## Project Title: Development at San Hing Road and Hong Po Road, Tuen Mun (Application No. EIA-263/2020) Submission of Information Pursuant to Section 8(1) of the EIA Ordinance

## Elaboration on the consideration of the different land use options and layout options of the proposed development with regard to the approved planning application.

1. In responding to Clause 3.3.3. of the EIA study brief, two valid approved planning applications within the Project Area were identified at the time of preparing the EIA Report and presented in the EIA Report (Table 2.5 refers), with details summarized as follows:

| Approved Planning Application No. | Application   | Location   | Site Area<br>(m²) | Plot Ratio<br>(PR) | No. of Flats |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| A/TM-<br>LTYY/381                 | Proposed<br>Residential<br>Development<br>(Flat)                              | Central portion of the Proposed Development Area | 14,553            | 1.0                | 96           |
| A/TM-<br>LTYY/337                 | Proposed Flat Development and Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction | North-eastern<br>corner of San<br>Hing Road Site | 3,832.4           | 1.0                | 35           |

2. Considerations were given to the respective requirements under Clause 3.4 of the EIA study brief on impacts of the Project as well as that of the approved planning applications. Two different options have been considered for environmental impact assessment purpose. The Proposed Development Area (PDA) for Option 1 (same as the EIA Report) is shown in *Figure 1* while the PDA for Option 2 with the above two approved planning application sites is shown in *Figure 2*. As shown in the *Figure 2*, the two approved planning application sites are located within the San Hing Road (SHR) Site under this Project. As the proposed land use and layout arrangement for the proposed developments at San Hing Road Site Extension (SHR Site Extension) and Hong Po Road (HPR) Site (Details refer to the EIA Report) are the same for both Options 1 and 2, they are not elaborated in the following option descriptions for clarity.

## Option 1 – Development of the SHR Site for Public Housing (with Domestic Plot Ratio (PR) of 6) while Developments of SHR Site Extension and HPR Site are the same as Option 2:

i) The SHR Site is proposed to be developed for public housing development at a maximum domestic PR of 6. About 9,400 numbers of public housing units, two primary schools and associated Government, Institution or Community (GIC) and retail facilities will be provided.

Option 2 – Development of Part of the SHR Site for Public Housing (with Domestic PR of 6), together with the Two Approved Planning Applications (with Domestic PR of 1), while Developments of SHR Site Extension and HPR Site are the same as Option 1:

- i) The two approved planning application sites are proposed for private residential developments with a maximum domestic PR of 1. According to the submitted information in the planning applications, a total number of about 131 numbers of private housing units will be provided without the provision of associated GIC and retail facilities; and
- ii) After excluding the site area of the two approved planning applications, the remaining portion of the SHR Site could only provide about 7,000 numbers of public housing units<sup>1</sup> at a maximum domestic PR of 6, two primary schools, associated GIC and retail facilities compared with about 9,400 numbers of public housing units in Option 1.
- iii) Apart from reduction of site area for the proposed public housing development, exclusion of the site area of the two approved planning applications would result in an awkward remaining site area which would impose constraints in planning of the proposed public housing development.
- 3. Since both Options 1 and 2 are mainly for residential purposes, the potential environmental impacts associated with both Options 1 and 2 are similar. Given the areas covered by the two approved planning applications under Option 2 only consists of a minor portion of the overall PDA, it is considered that the difference between the potential environmental impacts of the two options is not significant.
- 4. However, it is predicted that increment of traffic flow and sewage generation from the developments in Option 1 would be higher than that in Option 2. In terms of the implication on the environmental aspects, including air quality, traffic noise and sewage collection and treatment, it is anticipated that the impacts arising from developments in Option 1 are more than that in Option 2.
- 5. Moreover, Option 1 and Option 2 will have similar compatibility issues with surrounding landscape context as Option 1 is dominated by high-rise public housing developments while

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Preliminary estimation based on the reduction of site area for public housing development with an assumed PR of 6 and average flat size of 45m<sup>2</sup>.

Option 2 is dominated by high-rise public housing developments but mixture with small portions of low-rise residential developments within the PDA boundary. Besides that, the visual impact associated with developments in Option 1 would create more visual blockage due to more high-rise public housing developments than that in Option 2.

- 6. As the PDA boundary for both Option 1 and Option 2 is the same, it is considered that other potential environmental impacts (i.e. water quality, ecology, waste management, land contamination, cultural heritage, landscape and electric and magnetic fields) arising from the developments in Option 1 would be similar to Option 2.
- 7. In view of the above, Option 1 is considered as the reasonable worst case scenario in terms of environmental impacts and infrastructure needs, which would have covered those of Option 2. Option 1 was therefore adopted in the environmental impact assessment under this Project for detailed assessment.



