

# **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**TPB Paper No. 11001**

**For Consideration by  
the Town Planning Board on 21.3.2025**

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/YL-NSW/293  
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development with Commercial Uses  
and Social Welfare Facilities  
in “Undetermined” Zone**

**Various Lots in D.D. 103 and D.D. 115, Nam Sang Wai, Yuen Long**

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/YL-NSW/293**  
**UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development with Commercial Uses  
and Social Welfare Facilities  
in “Undetermined” Zone,  
Various Lots in D.D. 103 and D.D. 115, Nam Sang Wai, Yuen Long**

**1. Background**

*Section 16 application No. A/YL-NSW/293*

- 1.1 On 6.10.2021, the applicants, Top Field International Limited and Ideal Ace International Limited, submitted the subject application under the Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) to seek permission for proposed comprehensive residential development with commercial uses and social welfare facilities at the application site (the Site), with an area of about 53,584m<sup>2</sup>, which currently falls within an area zoned “Undetermined” (“U”) on the draft Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP) No. S/YL-NSW/9 (**Plan R-1**)<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.2 On 3.2.2023, the RNTPC of the Board decided to reject the application for the following reason:
- the “U” zone was one of the potential sites for public housing development in the short to medium term which was subject to the findings of the on-going Study<sup>2</sup> by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The encroachment of the proposed development onto the public housing site would jeopardise the government intention and development potential for public housing development at Tung Shing Lei. Subject to the findings of the Study, the “U” zone would be comprehensively reviewed and the approval of the application would undermine the comprehensive planning of the “U” zone.
- 1.3 For Members’ reference, the following documents are attached:
- (a) RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NSW/293A (Annex A)
  - (b) Extract of minutes of the RNTPC Meeting held on 3.2.2023 (Annex B)

---

<sup>1</sup> The Site was zoned “U” on the approved Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-NSW/8 at the time of submission in 2021 and consideration by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 3.2.2023. There is no change to the zoning of the Site on the current OZP.

<sup>2</sup> “Agreement No. CE 55/2020 (CE) – Site Formation and Infrastructure Works for Housing Developments at Tung Shing Lei, Au Tau, Kam Tin and Yuen Long Tai Yuk Road, Yuen Long – Feasibility Study” (the Study) for the subject “U” zone.

(c) Secretary of the Board's letter dated 17.2.2023

(Annex C)

Latest Planning Circumstances

- 1.4 According to the 2017 Policy Address, the subject "U" zone in Tung Shing Lei (TSL) (**Plan R-1**) is one of the potential sites for public housing development in the short to medium term.
- 1.5 In March 2021, CEDD commenced the Study to ascertain the optimal development intensity of potential public housing development, which was originally targeted for completion by end 2023. Given the various technical issues that need to be resolved, the Study is still on-going and anticipated to be completed by 2025. According to the latest findings of the Study, the Site encroaches a minor portion (for about 15%) of the potential public housing development site.
- 1.6 In light of the Government's re-prioritization exercise as announced in the Budget 2024-25 in 2024, there is currently no implementation programme of the said potential TSL public housing development.

**2. Application for Review**

- 2.1 On 20.2.2023, the applicants applied, under Section 17(1) of the Ordinance, for a review of the RNTPC's decision to reject the application (**Annex D**). In support of the review application, the applicants have submitted the following documents:
- (a) Further Information (FI) received on 24.12.2024<sup>3</sup> indicating (**Annex E**) the intention to pursue the original scheme submitted at the Section 16 application stage\*
  - (b) FI received on 28.1.2025 to clarify the anticipated (**Annex F**) completion of the proposed development<sup>#</sup>
  - (c) FI received on 14.3.2025 to provide further justifications as (**Annex G**) detailed in paragraph 3.1 and relevant drawings<sup>#</sup>

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

*# accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirements*

- 2.2 Compared with the Section 16 application, there is no change to the development scheme and major development parameters for the proposed development. The Site is bisected by the viaduct of MTR Tuen Ma Line (TML) into the Northern Site and Southern Site. The proposed development has a total PR of 3.028 comprising 14 residential towers with a building height (BH) of up to 44 storeys (above 1-2 basement storeys) providing a total of 3,556 units and nine houses with a BH of 2-3 storeys (above 1 basement storey). A one-storey retail podium for shop and services and eating place is proposed at Towers 8 and 9 in the Northern

---

<sup>3</sup> Eight FIs were received from the applicants on 29.3.2023, 7.6.2023 & 13.6.2023, 10.8.2023, 24.10.2023, 8.1.2024, 8.3.2024<sup>#</sup>, 23.5.2024<sup>#</sup> and 22.10.2024<sup>#</sup> in support of the Section 17 application. All eight FIs have been superseded by the FI received on 14.3.2025 (**Annex G**) and hence, they are not attached to this paper. (<sup>#</sup>exempted from publication requirement).

Site. The 14 towers are arranged in a 3-tier stepped profile descending from 44 storeys (139mPD) at the west to 26-31 storeys (91.6-112.8mPD) at the south, and with low-rise houses of 2-3 storeys (12-15mPD) at the east (**Drawings R-1 to R-4**), creating a transition between the high density Yuen Long New Town to its west and the low-to-medium density development at Kam Tin North to its east. A two-storey clubhouse block (above a basement storey) is proposed at the Northern Site (**Drawing R-2**) and a one-storey clubhouse podium is proposed below Towers 13 and 14 in the Southern Site (**Drawing R-4**).

2.3 An Egretty Preservation Zone comprising an eco-lake of about 10,600m<sup>2</sup> with wetland habitat and a landscape area to minimise the potential disturbance to the known birds' flight paths (**Drawing R-10**) is proposed at the northeastern corner of the Site as a feeding ground for migratory birds and as an ecological and visual buffer between the Egretty and the residential portion of the development (**Drawing R-1**). Social welfare facilities including a Neighbourhood Elderly Centre (NEC) and one team of Home Care Services for Frail Elderly Persons (HCSFEP) will also be provided in the proposed development. To mitigate the potential air quality and noise impacts arising from Yuen Long Highway, chimney emission from Pok Oi Hospital, traffic and railway noise as well as fixed noise from the surrounding brownfield operations, a setback of 20m from Yuen Long Highway, a setback of 5m from local distributors and a buffer distance of 200m from the chimney are proposed in the development layout (**Drawing R-8**). An underground Sewage Treatment Plant with tertiary treatment technology is proposed at the Northern Site (**Drawing R-1**), and with the implementation of which no net increase in pollution load to Deep Bay is anticipated. A proposed access road of not-less-than 7.3m wide single two-lane carriageway with a 2.5m wide footpath along the eastern kerbside of the carriageway will be provided (**Drawing R-9**). The proposed development is tentatively scheduled for completion by 2030.

2.4 The Master Layout Plan (MLP), section plans and Landscape Master Plan (LMP) of the proposed development are at **Drawings R-1 to R-7** respectively. Major development parameters of the proposed development are as follows:

Major Development Parameters	Proposed Development
<b>Site Area (about)</b>	53,584m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Total PR (about)</b>	3.028
- Domestic (about)	2.928
- Non-domestic (about)	0.10
<b>Total Gross Floor Area (GFA) (about)</b>	not more than 162,238m <sup>2</sup>
- Domestic (about)	not more than 156,880m <sup>2</sup>
- Non-domestic (about) <sup>(1)</sup>	
- Eating place / Shop & Services	not more than 5,358m <sup>2</sup>
- NEC	not less than 328m <sup>2</sup> (NOFA)
- One team of HCSFEP	not less than 142m <sup>2</sup> (NOFA)
<b>Building Height</b>	
- Residential Towers <sup>(2)</sup>	26-44 storeys (91.6-139mPD) (above 1-2 basement storeys)

Major Development Parameters	Proposed Development
- Houses	2-3 storeys (12-15mPD) (above 1 basement storey)
<b>Overall Site Coverage (about)</b>	18%
<b>No. of Blocks</b>	14 residential towers and 9 houses
<b>No. of Units</b>	3,556 flats and 9 houses
<b>Average Unit Size (about)</b>	44.1m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Anticipated Population (about)</b>	10,330
<b>Clubhouses</b>	
- No. of Clubhouses	2
- GFA (about) <sup>(3)</sup>	2,920m <sup>2</sup> (2-storey block) 1,000m <sup>2</sup> (1-storey podium at Towers 13 & 14)
<b>Open Space</b>	
- Local Open Space	Not less than 10,330m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Transport Facilities</b>	
- Private Car Parking Spaces	746 (incl. 10 accessible car parking spaces)
- Visitor Car Parking Spaces	70
- Motorcycle Parking Spaces	41
- Bicycle Parking Spaces	475
- Loading/Unloading Spaces for Goods Vehicle (L/UL)	21 (incl. 5 Light Goods Vehicles (LGVs) and 16 Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs))

- (1) Non-domestic uses include eating place and shop and services uses. The GFA of social welfare facilities (a NEC of NOFA of 328m<sup>2</sup> (or equivalent to GFA of about 667m<sup>2</sup>) and one team of HCSFEP of NOFA of 142m<sup>2</sup> (or equivalent to GFA of about 312m<sup>2</sup>), are proposed to be exempted from the GFA calculation subject to the approval of the Building Authority (BA).
- (2) The BH of Towers 1 to 9 include 1 storey of refuge floor; Towers 8 to 9 include 1 storey of retail podium; and Towers 13 to 14 include 1 storey of clubhouse.
- (3) Clubhouse GFA is assumed to be exempted from GFA calculation subject to the approval of the BA.

2.5 The applicants have submitted relevant technical assessments, including Environmental Assessment (EA), Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA), Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA), Landscape Proposal (LP), Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA), Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), Water Supply Impact Assessment (WSIA) and Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR), in support of the Section 16 application and the findings of the above technical assessments, which are still valid in support of the review application, conclude that the proposed development would not be subject to nor generate adverse impact from/to the surrounding areas.

2.6 On 22.3.2024 and 23.8.2024, the Board agreed to the applicants' requests to defer making a decision on the review application for two months each.

### **3. Justifications from the Applicants**

3.1 The justifications put forth by the applicants in support of the review application are detailed in Appendices I to Ia at **Annex A** and summarized at **Annex A**. Additional justifications submitted under the Section 17 review application are at **Annex E** and **Annex G**. The additional justifications can be summarised as follows:

- (a) The proposed development aims to optimise land resources at a highly convenient location next to Yuen Long New Town for private housing purpose. Majority of the Site is owned by the applicants while remaining lots will be under joint implementation. The proposed development could be readily implemented and contribute 3,565 private housing units and 9 houses in short to medium term, upon approval given by the Board. Early implementation of the proposed development by private initiatives can unlock the development potential of the remaining part of the TSL “U” zone.
- (b) In recognition of the ecological assets, a proactive preservation approach and sensitive design have been adopted in the formation of the layout of the proposed development. An Eco-lake of more than 1 ha and low-rise houses are proposed at the northeastern portion of the Site to minimise the potential disturbance to the known birds’ flight path. Besides, social welfare facilities including a NEC and one team of HCSFEP will also be provided in the proposed development to serve the community.
- (c) Relevant government departments have no objection to the submitted technical assessments during the Section 16 application stage, which demonstrates that the proposed development is technically feasible from traffic, environmental, sewerage, drainage, water supply, ecological, visual, landscape, air ventilation and geotechnical aspects. The proposed development will not incur any insurmountable impacts on the surrounding areas with appropriate mitigation measures implemented.
- (d) The proposed development is a comprehensively planned rather than a piecemeal one. It would not undermine the comprehensive development of the “U” zone as a whole, but could spearhead the development therein without compromising the development potential of the remaining areas.

### **4. The Section 16 Application**

#### **The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans R-1 to R-4c)**

4.1 The situation of the Site and its surrounding areas at the time of consideration of the Section 16 application by the RNTPC are described in paragraph 7 of **Annex A**. There have been some changes in the planned developments of the area and spatial context of the surrounding areas since the consideration of the application by the RNTPC in early 2023.

4.2 The Site is:

- (a) currently accessible via Yuen Long Tung Shing Lei Road which connects with Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long;
- (b) bisected into two portions by the viaduct of MTR TML and a group of Grade 3 Historic Buildings (Lau Village Houses);
- (c) the northern portion is largely occupied by ponds with grassland, vehicle repair workshop and residential dwellings; and
- (d) the southern portion comprises grassland and residential dwellings.

4.3 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) to its immediate north is Yuen Long Highway (YLH). Further north across YLH are a site which has been rezoned to “Residential (Group A)1” (“R(A)1”), “Residential (Group A)2” (“R(A)2”), and “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Pumping Station” in 2024 to facilitate a proposed Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS) development for public and private housing development at Ho Chau Road<sup>4</sup> with a total of 3,129 flats. Further northwest is a site under construction with an approved application (A/YL-NSW/274) for residential and community hub development with a PR of 2.29 and maximum BH of 75mPD for 1,518 flats (**Plan R-1**);
- (b) to its immediate east is grassland. Further northeast across YLH is a Towngas Offtake and Piggling Station;
- (c) to its immediate south are some scattered residential dwellings and a knoll zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) with permitted burial ground. To its further south are brownfield operations, shop and services and a church; and
- (d) to its west are some brownfield operations, pond, residential dwellings, plant nurseries, grassland and vacant land, a hotel and a church.

Planning Intention

- 4.4 The “U” zone is subject to impacts from Castle Peak Road, YLH, MTR TML and Yuen Long Bypass Floodway (YLBF). Under the “U” zone, any developments or redevelopments require planning permission from the Board so as to ensure the environment would not be adversely affected and that infrastructure, GIC facilities, and open space are adequately provided. The proposed development should also take into account the TML and YLBF. To realise a built-form which represents a transition from Yuen Long New Town to the rural area, the development intensity should take into account the urban type developments immediately to the west of the “U” zone and the rural characteristics of the area to its north. Development within the areas has to be comprehensively planned

---

<sup>4</sup> Under the proposed LSPS development, the site is subject to a maximum GFA of 95,100m<sup>2</sup> and maximum BH of 100mPD (for “R(A)1”) and maximum domestic GFA of 50,179m<sup>2</sup>, maximum non-domestic GFA of 2,245m<sup>2</sup> and maximum BH of 100mPD (for “R(A)2”).

as piecemeal development or redevelopment would have the effect of degrading the environment and thus jeopardising the long-term planning intention of the areas.

- 4.5 The Site falls within an area zoned “U” on the approved Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-NSW/8 during the Section 16 application stage and at the time when the review application was submitted. There is no change to the “U” zone on the current OZP (i.e. No. S/YL-NSW/9).

#### Previous Application

- 4.6 There is no previous application covering the Site.

#### Similar Applications

- 4.7 There are 10 similar applications for residential developments (No. A/YL-NSW/5, 7, 10, 15, 73, 105, 172, 224, 233 and 274) within the “U” zones as mentioned in paragraph 6 of **Annex A**. Except Application No. A/YL-NSW/15 and Applications No. A/YL-NSW/172, 224, 233 and 274 (on same site) were approved, the remaining applications (No. A/YL-NSW/5, 7, 10, 73 and 105) were rejected. Details of these applications are summarised at **Annex H** and their locations are shown on **Plan R-1**.

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

- 5.1 Comments on the Section 16 application made by the relevant government departments are stated in paragraph 9 of **Annex A**. Their advisory comments, if any, are in Appendix IV of **Annex A** and recapped in **Annex J**.
- 5.2 For the review application, the following relevant government departments have been further consulted. All maintain their previous views on the Section 16 application of no objection to/no adverse comment on the application (except Director of Housing (D of Housing) who objected to the Section 16 application) and have no further comments on the review application except D of Housing, Commissioner for Transport (C for T), Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) and Director of Social Welfare (DSW). Their views on the review application are summarised as follows:

#### **Public Housing Development in TSL**

##### **5.2.1 Comments of D of Housing:**

No objection to the review application in view of the latest circumstance where there is no implementation programme of the TSL public housing development.



## **Traffic**

### 5.2.2 Comments of C for T:

- (a) No adverse comment on the review application from traffic engineering perspective.
- (b) It is noted that there is no implementation programme of the potential TSL public housing development. Based on the TIA submitted under Section 16 application stage, we observe that the traffic impact arising from the proposed redevelopment to the adjacent road network within the Area of Influence would be acceptable. The TIA also indicates that the development proposal would provide parking and loading / unloading facilities within the proposed redevelopment in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines.
- (c) Requirements should be imposed as planning approval conditions, including but not limited to the following:
  - (i) the design and provision of vehicular access, including but not limited to the access road between development site and Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long, to the satisfaction of the C for T and the Director of Highways or of the Board;
  - (ii) the design and provision of vehicle parking and loading/unloading facilities for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the C for T or of the Board; and
  - (iii) the submission of a revised TIA and implementation of the road improvement works identified therein to the satisfaction of the C for T and the Director of Highways or of the Board

## **Environment**

### 5.2.3 Comments of DEP:

- (a) No objection to the review application from environmental planning perspective.
- (b) Should the Board consider that the application is acceptable, the following conditions should be incorporated:
  - (i) the submission of a revised noise impact assessment and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the DEP or of the Board; and
  - (ii) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment and implementation of the measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the DEP or of the Board.

- (c) In light of the amendments to the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO) which took effect on 30.6.2023, the proposed development will no longer constitute a designated project under Item P.2<sup>5</sup>, Part 1 in Schedule 2 of the EIAO and an Environmental Permit is not required for the construction and operation of the proposed development. Hence, the advisory clause that was originally included in the RNTPC paper for the Section 16 application (Appendix IV of **Annex A**) is no longer applicable.

### **Social Welfare Facilities**

#### 5.2.4 Comments of DSW:

- (a) after thoroughly reviewing the progress of planned projects, existing and projected demand of subvented home-based Community Care Services and the addition provision of Community Care Service Voucher Scheme for the Elderly as promulgated under 2024 budget speech, it is proposed that the original bid of one team of HCSFEP (2-team size non-kitchen based) at the Site to be withdrawn; and
- (b) he has no comment from social welfare perspective on the applicants' proposed plan to operate the HCSFEP in self-financing mode at the Site, providing that it should have no financial implication, both capital and recurrent, to Social Welfare Department.

## **6. Public Comments on the Review Application Received During Statutory Publication Period**

- 6.1 The review application and the FIs were published for public inspection. During the public inspection periods, a total of 124 public comments were received, including 11 supporting, 101 objecting to/raising concerns on and 12 expressing views on the review application. Full set of the public comments is enclosed in **Annexes I(1) to I(3)**. Their major views are summarised as follow:

### **Supporting**

- 6.2 The 11 supporting comments were submitted by individuals. The main supporting reasons are summarised as follows:
- (a) The proposed development which can release development potential of the underutilised land should be approved with approval conditions.
  - (b) Private housing developments should be allowed while the land use review is not yet completed. Both private and public housing developments can be developed in the area.

---

<sup>5</sup> Item P.2, Part 1 in Schedule 2 of the EIAO, i.e. a residential development (a) of not less than 2,000 flats; and (b) not served by public sewerage networks by the time a flat is occupied, was repealed following the amendments to the EIAO which took effect on 30.6.2023.

- (c) The proposed development can improve the existing environment at Tung Shing Lei.

Objecting / Raising Concerns

- 6.3 The 101 comments raising objection/concerns were from Tung Shing Lane Village Residents' Welfare Association; 2 green groups (viz. The Conservancy Association and Hong Kong Bird Watching Society) and individuals. Their major views are summarised as follows:

*Adverse ecological impacts*

- (a) The proposed development would reduce the area of fish ponds in the area and have adverse impacts on the ecological value and the natural environment.
- (b) The proposed development would obstruct bird's flight lines and the effectiveness of the mitigation measures proposed are in doubt. The development scale would deteriorate the quality of the habitats in the area and have adverse ecological impact on ardeid breeding colony.
- (c) The proposed development would cause direct loss in wetland habitats and the proposed development would increase pollution loading of Deep Bay area.
- (d) Various applications for development projects in the Wetland Buffer Area have been approved recently. Cumulative impacts to the adjacent ecologically sensitive areas need to be carefully assessed.

*Others*

- (e) The proposed development would jeopardise the public housing development and public housing should be provided in the proposed development to address the huge demand.
- (f) The proposed development is not in line with planning intention and incompatible with surrounding rural environment. Approval of which would set an undesirable precedent for other similar developments.
- (g) The proposed development would induce adverse traffic impacts; overload the MTR TML; and adversely affect the operation of Pok Oi Hospital.
- (h) Some local residents would need to be relocated and living style of local residents would be affected. Besides, the proposal will involve removal of graves and use of area zoned "Green Belt" for access road which affect existing old trees should not be supported.
- (i) Supporting facilities in Yuen Long are inadequate to support additional developments.

- (j) The environment of the nearby graded buildings at Tung Shing Lei would be affected.
- (k) There is strong demand in public housing and the demand for private housing is significantly reduced.

Expressing views

- 6.4 The remaining 12 comments were from Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation and individuals expressing views mainly on that the land ownership within the Site is unclear; the Board should consider whether the proposal would be compatible with the locality; all the potential impacts brought by the proposed development should be considered; the consideration of application should not be frozen by the land use review; the overall development intensity of the proposed development should be compared with the completed Long Sin Estate on the opposite side of Castle Peak Road; and the current environment of the area is good and shall be maintained.
- 6.5 At the stage of Section 16 application, 256 public comments were received, including 37 supporting and 219 objecting to or raising concerns on the application. The summary of the comments are in paragraph 10 of **Annex A**.

**7. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 7.1 The application is for a review of RNTPC's decision on 3.2.2023 to reject the application for proposed comprehensive residential development with commercial uses and social welfare facilities at the Site zoned "U". The application was rejected for the reason stated in paragraph 1.2 above.
- 7.2 The development proposals as summarised in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.5 above, as well as its supporting technical assessments and justifications submitted by the applicants under the Section 16 application remain unchanged. Additional justifications put forth by the applicants are summarised in paragraph 3.1 above.

The Proposed Development (**Drawings R-1 to R-7**)

- 7.3 The proposed comprehensive residential development with a total PR of 3.028 comprises 14 residential towers (26-44 storeys above basement storeys) providing 3,556 flats, 9 houses (2-3 storeys above basement storey), with a domestic GFA of 156,880m<sup>2</sup>, and non-domestic GFA of 5,358m<sup>2</sup>. An Eco-lake of about 10,600m<sup>2</sup>, commercial uses including shop and services and eating place, as well as social welfare facilities including a NEC and one team of HCSFEP will also be provided in the proposed development.

Planning Intention and the Latest Planning Circumstances

- 7.4 The Site forms part of a larger area which has been zoned "U" on the OZP (**Plan R-1**) since 1994. According to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, the area

was so designated as several major transport and drainage projects, including Yuen Long Highway, TML and YLBF, which were under planning at that time, would traverse the area. Development within the area has to be comprehensively planned as piecemeal development or redevelopment would have the effect of degrading the environment and thus jeopardising the long-term planning intention of the area. While TML and YLBF have been completed, the remaining area at the “U” zone is subject to review.

- 7.5 As announced in the 2017 Policy Address, the subject “U” zone is identified as one of the potential sites for public housing development of short to medium term for which there was no indication on the boundary or area involved. The Study for the TSL potential public housing development subsequently commenced in March 2021 with target completion by end 2023. When the Section 16 application was considered by RNTPC in February 2023, there was a more concrete plan for the TSL public housing development and hence, D of Housing raised objection to the Section 16 application as the proposed development would jeopardise the development potential of TSL public housing development. As announced in the 2024 Policy Address and reinforced in the 2025-26 Budget, the Government has identified sufficient land for meeting the public housing supply target over the next ten years, and coupled with the Government’s re-prioritisation exercise in 2024, there is currently no implementation programme of the potential TSL public housing development. Also, the completion of the Study is anticipated to be by end 2025 given various technical issues to be resolved. D of Housing has no objection to the review application in view of the latest circumstances.
- 7.6 Given the change in planning circumstances, there is scope to revisit the planning and development of the “U” zone. According to the applicants, the proposed development is ready for implementation upon approval by the Board, as the majority of the Site is owned by the applicants and the technical feasibility of the proposed development has also been demonstrated, and relevant government departments express no objection to/no adverse comments on the application from technical perspectives. For more efficient utilisation of land resources, consideration could be given to tapping into the private initiatives for early unleashing of the development potential of part of the “U” zone. The proposed development, if approved by the Board, could be implemented in short term and is anticipated to be completed in 2030, providing some 3,600 private flats with social welfare facilities to serve the future and existing population in the vicinity of the Site.
- 7.7 If the application is approved by the Board, the proposed development will take up part of the potential public housing site at TSL. Based on the latest information from the Study, the proposed development will encroach upon about 15% of the potential public housing site. When there is further plan for public housing development at the “U” zone, updated review could be conducted with the current Study as the basis and the proposed development could be taken as a committed development in formulating the land use proposal and development layout for the “U” zone as a whole and in undertaking technical assessments. Taking into account the latest planning circumstances and the latest stance of D of Housing as mentioned paragraphs 7.5 and 7.6 above, the proposed development,

if approved, will not preclude the possibility for further development of the “U” zone nor jeopardise the comprehensive planning of the “U” zone in the long run.

Land Use Compatibility and Development Intensity

- 7.8 The Site is bordering Yuen Long New Town and within a transitional location between urban and rural areas, with Pok Oi Hospital, village settlements and some brownfield operations in its immediate surroundings and clusters of high-density residential developments (i.e. Grand Yoho) to its west across Yuen Long Highway (**Plans R-1 and R-2**), as well as other planned/committed residential developments (e.g. the approved application no A/YL-NSW/274 for residential development with PR of 2.29 and maximum BH of 75mPD, and the proposed LSPS development, which zoned “R(A)1” and “R(A)2”, with equivalent domestic PRs ranging from 2.03 to 4.37 and maximum BH of 100mPD in same locality). The disposition and BH of the high-rise towers have taken into account the known birds’ flight paths as well as the Shek Kong Airfield height restriction. The 14 towers are arranged in a 3-tier stepped profile from 44 storeys (139mPD) at the west to 26-31 storeys (91.6-112.8mPD) at the south, and further to 2-3 storeys (12-15mPD) for low-rise houses at the north (**Drawings R-1 to R-4**), providing a smooth transition between the high density Yuen Long New Town to its west and the low-to-medium density development at Kam Tin North to its east. The low-rise houses are proposed around the eco-lake to minimise the potential disturbance to the known birds’ flight paths (**Drawing R-10**) and to serve as a buffer from the high-rise towers to its west. Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) has no adverse comment on natural conservation perspective.
- 7.9 While Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department considers that it is undesirable from visual impact point of view in view of the surrounding low-rise developments, Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) has no adverse comment on the application and considers that given the spatial context of the Site and its immediate surrounding areas, the proposed residential development at the Site would bring further visual changes to the existing neighbourhood, thus forming a new residential cluster of medium/high-rise developments. Building separations between towers and setbacks along site boundary (**Drawing R-11**) are proposed for enhancing wind penetration. According to the AVA, the performances of the proposed scheme on pedestrian wind environment are in general comparable with the baseline scheme (i.e. existing condition) under both annual and summer conditions, and concludes that the proposed development would be acceptable in air ventilation terms with mitigation measures incorporated. Considering the locality and planned development in the surrounding areas, the proposed PR of 3.028 and maximum BH of 139mPD is considered not unreasonable and not incompatible with the surrounding areas.

### Technical Feasibility

- 7.10 The applicants have submitted relevant technical assessments in support of the Section 16 application and the technical assessments are still valid to support the review application with no change to the development scheme. Other relevant government bureaux/departments including Commissioner for Heritage, C for T, DEP, Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD), Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-1, Railway Development Office, HyD, Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department, CTP/UD&L of PlanD, Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD, Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services, DSW, Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department and DAFC have no objection to or no adverse comment on the review application from heritage conservation, traffic, environmental, drainage, urban design and landscape, water supply, provision of social welfare facilities and fisheries aspects, etc. It is anticipated that the proposed development would not be subject to nor generate adverse impact from/to the surrounding areas.

### Public Comments

- 7.11 The public comments received on the review application as stated in paragraph 6 above are similar to those received at Section 16 stage. The planning assessments and departmental comments above are relevant.

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

- 8.1 Based on the latest planning circumstances in paragraph 1 and the assessments made in paragraph 7 and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 6, the Planning Department has no objection to the review application.
- 8.2 Should the Board decide to approve the review application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 21.3.2029, 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 Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the design and provision of vehicular access, including but not limited to the access road between development site and Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the design and provision of vehicle parking and loading/unloading facilities for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for

Transport or of the Town Planning Board;

- (d) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment and implementation of the road improvement works identified therein to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the Town Planning Board;
- (e) the submission of a revised Noise Impact Assessment and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (f) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment and implementation of the measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the Town Planning Board;
- (g) the submission and implementation of a drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (h) submission of a natural terrain hazard study and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office of the Civil Engineering Development Department or of the Town Planning Board;
- (i) the design and provision of a Neighbourhood Elderly Centre and one team of Home Care Services for Frail Elderly Persons (2-team size non-kitchen based) to the satisfaction of the Director of Social Welfare or of the Town Planning Board;
- (j) the submission of a Fisheries Impact Assessment and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the Town Planning Board;
- (k) the design and provision of Eco-lake, as proposed by the applicants, to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (l) the submission of a heritage assessment to ascertain any direct and indirect impacts arising from the proposed development to the five Grade 3 historic buildings at Nos. 63, 65, 66 and 67 Tung Shing Lei and Hat Shut Tong at No. 68 Tung Shing Lei and implementation of the appropriate mitigation/protective measures identified therein to safeguard these historic buildings, to the satisfaction of the Antiquities and Monuments Office or of the Town Planning Board.

#### Advisory Clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Annex J**.

- 8.3 Alternatively, should the Board decide to reject the review application, the following reason for rejection is suggested for Members' consideration:



the “U” zone is subject to land use review and proposed development(s) in the subject “U” zone has to be comprehensively planned, as piecemeal development or redevelopment would have the effect of degrading the environment and thus jeopardise the land use review and long-term development of the subject “U” zone.

## **9. Decision Sought**

- 9.1 The Board is invited to consider the application for a review of the RNTPC’s decision and decide whether to accede to the application.
- 9.2 Should the Board decide to approve the review 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.
- 9.3 Alternatively, should the Board decide to reject the review application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicants.

## **10. Attachments**

<b>Annex A</b>	RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NSW/293A
<b>Annex B</b>	Extract of minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on 3.2.2023
<b>Annex C</b>	Secretary of the Board’s letter dated 17.2.2023
<b>Annex D</b>	Applicants’ letter dated 29.2.2023 applying for review
<b>Annex E</b>	FI dated 24.12.2024
<b>Annex F</b>	FI dated 28.1.2025
<b>Annex G</b>	FI dated 14.3.2025
<b>Annex H</b>	Similar applications
<b>Annex I(1)</b>	Public comments on the review application (supporting)
<b>Annex I(2)</b>	Public comments on the review application (objecting)
<b>Annex I(3)</b>	Public comments on the review application (expressing views)
<b>Annex J</b>	Recommended advisory clauses
<b>Drawing R-1</b>	Master Layout Plan
<b>Drawings R-2 to R-4</b>	Section Plans
<b>Drawings R-5 to R-6</b>	Landscape Master Plan
<b>Drawing R-7</b>	Landscape Master Plan with the proposed Linear Park
<b>Drawing R-8</b>	Environmental Buffer Distances
<b>Drawing R-9</b>	Proposed Road and Pedestrian Accesses
<b>Drawing R-10</b>	Flight Zones and Layout Plan of Proposed Development
<b>Drawing R-11</b>	Proposed Building Separations and Setback
<b>Plan R-1</b>	Location Plan with similar applications
<b>Plan R-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plan R-3</b>	Aerial Photo
<b>Plans R-4a to R-4c</b>	Site Photos