

RNTPC Paper No. Y/I-CC/7  
For Consideration by the  
Rural and New Town  
Planning Committee  
on 6.9.2024

---

**APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT OF PLAN  
UNDER SECTION 12A OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICATION NO. Y/I-CC/7**

- Applicant** : Combine Hero Properties Limited represented by Aikon Development Consultancy Limited
- Application Site** : Cheung Chau Inland Lot (CCIL) 4 RP, Fa Peng, Cheung Chau
- Site Area** : About 743.102m<sup>2</sup>
- Lease** : Held under a government lease dated 28.12.1914 subject to Schedule B of Government Notification (GN) No. 365 of 1906 as building ground
- Plan** : Approved Cheung Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-CC/9
- Zoning** : “Residential (Group C) 6” (“R(C)6”)  
[Restricted to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 0.2, a maximum site coverage (SC) of 20% and a maximum building height (BH) of 2 storeys (7.62m)]
- Proposed Amendment** : To rezone the application site from “R(C)6” to “R(C)9” subject to a maximum PR of 1.58, a maximum SC of 52.43% and a maximum BH of 3 storeys (8.23m or 64mPD)

**1. The Proposal**

- 1.1 The applicant proposes to rezone the application site (the Site) (**Plan Z-1**) from “R(C)6” to “R(C)9” on the approved Cheung Chau OZP No. S/I-CC/9 to facilitate a proposed residential development. The revised set of Notes proposed by the applicant for the “R(C)9” zone is at **Appendix IV**. ‘House’ and ‘Flat’ are Column 1 uses of both the “R(C)6” and “R(C)9” zones, and a comparison of development restrictions under the two zonings is shown in the following table:

<b>Development Restrictions</b>	<b>Current “R(C)6” Zone</b>	<b>Proposed “R(C)9” Zone</b>	<b>Difference (about)</b>
Maximum PR	0.2	1.58	+1.38 (+690%)
Maximum SC	20%	52.43%	+32.43% (+162%)
Maximum BH (no. of storeys)	2 storeys	3 storeys	+1 storey (+50%)

Maximum BH (m/mPD)	7.62m	8.23m or 64mPD	+0.61m (+8%)
-----------------------	-------	----------------	--------------

1.2 The applicant indicates that a set of site formation plans and Certificate of Exemption (CoE) for building works (CoE(BW)) for six New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEHs) at the Site were approved and issued by the Building Authority (BA) and the District Lands Officer/Islands, Lands Department (DLO/Is, LandsD) in 1992 and 1993 respectively before the Site was covered by the first Cheung Chau OZP in 2004. However, as the development parameters of the proposed NTEHs exceed relevant restrictions of the existing “R(C)6” zone, amendments to the OZP are necessary to take forward the proposed development. The PR, SC and BH of the proposed NTEHs are within the relevant restrictions of the proposed “R(C)9” zone.

1.3 The block plan, floor plans, elevation and section plans of the indicative scheme submitted by the applicant are at **Drawings Z-2 to Z-6**. Major development parameters of the indicative scheme<sup>1</sup> are as follows:

Site Area	About 743.102m <sup>2</sup>
SC	About 52.43%
Gross Floor Area (GFA)	About 1,168.881m <sup>2</sup>
BH	Not more than 8.23m About 63.916mPD
No. of Storeys	Not more than 3 storeys
PR	About 1.573
No. of Blocks	6
Estimated Population	54

1.4 To support the application, the applicant has also submitted a drainage plan, a tree survey plan with tree assessment schedule and a conceptual landscape plan based on the indicative scheme (**Appendix Ia**).

1.5 The Site is accessible via an existing footpath branching off from Don Bosco Road and Ming Fai Road where the proposed development would continue to make use of the existing footpath as major access (**Plans Z-2 and Z-5a**). According to the applicant, while the provision of emergency vehicular access is not required for the proposed development under the “New Territories Exempted Houses – A Guide to Fire Safety Requirements”, the proposed development will implement fire safety alternatives<sup>2</sup> to ensure fire safety. According to the proposal, six septic tanks and soakage pits will be built to support the proposed residential development. As shown on the drainage plan (**Drawing Z-7**), U-channel will be provided along the perimeter of the Site with a catch pit and outfall to existing drains.

1.6 The applicant indicates that the majority of the Site is now covered by vegetation without mature trees, and existing vegetation within the Site will be retained as far as possible. According to the tree survey plan (**Appendix Ia**) and planting proposal

<sup>1</sup> Balconies of the proposed six NTEHs are exempted.

<sup>2</sup> According to the “New Territories Exempted Houses – A Guide to Fire Safety Requirements” administered by LandsD, fire safety alternatives includes (i) automatic sprinkler system; (ii) fire detection system and hose reel system; or (iii) fire detection system and fire extinguisher on each floor.

(**Appendix Ic**), the five existing trees, which are generally in fair and poor health condition with low amenity value within the Site, will be felled. 15 trees including six heavy standard trees and nine ornamental trees and buffer planting are proposed along the boundary of the Site to alleviate possible visual intrusion and provide visual amenity as outlined in the conceptual landscape plan (**Drawing Z-8**).

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

- (a) Application form received on 11.7.2024 (**Appendix I**)
- (b) Letter dated 26.6.2024 with Supplementary Planning Statement (SPS) (**Appendix Ia**)
- (c) Letter dated 17.7.2024 with replacement pages (**Appendix Ib**)
- (d) Further information (FI) received on 15.8.2024\* (**Appendix Ic**)

*\* accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirements*

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

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed in the SPS (**Appendices Ia and Ib**). They are summarised as follows:

- (a) the proposed rezoning aims to reflect the long-established building status and respect development rights and entitlements under lease established prior to the gazettal of the first Cheung Chau OZP. Approval of the current application would facilitate implementation of the proposed development without further delay. The maximum PR, SC and BH in the proposed “R(C)9” follow the relevant parameters of the development of the approved building plans and CoEs;
- (b) the proposed six 3-storey NTEHs entirely align with the planning intention of “R(C)” for low-rise, low density residential developments, especially given that ‘House’ use is always permitted under the current OZP. The proposed development is entirely compatible with the surrounding environment which is characterised by low-rise and low-density developments. Replacing the existing ruined structures at the Site by the proposed development would help unleash redevelopment potential of a long-abandoned site, upgrade the environment to a more pleasant residential neighbourhood and address building safety concerns;
- (c) the proposed rezoning would only be financially justifiable with the proposed development intensity due to its remote location and high construction costs. It would also increase housing supply by optimising the use of valuable developable land;
- (d) the proposed development is technically feasible in terms of building works, sewerage, drainage and site formation as demonstrated by the approval of building plans and issuance of CoEs. The proposed development shall not pose any adverse traffic, environmental, sewerage, drainage, visual and infrastructural impacts on the surrounding areas. Besides, the proposed development will adopt site practices and relevant guidelines during construction phases to avoid disturbance to the surrounding greenbelt setting; and
- (e) considering as an exception to reflect permissible development rights and

entitlements, approval of the application would not set an undesirable precedent.

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

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

### **4. Background**

- 4.1 The Site was zoned “R(C)6” on the first Cheung Chau OZP gazetted on 18.6.2004 subject to a maximum PR of 0.2, SC of 20% and BH of 2 storeys (7.62m), or the PR, SC and BH of the existing building, whichever is the greater. According to the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP, the “R(C)” zone covers existing and reserved sites for low-rise, low-density residential developments that are compatible with the rural character of Cheung Chau. The “R(C)6” sub-area is designated for existing single-house developments which are mostly scattered on the visually prominent knolls or hill slopes in the south-eastern upland where some of them are vacant or have been abandoned. Since then, there has been no change to the zoning of the Site.
- 4.2 Prior to the publication of the first Cheung Chau OZP in 2004, a CoE(BW) for six NTEHs with each of not more than 3 storeys (8.23m) and a total roofed-over area not exceeding 65.03m<sup>2</sup> (**Appendix Ia**) at the Site was issued by DLO/Is, LandsD on 12.1.1993, while a set of site formation plans to facilitate the six NTEHs was approved by BA on 20.3.1992. However, the proposed development has not commenced. Besides, a CoE for drainage works (CoE(DW)) of the proposed development was issued by DLO/Is, LandsD on 18.1.2023 with a condition for compliance with the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), among others.

### **5. Previous Application**

There is no previous planning application at the Site.

### **6. Similar Application**

There is a similar section 12A application (No. Y/I-CC/6) for proposed rezoning of a site from “R(C)5” to “R(C)8” to facilitate the development of six 3-storey houses with increased PR, SC and BH. The application was agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 28.10.2016 mainly on the grounds that the proposed development was considered not incompatible with the nearby developments and was in line with government policy to increase the flat supply and make efficient use of developable land. Details of the similar application are summarised at **Appendix II** and its location is shown on **Plan Z-1**.

### **7. The Site and its Surrounding Areas (Plans Z-1 to Z-3a and site photos on Plans Z-4 to Z-5c)**

7.1 The Site is:

- (a) located at the upland area of Fa Peng in the south-eastern part of Cheung Chau;
- (b) mainly occupied by two single-storey abandoned ruined houses erected on two different level platforms. Trees, shrubs and some undergrowth can be found in the remaining part of the Site; and
- (c) accessible from Don Bosco Road to the west and Ming Fai Road to the north via an informal footpath.

7.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) in rural character mainly comprising low-rise and low-density residential developments ranging from 2 to 3 storeys high as well as natural vegetation and trees;
- (b) to its south is another abandoned ruined houses on a private lot (i.e. CCIL 52) which is also zoned “R(C)6”;
- (c) to its north and west are low-rise and low-density residential developments including Seaview Garden zoned “R(C)1” subject to a maximum PR of 1, SC of 40% and BH of 3 storeys (8.23m) and Fa Peng Knoll zoned “R(C)4” subject to a maximum PR of 0.6, SC of 30% and BH of 2 storeys (7.62m);
- (d) to its northwest are a place of retreat called Bethany Lodge zoned “Government, Institution or Community (4)” (“G/IC(4)”) subject to a maximum BH of 2 storeys (7.62m) and The Salvation Army Bradbury Camp zoned “Recreation” (“REC”) subject to a maximum PR of 0.2 and BH of 2 storeys (6m); and
- (e) to its eastern and further southern side is the coastline of Cheung Chau zoned “Coastal Protection Area”.

## **8. Planning Intention**

The planning intention of the “R(C)” zone is intended primarily for low-rise, low-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Board.

## **9. Comments from Relevant Government Bureau/Departments**

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

### **Land Administration**

- 9.1.1 Comments of DLO/Is, LandsD:

- (a) the Site is within CCIL 4 RP which is held under a government lease dated 28.12.1914 for the term of the lease and subject to Schedule B of GN 365 of 1906 (hereinafter collectively referred to as “the Lease”) as building ground;
- (b) according to her records, a set of building plans dated 27.11.1992 in relation to the redevelopment proposal of six NTEHs was approved by DLO/Is, LandsD on 7.1.1993. A CoE(BW) was issued to the applicant on 12.1.1993;
- (c) no adverse comment on the redevelopment proposal of six NTEHs on the Site in accordance with the approved building plans dated 27.11.1992 from land administration perspective;
- (d) there were no provisions under the Lease or the CoE(BW) and the CoE(DW) requiring approval for assignments/selling individual units;
- (e) while there were no height restrictions or no. of storeys imposed on the Lease, it is stated that in the Schedule of Conditions annexed to the CoE(BW) that “The six buildings when constructed, will each be a building of not more than 3 storeys and of a height of not more than 8.23m, and will have a total roofed-over area not exceeding 65.03m<sup>2</sup>”. According to her records, the approved building plans under CoE are still valid;
- (f) upon an application submitted by the applicant, a CoE(DW) was issued to the applicant on 18.1.2023. On the other hand, a set of site formation plans dated 12.1991 in connection with the lot and CCIL 52 was approved by BA on 20.3.1992. No CoE in respect of site formation works was issued by DLO/Is, LandsD; and
- (g) other detailed comments are at **Appendix III**.

### **Building Matters**

#### **9.1.2 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories East 1 & Licensing, Buildings Department (CBS/NTE1&L, BD):**

- (a) pursuant to section 7 of the Buildings Ordinance (Application to the New Territories) Ordinance (Cap. 121), sections 4, 9, 14, 21 and 30 of the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and the regulations made under BO shall not apply in respect of any building, building works or site formation works specified in a CoE;
- (b) submission of the prescribed plan for site formation works to BD for approval depends on whether the exemption criteria or the associated conditions set out in Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-56 are met; and
- (c) other detailed comments are at **Appendix III**.

### **Geotechnical**

#### 9.1.3 Comments of the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO),CEDD):

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application from the geotechnical point of view providing that the proposed development and the associated geotechnical works would be up to the current required geotechnical standards; and
- (b) it is noted in the section 5.10 of the SPS that the site formation for the proposed development could not meet the exemption criteria or the associated conditions set out in PNAP APP-56 and the applicant would submit the prescribed plans for site formation works to BD for approval in the standard manner prior to commencement of site formation works. Therefore, submission of a Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) in the rezoning application is not required.

### **Drainage and Sewerage**

#### 9.1.4 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department (CE/HK&I, DSD):

- (a) no comment on the application noting that a detailed drainage plan would be submitted in later stage; and
- (b) other detailed comments are at **Appendix III**.

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

- (a) since the public sewerage in the vicinity of the proposed development is not available at the moment, discharge of wastewater into septic tank and soakaway pit system is acceptable by Environmental Protection Department (EPD). The design and construction of the septic tank and soakaway pit system of the development shall comply with EPD's Professional Persons Environmental Consultative Committee Practice Note 1/23. Overall, he has no adverse comment on the design where soakaway pits will not affect the foundation of adjacent building. DSD's technical advice is to be considered for future connection to the public sewer. Besides, should the public sewer become available for connection in future, the premises owners shall divert their sewage from the septic tank and soakaway pit system to the public sewer accordingly; and
- (b) other detailed comments are at **Appendix III**.

### **Fire Safety**

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

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application; and

- (b) detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of a formal application submission of Short Term Tenancy/Short Term Waiver, general building plans or referral of application via relevant licensing authority.

### **Water Supply**

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

no objection to the application from water supply point of view.

### **Traffic**

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

no comment on the application from traffic engineering point of view.

#### 9.1.9 Comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department (CHE/NTE, HyD):

no comment on the application from highways maintenance point of view given that there are no public roads/footpaths and road features currently maintained by HyD adjoining the Site.

### **Urban Design and Landscape**

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

##### **Urban Design**

- (a) the increase in maximum PR from 0.2 to 1.58 and SC from 20% to 52.43% as proposed is substantial and relatively high compared with the residential developments nearby. However, the proposed development is of 3 storeys high and the site area is small, it could probably be shielded by surrounding dense vegetation and not be visible to the nearby viewers. As such, significant adverse visual impact is not anticipated;
- (b) regarding the non-inclusion of SC in the development control for the proposed “R(C)9” zone on the OZP, according to the streamlined arrangement under Joint Practice Note (JPN) No. 7, more stringent SC restrictions than the relevant provisions would only be applied under the planning regime for specific planning purposes in selected sites; for other areas, more flexibility could be allowed for deriving schemes with a lower/more varied BH profile in exchange for a higher SC;

##### **Landscape**

- (c) according to aerial photo of 2023 (**Plan Z-3a**), the Site is situated in



an area of miscellaneous rural fringe landscape character surrounded by dense vegetation and trees with low-rise residential developments to its west and north. There are two existing houses within the Site. The proposed NTEH development is considered not incompatible to the surrounding landscape character;

- (d) with reference to section 5.7 of the SPS and Appendix 8 (Tree Survey Plan, Tree Assessment Schedule and Photographic Record of Existing Trees), “a total of five trees were identified within the application site” and they were proposed to be felled. According to the Conceptual Landscape Plan (**Drawing Z-8**), 15 new trees and buffer planting are proposed to be planted within the Site; and
- (e) other detailed comments are at **Appendix III**.

9.1.11 Comments of the Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department (CA/ASC, ArchSD):

no comment on the application from architectural and visual impact point of view noting that the proposed development shares a similar height profile with the existing buildings and is shielded by dense vegetation and trees from public view, and that sensitive design measures would be incorporated by the applicant, such as using light colour tones for the building facade to better integrate with the existing landscape.

**Nature Conservation**

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

no comment on the application from nature conservation perspective as the Site is partly occupied by an old structure now and the proposed amendment is minor.

9.2 The following bureau/government departments have no objection to/no comment on the application:

- (a) District Officer/Islands, Home Affairs Department;
- (b) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (c) Commissioner of Police; and
- (d) Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments), Antiquities and Monuments Office, Development Bureau.

**10. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 10.1 The applicant proposes to rezone the Site from “R(C)6” to “R(C)9” subject to a maximum PR of 1.58, SC of 52.43% and BH of 3 storeys (8.23m or 64mPD). The revised set of Notes proposed by the applicant for the “R(C)9” sub-area is at **Appendix IV**. As shown on the applicant’s indicative scheme (**Drawings Z-2 to Z-6**), the proposed six 3-storey NTEHs have a PR of about 1.573, a GFA of about

1,168.881m<sup>2</sup>, a SC of about 52.43%, and a BH of not more than 8.23m and about 63.916mPD.

- 10.2 According to the applicant, CoE(BW) and site formation plans for six NTEHs at the Site have been issued or approved by the relevant authorities before the publication of the Cheung Chau OZP in 2004. CoE(DW) was also issued on 18.1.2023 with a condition for compliance with the Ordinance. Implementation of the residential development is at an advance stage. However, the proposed development exceeds relevant restrictions on the OZP. The current application is to allow taking forward the proposed development by rezoning the Site from “R(C)6” to “R(C)9”. The PR, SC and BH of the proposed development fall within relevant restrictions of the proposed “R(C)9” zone. DLO/Is, LandsD, CBS/NTE1&L, BD and H(GEO), CEDD have no objection to/adverse comment on the application.

### Planning Intention

- 10.3 The planning intention of the “R(C)” zone is primarily for low-rise, low-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Board. According to the ES of the OZP, the “R(C)” zone covers the existing and reserved sites for low-rise, low-density residential developments compatible with the rural character of Cheung Chau while the “R(C)6” sub-area is for existing single house developments which are mostly scattered on the visually prominent knolls or hill slopes in the south-eastern upland. The “R(C)9” zone proposed by the applicant is to reflect the development parameters of the six 3-storey NTEHs with CoEs and approved site formation plans. While the proposed “R(C)9” zoning has a higher maximum PR of 1.58 and BH of 3 storeys (8.23m) compared with the current “R(C)6” zone, it is still in line with the planning intention of the “R(C)” zone primarily for low-rise, low-density residential developments.

### Land Use Compatibility, Urban Design and Landscape Aspects

- 10.4 Located at the upland area of Fa Peng in the eastern part of Cheung Chau, the Site, which is largely occupied by abandoned ruined houses, is mainly surrounded by low-rise, low-density residential, institutional and recreational developments of 1 to 3-storey high mostly zoned “R(C)”, “G/IC(4)” and “REC”. The proposed six 3-storey NTEH development is considered not totally incompatible with the surrounding environment. According to CTP/UD&L, PlanD, as the proposed development is of 3 storeys high and the site area is small, it could probably be shielded by surrounding dense vegetation and not be visible to the nearby viewers, significant adverse visual impact is not anticipated. Both CA/ASC, ArchSD and CTP/UD&L, PlanD have no adverse comment on the application from urban design and visual impact perspectives.
- 10.5 From landscape planning perspective, the Site is in an area of miscellaneous rural fringe landscape character surrounded by dense vegetation and trees with low rise residential developments to its west and north. The applicant’s tree survey report indicates that five existing trees generally in fair and poor health condition with low amenity value identified within the Site will be felled. According to the conceptual landscape plan (**Drawing Z-8**), 15 trees and buffer planting are proposed for the

proposed development. CTP/UD&L, PlanD advises that the proposed development is considered not incompatible to the surrounding landscape character. Besides, DAFC has no comment on the application from nature conservation perspective in view that the Site is partly occupied by an old structure and the proposed amendment to the OZP is minor.

#### Technical Aspects

- 10.6 The applicant has submitted a drainage plan in support of the application with proposed drainage facilities. Given that a detailed drainage plan would be submitted in later stage, CE/HK&I, DSD has no comment on the application. DEP has no adverse comment on the applicant's proposal to construct septic tanks and soakage pits on the Site. H(GEO), CEDD has no objection to the application and advises that submission of a GPRR is not required given that the applicant would submit site formation plans to BD for approval prior to commencement of site formation works. Other government bureau/departments concerned including C for T, CHE/NTE, HyD, CE/C, WSD and D of FS have no objection to/adverse comment on the application.

#### Similar Application

- 10.7 There is a similar section 12A application (No. Y/I-CC/6) for proposed rezoning of a site from "R(C)5" to "R(C)8" to facilitate the development of six 3-storey houses with increased PR, SC and BH agreed by the Committee on the same OZP. Approval of the current application is generally in line with the Committee's previous decision.

#### Development Restrictions to be stipulated on the OZP

- 10.8 Roofed-over area of a NTEH is capped at 65.03m<sup>2</sup> under the Buildings Ordinance (Application to the New Territories) Ordinance (Cap. 121). Under the spirit of the streamlined arrangements of SC restriction under JPN No. 7, with the maximum SC permissible has been stipulated under other development control regime, a SC restriction in the OZP for the Site is not necessary. In this regard, only a maximum PR of 1.58 and a maximum BH of 3 storeys (8.23m) are recommended for statutory planning control purpose. Should the application be agreed by the Committee, PlanD will work out the development restrictions to be set out in the Notes for the Committee's consideration prior to gazetting of the proposed amendments to the OZP under section 5 of the Ordinance.

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

- 11.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 10 above, PlanD has no in-principle objection to the application.
- 11.2 Should the Committee decide to agree/partially agree to the application, PlanD would work out the appropriate amendments to the OZP, including development restrictions to be set out in the Notes and ES for the consideration of Committee prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Ordinance upon reference back of the OZP.

- 11.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide not to agree to the application, the following reason is suggested for Members' reference:

there is no strong planning justification in the submission for rezoning the application site from "Residential (Group C) 6" ("R(C)6") to "R(C)9" and the proposed increase in development intensity. The current "R(C)6" zoning is considered appropriate and should be retained.

## **12. Decision Sought**

- 12.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to agree, partially agree, or not to agree to the application.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide not to agree to the application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for the decision should be given to the applicant.

## **13. Attachments**

<b>Appendix I</b>	Application Form received on 11.7.2024
<b>Appendix Ia</b>	Letter dated 26.6.2024 with SPS
<b>Appendix Ib</b>	Letter dated 17.7.2024 with replacement pages
<b>Appendix Ic</b>	FI received on 15.8.2024
<b>Appendix II</b>	Similar Application
<b>Appendix III</b>	Detailed Departmental Comments
<b>Appendix IV</b>	Revised Notes for the "R(C)" Zone under the Approved Cheung Chau OZP No. S/I-CC/9 Proposed by the Applicant
<b>Drawing Z-1</b>	Lot Index Plan
<b>Drawings Z-2 to Z-6</b>	Master Layout Plan and Architectural Drawings
<b>Drawing Z-7</b>	Drainage Plan
<b>Drawing Z-8</b>	Conceptual Landscape Plan
<b>Plan Z-1</b>	Location Plan
<b>Plan Z-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plans Z-3a and Z-3b</b>	Aerial Photos
<b>Plan Z-4</b>	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Photos
<b>Plans Z-5a to Z-5c</b>	Site Photos