

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

**APPLICATION NO. Y/TM-LTY Y/10**

- Applicant** : Shine Wheel Limited represented by Ove Arup & Partners HK Limited
- Site** : Lots 220 RP and 221 in D.D.130, San Hing Road, San Hing Tsuen, Tuen Mun, New Territories
- Site Area** : About 2,255 m<sup>2</sup>
- Lease** : Block Government Lease (demised for agricultural use)
- Plan** : Approved Lam Tei and Yick Yuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TM-LTY Y/12 (currently in force)
- Draft Lam Tei and Yick Yuen OZP No. S/TM-LTY Y/11 (at the time of submission)  
*[The zoning and development restrictions for the application site (the Site) remain unchanged on the current OZP]*
- Zoning** : (i) “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) (about 95%); and  
*[Restricted to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 1.0, a maximum site coverage (SC) of 40% and a maximum building height (BH) of 4 storeys over single-storey car park (15m)]*
- (ii) “Village Type Development” (“V”) (about 5%)  
*[Restricted to a maximum BH of 3 storeys (8.23m)]*
- Proposed Amendment** : To rezone the Site from “R(E)” and “V” to “Residential (Group A)1” (“R(A)1”)

**1. The Proposal**

- 1.1 The applicant proposes to rezone the Site (**Plan Z-1a**) from “R(E)” and “V” to “R(A)1” to facilitate a high-density residential development. The proposed “R(A)1” zone is subject to a maximum PR of 5 and a maximum BH of 100mPD. A set of Remarks for the proposed “R(A)1” zone under the Notes of the current “R(A)” zone is attached at **Appendix II**.

- 1.2 The Site is located at the southern fringe of the Lam Tei and Yick Yuen planning area. It is sandwiched by the village type developments and San Hing Tsuen in the north and east and the planned high-density San Hing Road (SHR) and Hong Po Road (HPR) public housing development in the south and west. To the south across HPR is Yan Tin Estate, a recently completed public housing estate in Tuen Mun planning area while to the further south is Tuen Mun New Town. The Site is formed, fenced and currently used as warehouse (**Plans Z-2 to Z-4b**).
- 1.3 According to the indicative scheme submitted by the applicant, the proposed residential development comprises two residential blocks of 29 storeys (including three levels of basement car parks) with a BH of not more than 100mPD, a domestic PR of not more than 5 and a gross floor area (GFA) of not more than 11,275m<sup>2</sup>. The indicative Master Layout Plan (MLP), floor plans, section plans, and Landscape Master Plans (LMPs) are at **Drawings Z-1 to Z-11**. Major development parameters of the proposal are as follows:

Development Parameters	Indicative Scheme
<b>Site Area</b>	About 2,255 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Domestic PR</b>	Not more than 5
<b>Domestic GFA</b>	Not more than 11,275 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>BH</b> - mPD - No. of Storeys	Not more than 100 mPD 29 (including three levels of basement and excluding transfer plate)
<b>SC</b>	Below 15m: not more than 66% Above 15m: not more than 33.3%
<b>No. of Blocks</b>	2
<b>No. of Flats</b>	288
<b>Average Flat Size</b>	around 40 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Estimated Population</b>	778 <sup>(a)</sup>
<b>Private Open Space</b>	Not less than 778 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Car Parking Provision</b> - Private (Residential) <sup>(b)</sup> - Visitors - Motorcycle	87 10 3
<b>Loading/Unloading Bays</b>	2
<b>Target Completion Year</b>	2026

Remarks:

- (a) A Person Per Occupied Flat Ratio of 2.7 is assumed.  
(b) Including accessible car parking spaces

- 1.4 In support of the rezoning application, the applicant has submitted Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), Environmental Assessment (EA), Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA), Landscape Proposal (LP) and Preliminary Archaeological Impact Assessment (PAIA)<sup>1</sup>.

Urban Design Aspect

- 1.5 According to the applicant, the development intensity (i.e. a maximum PR of 5 and a maximum BH of 100mPD) adopted for the proposed residential development is to ensure a compatible development scale with the surroundings and to create a stepped BH profile serving as a transition from the planned SHR and HPR public housing development in the south and west towards the village type developments in the north and east.

Environmental and Air Ventilation Aspects

- 1.6 Various environmentally sensitive design measures are incorporated in the proposed indicative scheme. By setting back the proposed residential blocks from SHR, placing residential floors on the 6.1m high podium and applying acoustic balconies with sound absorptive materials, the potential traffic noise impacts and vehicular emissions from SHR would be minimised (**Drawings Z-8 to Z-11**). On air ventilation aspect, the applicant proposes to designate two local air paths (about 8.5m and 10m in width) to form a crucified air path at podium level with the proposed semi-enclosed garden setting and building setback along SHR to enhance the wind penetration in the area (**Drawing Z-16**).

Traffic Aspect

- 1.7 Vehicular access of the proposed development is located at SHR (**Drawings Z-13 and Z-14**) which is linked to Castle Peak Road to its further east. Car parking spaces and loading/unloading spaces will be provided in accordance with the requirement of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), in which a high-end provision of private car parking spaces is adopted. While the Site is accessible by franchised buses and Light Rail Transit within walking distance, it is only directly served by one Green Minibus (GMB) route which is the major feeder service between Tsing Chuen Wai and MTR Siu Hong Station. To minimise the impact on the existing GMB service and to serve the needs of the future residents, the applicant proposes to provide shuttle services<sup>2</sup> from the Site to MTR Siu Hong Station during morning peak hours (i.e. from 6:00 am to 10:00 am). Besides, a possible pedestrian connection and an open piazza<sup>3</sup> along SHR

---

1 According to the applicant, the PAIA was conducted for a previously approved s.16 planning application (No. A/TM-LTTY/291) at the Site. The assessment result for the indicative scheme, with minor update of the site boundary, would not deviate from the approved scheme. Archaeological Impact Assessment will be conducted in detailed design stage, and it could form part of the clause of the lease conditions.

2 The proposed shuttle service would be reviewed and adjusted subject to the actual demand and whether the public transport services in the area would be enhanced.

3 The applicant will be responsible for the management and maintenance of the proposed open piazza.

are proposed with a view to enhancing connectivity, streetscape and visual amenity of SHR (**Drawing Z-3**).

Open Space and Landscape Aspects

1.8 According to the indicative LMPs (**Drawings Z-9 to Z-11**), private open space of not less than 778 m<sup>2</sup> (i.e. 1 m<sup>2</sup> per person) will be provided. To enhance the greenery and to minimise the potential visual impact on the surrounding areas, a total of 21 new trees are proposed on the podium landscape area and bamboo species are introduced in the moveable planters on the ground floor to provide screening effect.

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

- (a) Application form received on 24.11.2021 (Appendix I)
- (b) Further Information (FI) received on 4.7.2023 (Appendix Ia)  
(for submission of a consolidated report)

*[Supporting planning statement received on 24.11.2021 and FIs received on 28.1.2022, 8.4.2022, 10.6.2022, 12.8.2022, 26.8.2022, 29.9.2022, 25.10.2022, 19.12.2022, 30.12.2022, 17.2.2023, 16.3.2023, 22.3.2023, 20.4.2023, 30.6.2023 and 4.7.2023 were superseded and not attached]*

1.10 On 13.1.2023, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to defer a decision on the application to allow time for relevant government department to review and comment on the application.

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

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed at **Appendix Ia**. They can be summarised as follows:

- (a) A major part of the Site is subject to an approved s.16 planning application (No. A/TM-LTYY/291) for residential use. Compared to the approved scheme, the current rezoning proposal with a higher development intensity is able to achieve larger flat production (i.e. increased from 16 flats to 288 flats) in response to the Government's policies for increasing housing land supply and the recent changing planning circumstances of the area.
- (b) The proposed indicative scheme, of a smaller development scale compared to the adjoining planned SHR and HPR public housing development, is compatible with the surrounding land uses. The proposed BH allows a gradual stepped BH profile and a compatible transition from the SHR and HPR public housing development in the south and west towards the village settlements in the north and east.
- (c) The proposed development is in line with the planning intention of the existing "R(E)" zone at the Site by phasing out the existing brownfield uses through redevelopment for residential use, and with an optimal and compatible development

intensity. The existing industrial/residential (I/R) interface issues could also be eliminated. The proposed development would provide a quality environment and enhanced connectivity for future residents and the neighbourhood.

- (d) The proposed development rationalises the zoning boundary by incorporating about 110m<sup>2</sup> of land in the adjacent “V” zone (about 0.03% of the subject “V” zone) into the Site to increase flat supply without causing adverse impact on Small House (SH) supply in the area.
- (e) Various technical assessments have been carried out to examine the feasibility of the proposed rezoning based on the indicative scheme. All assessments demonstrated that the indicative scheme is technically acceptable and will not generate adverse visual, traffic, sewerage, environmental, landscape, air ventilation and archaeological impacts. The proposed rezoning is well justified and will establish a desirable precedent for similar developments to achieve various planning objectives and merits.

### 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. **Background**

4.1 The Site was first included in the draft Lam Tei and Yick Yuen Development Permission Area Plan No. DPA/TM-LTY Y/1 gazetted on 18.6.1993. It fell partly within an “Unspecified Use” area and partly within the area zoned “V”. On the draft Lam Tei and Yick Yuen OZP No. S/TM-LTY Y/1 gazetted on 7.6.1996, a major part of the Site was zoned “Undetermined” (“U”) with its eastern and western tips zoned “V” and “Industrial (Group D)” (“I(D)”) respectively. Subsequently, the “U” and “I(D)” portions were rezoned to “R(E)” on the draft Lam Tei and Yick Yuen OZP No. S/TM-LTY Y/3 gazetted on 23.5.2000. There has been no change in the zonings of the Site since then.

4.2 The Site is not subject to any planning enforcement action.

### 5. **Previous Applications**

#### **Section 16 Applications**

- 5.1 The Site is involved in three previous s.16 applications, two of which (No. A/TM-LTY Y/19 and 291) for proposed residential/flat development are relevant to the current application. Details of the applications are shown at **Appendix III** and their locations are shown on **Plan Z-1b**.
- 5.2 Application No. A/TM-LTY Y/19 (PR of 0.95 and 24 flats) submitted by the same applicant for proposed residential development covering a major part of the Site was rejected by the Board upon review on 12.6.1998 when the Site was mainly zoned “U” and “I(D)” on the considerations that a land use review was being

conducted to determine the future land-uses in the area and it was premature to determine the application at that stage as it would impose constraints on the land use review; insufficient information to address the potential I/R interface problem with the adjacent “I(D)” zone and setting undesirable precedent.

- 5.3 Application No. A/TM-LTYT/291 (PR of 1 and 16 flats) submitted by the same applicant for proposed flat development covering a major part of the Site was approved by the Board upon review on 12.2.2016 mainly on the considerations that the proposed development was in line with the planning intention of the “R(E)” zone and compatible with the surrounding development and relevant government departments had no adverse comments on the proposed development.

#### S.12A Application

- 5.4 The current applicant submitted a s.12A application (No. Y/TM-LTYT/7) in 2020 to rezone the Site (with same site area) from “R(E)” and “(V)” to “R(A)” for high-density residential development (PR of 5 and 288 flats). The application was subsequently withdrawn by the applicant in 2021.

### **6. Similar Application**

There is no similar application within the same “R(E)” and “V” zones on the OZP.

### **7. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans Z-1a to Z-4b)**

- 7.1 The Site is:

- (a) accessible from SHR to its east;
- (b) formed, fenced and currently used as a warehouse;
- (c) located to the immediate east of the planned SHR and HPR public housing developments zoned “R(A)” (subject to a maximum PR of 6.5 and a maximum BH of 160mPD) and to the north of Tuen Mun New Town (**Plan Z-1a**); and
- (d) located within the common ‘Village Environs’ (‘VE’) of San Hing Tsuen, Tuen Tsz Wai and Tsing Chuen Wai in Lam Tei, Tuen Mun which are recognized villages, and the Sites of Archeological Interest – San Hing Tsuen (**Plans Z-1a and Z-2**).

- 7.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) surrounded by low-rise village type developments and temporary structures for residential purposes intermixed with some brownfield operations;
- (b) to the east across SHR are San Hing Tsuen, vehicle parks and warehouses which are suspected unauthorized developments (UD);

- (c) to the immediate south are village type developments and a temporary vehicle park which is covered by three valid planning permissions No. A/TM-LTTY/370, 371 and 372 for SH developments;
- (d) to the west are some temporary structures for residential purpose, vacant land and a warehouse which is suspected UD;
- (e) to the north are village type developments including Emperor Villa, Sun King Garden and Hanison Garden; and
- (f) two approved applications (No. Y/TM-LTTY/9 and A/TM-LTTY/426) for proposed residential development with respective maximum PRs of 2.5 and 5 and maximum BHs of 8 storeys (35mPD) and 19 storeys (64.45mPD) are located to the further east of the Site near Castle Peak Road (**Plan Z-1a**).

## **8. Planning Intention**

- 8.1 The “R(E)” zone is intended primarily for phasing out of existing industrial uses through redevelopment for residential use on application to the Board. Whilst existing industrial uses will be tolerated, new industrial developments are not permitted in order to avoid perpetuation of I/R interface problem.
- 8.2 The “V” zone is intended to reflect existing recognized and other villages, and to provide land considered suitable for village expansion and re-provisioning of village houses affected by Government projects. Land within this zone is primarily intended for development of SH by indigenous villagers. It is also intended to concentrate village type development within this zone for a more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services. Selected commercial and community uses serving the needs of the villagers and in support of the village development are always permitted on the ground floor of a New Territories Exempted House. Other commercial, community and recreational uses may be permitted on application to the Board.

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

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

### **Land Administration**

- 9.1.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Tuen Mun, LandsD (DLO/TM, LandsD):
  - (a) The Site comprises Lots 220 RP and 221 in D.D. 130 which are both Old Schedule Agricultural Lots held under Block Government Lease which contain the restriction that no structures are allowed to be erected without prior approval of the Government.
  - (b) The northeast corner of the Site encroaches onto the “V” zone for three recognized villages, namely Tsing Chuen Wai, Tuen Tsz Wai

and San Hing Tsuen (**Plan Z-2**). Besides, the entire Site falls within the 'VE' of aforesaid recognized villages. Under the prevailing policy, land within 'VE' or "V" zone for recognized villages should be retained primarily for applications under the SH Policy. Non SH Policy land exchanges would not normally be accepted.

- (c) The applicant has not provided the source of information about the site area. There is no guarantee that the site area is accepted.
- (d) The Site is not the subject of any SH application approved/ under processing.
- (e) The proposed development will be in breach of the lease conditions governing the lots. If the planning approval is given, the land owner is required to apply for a land exchange to effect the proposal. Such application will be considered by LandsD acting in its capacity as the landlord at its own discretion and there is no guarantee that the land exchange application for the proposed development will be approved. In the event that the land exchange application is approved, it would be subject to such terms and conditions including, among others, the payment of premium and administrative fee as may be imposed by LandsD.
- (f) LandsD reserves the right to take enforcement actions as may be considered appropriate against any unauthorized occupation of Government land and any unauthorized erection or extensions or alterations of structures that may be found on the Site irrespective of whether planning permission will be given or not.

### **Environment**

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

- (a) The applicant has submitted an EA and SIA (**Annexes D and E of Appendix Ia**) to support the application. He has no adverse comment on the application.
- (b) While he has no adverse comment to the application from noise perspective, should the application be approved, a Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) submission clause should be imposed in the land exchange application. The applicant should be required to submit a NIA report at the General Building Plan submission stage and to provide noise mitigation measures to achieve 100% compliance with the noise criteria of the HKPSG including road traffic noise standard as committed by the applicant in the EA.

### **Traffic**

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



She has no adverse comment on the application subject to the following to be considered in detailed design stage:

- (a) the applicant should review and update the vehicular access and internal driveway arrangement and should seek comments from relevant government departments to address the respective departmental requirements, e.g. queuing outside the vehicular access should be avoided as appropriate as it would cause traffic lane blockage of adjacent roads; and
- (b) the applicant should consider providing more motorcycle (MC) parking spaces inside the proposed development as appropriate, given the increasing trend of MC parking demand and they are small in size and are easily allocated inside the carpark or in vicinity to internal driveway.

### **Urban Design and Landscape**

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

The proposed development consists of two towers with 26 storeys (excluding three levels of basement car park) (about 99.9 mPD) which are about 766% higher than adjacent village type developments with three domestic storeys. It is undesirable from visual impact point of view and may not be compatible to adjacent village type developments.

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

#### **Urban Design and Visual**

- (a) The Site is mainly surrounded by low-rise village type developments, and hence the proposed development would be visually prominent in the existing rural setting. However, according to the VIA (**Annex B of Appendix Ia**) (**Drawings Z-17 to Z-19**), the proposed development, abutting the planned public housing development at SHR site with a maximum BH of 160 mPD, is considered not particularly out-of-context. The proposed residential towers with a BH of 100 mPD would become part of the high-rise buildings cluster. As such, it is unlikely that the proposed development would impose any significant visual impact in the wider context.

#### **Landscape**

- (b) With reference to the aerial photo of 2021, the Site is situated in an area of miscellaneous rural fringe landscape character predominated by villages, open storages and small sized tree groups. The applied use is considered not incompatible to the landscape character of the surrounding area. The Site is currently occupied by a warehouse and hard paved with no significant vegetation observed within the

Site, and only a small scrubland with a few trees were observed at the western boundary directly outside the Site.

- (c) It is noted that not less than 788 m<sup>2</sup> of open space would be provided within the proposed development for estimate population of 778 people, including recreational facilities such as swimming pool, water features, kids play area and trellis (**Drawings Z-9 to Z-11**). Both at grade plantings and podium planting were proposed around the Site while heavy standard new trees and bamboos were also proposed along the site boundary and building edge. In view that significant adverse landscape impact arising from the applied use is not envisaged, she has no objection to the application from landscape planning perspective. Other detailed comments are at **Appendix IV**.

### **Air Ventilation**

#### 9.1.6 Comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

The development scheme does not fall within the categories of the projects requiring AVA and hence AVA is considered not necessary.

### **Fire Safety**

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

He has no objection in principle to the application subject to water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations being provided to his satisfaction. Other detailed comments are at **Appendix IV**.

### **Building Matters**

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

His office has no in-principle objection under the Building Ordinance (BO) on the application but he draws the applicant's attention to the following points:

- (a) the Site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street and emergency vehicular access in accordance with Regulations 5 and 41D of the Building (Planning) Regulations [B(P)R] respectively; and
- (b) detailed comments under the BO will be provided at the building plan submission stage. Other detailed comments are at **Appendix IV**.

### **Others**

- 9.1.9 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Housing Projects 2, Civil Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CE/HP2, CEO, CEDD):

His office is undertaking the Agreement No. CE 39/2021 (CE) titled “Site Formation and Infrastructure Works for Public Housing Development at San Hing Road and Hong Po Road, Tuen Mun and Choi Shun Street Sheung Shui – Investigation, Design and Construction” for the site formation and infrastructure works for SHR and HPR public housing development which is located at very close proximity to the Site. As the applicant has taken into account the concerned public housing development in various technical assessments, his office has no adverse comments on the application.

- 9.2 The following departments have no comment on the application:

- (a) Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD);
- (b) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS);
- (c) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC);
- (d) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH);
- (e) Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM(W), CEDD);
- (f) Director of Housing (D of Housing);
- (g) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD);
- (h) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highway Department (CHE/NTW, HyD);
- (i) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS);
- (j) Director of Social Welfare Department (DSW); and
- (k) District Officer (Tuen Mun), Home Affairs Department (DO(TM), HAD).

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

- 10.1 The application was published for public comment on 3.12.2021 and subsequently relevant FIs submitted by the applicant were published eight times for public comments. During the statutory publication periods, a total of 42 public comments were received and all raised objecting comments to the application. A full set of the public comments is deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection.
- 10.2 Among the 42 public comments, 27 comments were submitted by indigenous inhabitant representative/village representative/villagers of San Hing Tsuen in the form of two types of standard letters with one attaching number of signatures (samples at **Appendices V-1 and V-2**). Five comments were submitted by a Tuen Mun District Council member (sample at **Appendix V-3**) and the remaining ten comments were submitted by individuals, including a tenant and a worker of the Site (samples at **Appendices V-4 to V-7**). Their major views are summarised as follows:

- (a) the proposed BH under the indicative scheme is excessive and not compatible with the surroundings which are mainly village houses. The proposed development will induce adverse visual and air ventilation impacts and cause wall effect. The proposed two tall residential blocks will also affect the *fung shui* of San Hing Tsuen;
- (b) the proposed development would affect the views of the ridgelines of Castle Peak;
- (c) the existing road network of the area is already saturated. Further increase in population without adequate traffic improvement measures will overload the existing road networks and public transport services and accelerate shortage in parking spaces and illegal on-street parking problems;
- (d) adverse air, dust and noise impacts are expected during the construction phases. Piling works will pose risk to the structural safety of the village houses adjoining the Site and the frequent access of construction vehicles will cause pedestrian safety issue;
- (e) the existing community and supporting facilities in the area are insufficient to cater for the needs of the additional population; and
- (f) the current business operation at the Site will be affected, causing financial loss to the tenant.

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

- 11.1 The application is for rezoning the Site from “R(E)” and “V” to “R(A)1” to facilitate a high-density residential development. The applicant proposes that the new “R(A)1” zone should be subject to a maximum PR of 5 and a maximum BH of 100mPD. The proposed Remarks for the “R(A)1” zone under the Notes of “R(A)” zone of the OZP is at **Appendix II**.
- 11.2 According to the indicative scheme (**Drawings Z-1 to Z-11**), the proposed residential development is subject to a maximum domestic PR and BH of not more than 5 and 100mPD respectively comprising two residential blocks of 29 storeys (including three levels of basement car park) providing a total of 288 flats. The development is targeted for completion by 2026.

### Land Use Compatibility

- 11.3 The Site is located in the southern fringe of Lam Tei and Yick Yue planning area which is undergoing transformation in both land use and planning context. To the north and east of the Site are predominately low-rise village type developments and San Hing Tsuen intermixed with some brownfield operations while to the west and south is the planned high-rise SHR and HPR public housing development with Tuen Mun New Town to the further south. Two applications (No. Y/TM-LTYT/9 and A/TM-LTYT/426) for proposed residential development with respective maximum PRs of 2.5 and 5 and maximum BHs of 8 storeys (35mPD) and 19 storeys (64.45mPD) agreed/approved by the Committee on 24.9.2021 and 19.5.2023 are located to the further east of the Site near Castle Peak Road (**Plan Z-1a**). Given

the above context, the proposed residential development at the Site is considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses.

Development Intensity

- 11.4 The applicant proposes that the new “R(A)1” zone for the Site should be subject to a maximum PR of 5 and a maximum BH of 100mPD. Compared to the planned SHR and HPR public housing development located to the south and west of the Site, which is mainly zoned “R(A)” subject to a maximum PR of 6.5, the proposed PR of 5 under the indicative scheme is considered not unacceptable while optimises the use of land resources.
- 11.5 Regarding the proposed BH under the indicative scheme, CA/CMD2, ArchSD considers that the development is undesirable from visual impact point of view and may not be compatible to adjacent village type developments. According to the VIA, the proposed development would have slightly adverse impact from a selected public viewing point with close distance to the Site. The applicant proposed a maximum BH of 100mPD to create a stepped BH profile with the adjacent developments with a maximum BH of 160mPD and also a more visually interesting environment for the area. As aforementioned, the land use and planning context of the surrounding areas has been changing, in particular with more medium to high-density residential developments planned. In this regard, CTP/UD&L, PlanD considers that the proposed development abutting the planned SHR and HPR public housing site is considered not particularly out-of-context. The proposed residential towers with a BH of 100mPD would become part of the high-rise buildings cluster and also create a stepped BH profile along Castle Peak Road – Lam Tei allowing gradual transition from the high-rise public housing developments in the west to the low-rise rural settlements in the north and east (**Plan Z-5**). Overall, the proposed PR and BH are considered generally not incompatible with the existing and planned developments in the area.

Open Space and Landscape

- 11.6 According to the indicative LMPs (**Drawings Z-9 to Z-11**), not less than 778 m<sup>2</sup> private open space will be provided at the Site and a total of 21 new trees and screening planting will be provided to enhance greenery and to minimise the potential visual impact to the surrounding areas. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no adverse comment on the proposed scheme from landscape planning perspective.

Environmental and Other Technical Considerations

- 11.7 The applicant has submitted various technical assessments (**Appendix Ia**) to demonstrate that the proposed development is technically feasible and would not result in adverse environmental and technical impacts as detailed in the departmental comments in paragraph 9 above.
- 11.8 On environmental aspect, the proposed development would adopt environmentally sensitive design including building setback, podium setting and acoustic balcony with sound adoptive materials to reduce potential traffic noise and vehicular emissions from SHR. DEP has no adverse comment on the application and advises that the requirement of NIA submission should be imposed in the land

exchange and general building plan submission stages to ensure full compliance with the noise criteria under HKPSG. During the construction phase of the proposed development, relevant requirement of dust control regulation and site good practices will be observed and followed.

- 11.9 The Site is currently occupied by warehouse which has I/R interface problem with the adjacent residential and village type developments (**Plans Z-2 and Z-3**). The proposed development would help phase out the existing brownfield operations and improve the general environment of the area. Besides, the proposed crucified air paths and building setback in the proposed development would enhance the wind penetration of the area.
- 11.10 On traffic aspect, the proposed car parking and loading/unloading spaces are provided in compliance with the requirements under HKPSG in which a high-end provision of private car parking spaces is adopted. Morning peak hours shuttle service is proposed to serve the future residents an easy access to the MTR Siu Hong Station and at the same time to minimise the impact to the existing GMB services in the area (**Drawing Z-15**). C for T has no adverse comment on the TIA submitted. Besides, a possible pedestrian connection and an open piazza along SHR are proposed with a view to enhancing connectivity, streetscape and visual amenity of SHR.
- 11.11 On archaeological aspect, ES(A&M), AMO has no in-principle objection to the application provided that an AIA, including an archaeological field investigation as part of the AIA, be conducted to assess the archaeological impact arising from the proposed development prior to the commencement of excavation works as recommended by the PAIA.
- 11.12 Other relevant government departments including CE/MN, DSD, CE/C, WSD and D of FS have no adverse comment on or no objection to the application. Since the applicant indicated that the technical assessments have already taken into account the SHR and HPR public housing developments, CE/HP2, CEDD and D of Housing have no comment on the application in this regard. Should the rezoning application be approved by the Committee, the proposed design features and mitigation measures would be subject to further scrutiny at the subsequent lands administration and detailed design and implementation stages.

Previous Application

- 11.13 A previous approval for residential development has been granted to the Site in 2016, approval of the current application is in line with the Committee's previous decision.

Public Comments

- 11.14 There were 42 public comments received during the statutory publication periods as summarised in paragraph 10 above. The major grounds of objections/adverse comments are related to traffic, environmental and visual impacts. The planning considerations and assessments in paragraphs 11.1 to 11.12 above are relevant.

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

12.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 above and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 10 above, the Planning Department has no in-principle objection to the application.

12.2 Should the Committee decide to agree/partially agree to the application, the relevant proposed amendment to the OZP, together with the revised Notes, and Explanatory Statement, will be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance when opportunity arises.

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

the site is located in an area predominantly rural in character. There is no strong justification to rezone the Site from "R(E)" and "V" to "R(A)1". The current "R(E)" and "V" zoning for the Site are considered appropriate.

## **13. Decision Sought**

13.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to agree, partially agree, or not to agree to the application.

13.2 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.

## **14. Attachments**

<b>Appendix I</b>	Application Form received on 24.11.2021
<b>Appendix Ia</b>	FI received on 4.7.2023
<b>Appendix II</b>	Proposed Remarks of the "R(A)1" Sub-Area
<b>Appendix III</b>	Previous s.16 Applications
<b>Appendix IV</b>	Detailed Departmental Comments
<b>Appendices V-1 to V-7</b>	Samples of Public Comments Received During the Statutory Publication Periods
<b>Drawing Z-1</b>	Schematic Master Layout Plan
<b>Drawing Z-2</b>	Basement Floor Plan
<b>Drawing Z-3</b>	Ground Floor Plan
<b>Drawing Z-4 and Z-5</b>	Floor Plans
<b>Drawing Z-6 and Z-7</b>	Section Plans
<b>Drawing Z-8</b>	Front Elevation
<b>Drawing Z-9 to Z-11</b>	Landscape Master Plans
<b>Drawing Z-12</b>	Open Space Diagram
<b>Drawing Z-13 and Z-14</b>	Vehicular Ingress and Egress Route
<b>Drawing Z-15</b>	Proposed Shuttle Service Route
<b>Drawing Z-16</b>	Wind Passage Plan
<b>Drawing Z-17 to 19</b>	Photomontages

<b>Plan Z-1a</b>	Location Plan
<b>Plan Z-1b</b>	Previous Applications Plan
<b>Plan Z-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plan Z-3</b>	Aerial Photo
<b>Plans Z-4a to Z-4b</b>	Site Photos
<b>Plan Z-5</b>	BH Profile for Residential Sites in the Vicinity of the Proposed Residential Developments

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
JULY 2023**