023   |
| <b>Appendix Id</b>            | FI dated 15.11.2023  |
| <b>Appendix Ie</b>            | FI dated 19.1.2024   |
| <b>Appendix If</b>            | FI dated 9.2.2024  |
| <b>Appendix II</b>            | Extract of TPB PG-No. 12C  |
| <b>Appendix III</b>           | Previous Applications  |
| <b>Appendix IV</b>            | Recommended Advisory Clauses   |
| <b>Appendix Va</b>            | Public Comments (Objecting)  |
| <b>Appendix Vb</b>            | Public Comments (Providing Views)  |
| <b>Drawings A-1</b>           | MLP of Approved Scheme (No. A/YL-MP/229) and the Current Scheme                        |
| <b>Drawing A-2</b>            | Basement Plan of Approved Scheme   |
| <b>Drawing A-3</b>            | Phasing Plan   |
| <b>Drawings A-4a to A-4d</b>  | Floor Plans of House Types A1, A2, B, C1, C2, D and E                                  |
| <b>Drawings A-5a and A-5b</b> | Site Sections  |
| <b>Drawing A-6a</b>           | LMP of Approved Scheme (No. A/YL-MP/229) and the Current Scheme                        |
| <b>Drawing A-6b</b>           | Communal Landscape/Greenery Demarcation Plan of Approved Scheme and the Current Scheme |
| <b>Drawing A-6c</b>           | Habitat in the WRA   |
| <b>Drawing A-7</b>            | Visual Corridors of Approved Scheme and the Current Scheme                             |
| <b>Drawings A-8a and A-8b</b> | Tree Felling Plan and Tree Treatment Plan  |
| <b>Drawings A-9 and A-9b</b>  | Landscape Sections   |
| <b>Drawing A-10</b>           | Proposed Drainage Plan   |
| <b>Drawing A-11</b>           | Proposed Noise Mitigation Measures   |
| <b>Drawing A-12</b>           | Proposed Junction Improvement Works  |

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Plan A-1</b>           | Location Plan                              |
| <b>Plan A-2</b>           | Site Plan                                  |
| <b>Plans A-3a to 3d</b>   | Aerial Photos in 2022, 2018, 2011 and 2007 |
| <b>Plans A-4a to A-4c</b> | Site Photos                                |

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
FEBRUARY 2024**