

**Previous Applications covering the Application Site**

**Approved Applications**

	<b><u>Application No.</u></b>	<b><u>Proposed Uses</u></b>	<b><u>Date of Consideration (RNTPC)</u></b>	<b><u>Approval Conditions</u></b>
1	A/YL-KTN/79*	Open Storage of Marble and Marble Workshop	8.1.1999 for 3 years	(1), (2), (3)
2	A/YL-KTN/91*	Ponding Filling for a Plant Nursery	30.7.1999	(2), (4)
3	A/YL-KTN/95*	Filling of Ponds for Plant Nursery	10.9.1999	(2), (4)
4	A/YL-KTN/575	Temporary Site Office with Ancillary Open Storage of Building Materials, Storage of Repairing Tools and Staff Car Park for 3 Years	12.1.2018	(1), (2), (3), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10)

\* Application site(s) was zoned "Undetermined" ("U") at the time of consideration

**Approval Conditions**

- (1) Submission and implementation of landscaping proposals.
- (2) Provision of drainage facilities/ submission and implementation of drainage proposal.
- (3) Reinstatement of the application site upon expiry of planning permission.
- (4) Permission shall cease to have effect on a specific date unless prior to the said date either the development hereby permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed.
- (5) Restriction of operation hours
- (6) No medium to heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes is allowed to enter/exist the site
- (7) No dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying or other workshop activities are allowed on the Site
- (8) No vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse into/from public road
- (9) Provision of fire extinguisher and submission and implementation of fire services installation proposal
- (10) Revocation of approval if any planning conditions are not complied with during planning approval or by specified dates

### Summary of the approved applications

- (a) Application No. A/YL-KTN/79 for open storage of marble and marble workshop was approved with conditions by the Committee on 8.1.1999 for 3 years mainly for the reasons that the development was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses; approval on temporary basis would satisfy the short term demand for open storage sites; and no adverse comments from relevant departments.
- (b) Applications No. A/YL-KTN/91 and 95 for proposed pond filling for a plant nursery were approved with conditions by the Committee on 30.7.1999 and 10.9.1999 respectively mainly for the reasons that the proposal was considered compatible with the surrounding land uses; and relevant departments had no adverse comment.
- (c) Application No. A/YL-KTN/575 for temporary site office with ancillary open storage of building materials, storage of repairing tools and staff car park was approved by the Committee on 12.1.2018 mainly for the reasons that the approval of the application would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the "CDA(1)" zone; the use was not incompatible with surrounding areas; and relevant government departments has no adverse comments and no objection was received from the public.

### Rejected Applications

	<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Proposed Uses</u>	<u>Date of Consideration (RNTPC/TPB)</u>	<u>Main Rejection Reasons</u>
1	A/DPA/YL-KTN/16*	Proposed Small House Development	6.8.1993 on review	(2), (3), (4)
2	A/DPA/YL-KTN/17*	Proposed Small House Development	5.3.1993	(2), (3), (4)
3	A/DPA/YL-KTN/18*	Proposed Small House Development	5.3.1993	(2), (3), (4)
4	A/DPA/YL-KTN/19*	Proposed Small House Development	5.3.1993	(2), (3), (4)
5	A/DPA/YL-KTN/20*	Proposed Small House Development	5.3.1993	(2), (3), (4)
6	A/DPA/YL-KTN/21*	Proposed Small House Development	5.3.1993	(2), (3), (4)
7	A/DPA/YL-KTN/22*	Proposed Small House Development	5.3.1993	(2), (3), (4)
8	A/DPA/YL-KTN/23*	Proposed Small House Development	5.3.1993	(2), (3), (4)
9	A/DPA/YL-KTN/24*	Proposed Small House Development	5.3.1993	(2), (3), (4)
10	A/DPA/YL-KTN/25*	Proposed Small House Development	5.3.1993	(2), (3), (4)

11	A/YL-KTN/163*	Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials for 3 Years	7.2.2003	(1), (2)
12	A/YL-KTN/187*	Temporary Gardening Exhibition Ground and Storage of Landscaping Materials for 3 Years and Regularization of Pond Filling	30.4.2004	(1), (2)
13	A/YL-KTN/193*	Temporary Parking of Lorries, Container Tractors and Trailers and Open Storage of Equipment and Construction Materials for 5 Years	25.6.2004	(1), (2)
14	A/YL-KTN/195*	Temporary Open Storage of Construction Equipment and Excavators for 2 Years	12.11.2004 on review	(1), (2)
15	A/YL-KTN/199*	Temporary Open Storage of Waste Plastic Materials for Recycling and Export for 3 Years	12.11.2004 on review	(1), (2)
16	A/YL-KTN/203*	Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials for 3 Years and Regularization of Pond Filling	24.9.2004	(1), (2)
17	A/YL-KTN/204*	Temporary Open Storage of Construction Machineries and Warehouse for 3 Years and Regularization of Pond Filling	24.9.2004	(1), (2)
18	A/YL-KTN/210*	Temporary Open Storage of Bamboo Poles and Scaffolding Materials for 3 Years	3.12.2004	(1), (2)
19	A/YL-KTN/256*	Temporary Open Storage (Plant Nursery Materials, Tools and Equipment) for 2 Years	15.9.2006	(1), (2)
20	A/YL-KTN/281*	Temporary Open Storage of Scrap Metal for 3 Years	11.4.2008 on review	(1), (2)
21	A/YL-KTN/295*	Temporary Waste Tires Recycling Manufactory for 3 Years	26.9.2008 on review	(2), (5), (6)

\* Application site(s) was zoned "U" at the time of consideration

### **Rejection Reasons**

- (1) The proposed development did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for "Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses" in that residential dwellings which were located to its close proximity would be susceptible to adverse environmental nuisances/ it was not compatible with the surrounding areas which were rural in character with residential structures/ponds/agricultural land and there were adverse departmental comments on the application or local objection.

- (2) There was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause adverse traffic/ environmental/ sewage/ drainage/ landscaping/ visual impacts on the surrounding areas.
- (3) The proposed development is not in line with the planning intention for the area
- (4) No appropriate housing layout has been proposed in the submission.
- (5) The development was not compatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominated by residential structures/village houses and vacant lands
- (6) Approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the "U" zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area.

Summary of the rejected applications

- (a) Applications No. A/DPA/YL-KTN/16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 for proposed small house development were all rejected by the Committee on 5.3.1993 or the Board on review on 6.8.1993 (for A/DPA/YL-KTN/16) mainly on the grounds that the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention; insufficient information to demonstrate the proposed development would not cause adverse traffic/ drainage/ sewage impacts on the surrounding areas; and no appropriate housing layout plan proposed in the submission.
- (b) Applications No. A/YL-KTN/163, 187, 193, 195, 199, 203, 204, 210, 256 and 281 for various temporary open storage uses were rejected by the Committee or the Board on review between 2003 and 2008 mainly on the grounds that the development did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for "Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses" in that the development was incompatible with the surrounding areas and there were adverse departmental comments on the application or local objection; and no information in the submission to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse environmental, traffic, drainage, visual and/or landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.
- (c) Application No. A/YL-KTN/295 for temporary waste tires recycling manufactory was rejected by the Board on review on 26.9.2008 mainly on the grounds that the development was not compatible with the surrounding land uses; insufficient information to demonstrate the development would not generate adverse environment, traffic, drainage and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent.

**Appendix III of RNTPC**  
**Paper No. A/YL-KTN/604B**

**Similar applications for the same use in the adjacent “CDA” zone**

**Approved Applications**

	<b><u>Application No.</u></b>	<b><u>Proposed Uses</u></b>	<b><u>Date of Consideration (RNTPC/TPB)</u></b>	<b><u>Approval Conditions</u></b>
1	A/YL-KTN/60	Proposed comprehensive residential development with commercial, GIC and open space facilities	11.9.1998 (minor amendments on 24.8.2001 and 3.9.2004 extending the validity period until 11.9.2007)	(1), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (11), (13), (14), (16), (17), (18),
2	A/YL-KTN/118	Proposed residential development with commercial, GIC and open space facilities and minor relaxation of building height restriction	5.10.2001 (minor amendments on 17.9.2004 and 28.9.2007 (Application No. A/YL-KTN/118-1 with validity period until 5.10.2010); (minor amendments on 7.9.2012 (Application No. A/YL-KTN/118-2) )	(1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (7), (8), (9), (10), (12), (13), (14), (15), (16)

**Approval Conditions**

- (1) The submission and/or implementation of a (revised) master landscape plan.
- (2) The submission of a (revised) visual impact assessment, including a model of the scheme and the surrounding area to address the visual impact on the adjoining rural area.
- (3) The provision of a public car-park for Sha Po Tsuen
- (4) The submission and/or implementation of ecological mitigation measures as proposed.
- (5) The implementation of part of the Sha Po Tsuen Stream Rehabilitation project within the application site
- (6) The submission of a (revised) traffic impact assessment.
- (7) The submission of site formation proposals, taking into account existing water-mains
- (8) The design and implementation of public/landscaped garden, leisure facilities and a public toilet for Sha Po Tsuen and adjacent villages
- (9) The permission shall cease to have effect on a specified date unless prior to the said date

- either the development hereby permitted is commenced or this permission is renewed
- (10) The provision of the layout and geometric details of internal roads, the layout of public transport interchange and the design of junction between Castle Peak Road and Western Access Road
  - (11) The provision of school sites (two former school and/or kindergarten and primary school) as proposed.
  - (12) The provision of roundabouts and road works within and close to the administrative protection boundary of the Northern Link
  - (13) The submission of drainage impact assessment.
  - (14) The design and provision of emergency vehicular access (EVA) and/or water supply for fire fighting and fire service installations.
  - (15) The submission and implementation of site formation proposals for a primary school
  - (16) The submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan
  - (17) The submission and implementation of sewerage disposal proposals
  - (18) The provision of car-parking spaces, layout of internal roads and public transport terminus, and junction layout between Castle Peak Road and the Western Access Road

**Detailed comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD**

**Tree Survey Information**

- (a) As the tree survey of Phase A was conducted in August and September 2015 and February 2016, she reiterated that the applicant is required to incorporate an updated tree survey information in the Landscape Master Plan to facilitate further design development and the anticipated Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal.

**Revised Landscape Master Plan (LMP)**

- (b) Lay-by area: To better serve the residents, circulation path should be allowed along the layby to facilitate access to residential blocks. "Private gardens" located adjacent to the layby areas, which may hinder effective circulation path network, should be reviewed. Moreover, entrance to residential blocks/club house should also be indicated in the LMP.
- (c) Holding nursery: The applicant is required to clarify whether there is direct maintenance access between the holding nursery and the proposed residential development. Moreover, it seems the "right of way to third party lot" is not connected to existing formed footpath.

**Detailed comments of CE/MN, DSD**

**Revised Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) in FI(2) received by the Board on 16.11.2018**

- (a) Responses to Comments Item 11.1: The said information cannot be found in Figure F5. The consultant should clarify.
- (b) Response to Comments Item 11.1 and Figure F4: The consultant should provide the approximate levels of the peripheral channels to demonstrate that the channel can smoothly intercept overland flow. It is also noted that the peripheral channels would convey flow from Phase A to Sha Po Tsuen Channel via Phase B, which works has no confirmed programme. In addition, the proposed peripheral channel is seen not to serve the catchment at the south of the site. The consultant should review.
- (c) Responses to Comments Item 11.1 and Master Layout Plan: According to the Master Layout Plan, KT2 is proposed to be decked over and the Sha Po Tsuen Channel will be maintained as an open channel. These information should be clearly mentioned in the text and shown in the drawings. Moreover, the deck over section should not affect the drainage capacity of the existing channel.

- (d) Section 2.2.1: "KT2" is not indicated in the drawings.
- (e) Section 3.1.4, 4<sup>th</sup> line: "CE45/2007 (DS)" should read as "CE 46/2007(DS)"
- (f) Section 4.3.1, Figure F4 and Responses to Comments Item 11.3: In accordance with the topographic survey plan in Annex F4, the proposed main access will block the overland flow of some existing sub-catchment areas and also some overland flow directions are incorrectly shown.
- (g) Table F8: The ground level of the proposed drainage system is much higher than the existing ground level which will result in the blockage of overland flow from areas outside the Site. In addition, the Locations A-F are not shown in Figure F5.
- (h) It is the responsibility of the developer to seek explicitly the consents and agreement of the proposed works from all other Government departments and to obtain requisite statutory approval for use and occupancy of land from the relevant authorities.
- (i) The ground level should be indicated in the Layout Plan of Plan Road of Proposed Development for checking.

Sewerage Impacts Assessment (SIA) for FI(2) received by the Board on 16.11.2018

- (j) Responses to Comments Item 11.7.2: The new pumping arrangement should have its full accessories to meet the operation and maintenance requirements of Sewage Treatment Division 1 of his Department. The consultant should clearly record this requirement in Section 6.3. DSD reserved his rights to comment in the detailed design stage.
- (k) It is noted that the increase of estimated sewer flow is about 27% with no major change in the sewage disposal scheme. The SIA needs to meet the full satisfaction of EPD, the planning authority of sewage infrastructure. DSD's comments on the SIA submitted are subject to views and agreement of EPD.

**Advisory Clauses**

- (a) the approved Master Layout Plan, together with the set of approval conditions, will be certified by the Chairman of the Town Planning Board and deposited in the Land Registry in accordance with section 4A(3) of the Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into a revised Master Layout Plan for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as possible;
- (b) the approval of the application does not imply that the proposed building design elements could fulfill the requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines and the relevant requirements under the lease, and that the proposed gross floor area (GFA) concession for the proposed development will be approved/granted by the Building Authority. The applicant should approach the Buildings Department and the Lands Department direct to obtain the necessary approval. If the building design elements and the GFA concession are not approved/granted by the Building Authority and the Lands Authority and major changes to the current scheme are required, a fresh planning application to the Board may be required;
- (c) resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the Site;
- (d) note DLO/YL, LandsD's comments that the Site comprises various private lots which, by the terms of the Block Government Lease or New Grant or Tai Po New Grants under which they are held, are demised as agricultural ground and adjoining Government land, particularly Government Land Licences restricted to be used for cultivation and fish pond and erection of some structures, all in DD 107. The actual site area, permitted use and land holding details of the lots under application have to be verified at the land exchange stage if any land exchange is applied for by the applicant to LandsD. The private lots within the Site are owned by different owners. The ownership particulars of the lots forming the Site have to be examined in details at the land exchange application stage. The western periphery of the Site encroaches onto the planned access road linking up the Sha Po North Phase I development within Lot No. 1927 in DD 107 ("Lot 1927") and Phase II (of which land exchange application has been received) under Application No. A/YL-KTN/118-2. His office reserves comments on the matter and any project interface with other proposed land exchange will be considered at the land exchange application stage, if any land exchange is applied for by the applicant to the LandsD. A private lot namely, Lot No. 1778 in DD 107 will become landlocked if Phase A of the proposed development is pursued. Whilst a right of way to third party lot has been indicated on the MLP, his office reserves comments on the provision of right of way to the adjoining lots and its details will be considered at the land exchange application stage, if any land exchange is applied for by the applicant to the LandsD. The proposed access road via the unnamed road to Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi and proposed road improvement works at the junction of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi and Chi Ho Road encroaches onto land of various statuses, including but not limited to private lots. He is not prepared to recommend invoking the relevant Ordinance for resumption of any private lots or

creation of any rights for implementation of the proposed private development. The Site is subject to a maximum height ranging from 89mPD to 129mPD under the relevant plan for the Shek Kong Airfield Height Restriction. The applicant has to apply to the LandsD for a land exchange to effect the proposed development. Such application will be considered by LandsD acting in its capacity as a landlord at its sole discretion and there is no guarantee that the land exchange for the proposed development, including the grant of any additional Government land, will be approved. In the event that the land exchange application is approved, it would be subject to such terms and conditions, including, among other things, the payment of premium and administrative fee, as may be imposed by the LandsD at its sole discretion;

- (e) note CHE/NTW, HyD's comments that his development does not and will not maintain the existing road proposed to be widen and any access connecting the Site and Castle Road- Tam Mi. If the proposed access point is agreeable by TD, DLO/YL may consider to designate the access road as Brown Area to be maintained by the future developer. The applicant should be responsible for his own access arrangement. Any proposed works at such access road shall be completed by the applicant up to the prevailing traffic engineering and highway standards to the satisfaction of TD and HyD, such that the Government may consider taking up its management and maintenance in the future if the situation warrants. He reserves the right to comment on the details of the proposed road when they are available. For the driveways, car parks, etc. within the private lot, they shall not be maintained by HyD;
- (f) note CES/RD, LandsD's comments that part of the Site falls within (i) RDS 2014 Northern Link (NOL) and Kwu Tung Station Limit of Area of Influence; and (ii) RDS 2014 NOL and Kwu Tung Station Administrative Route Protection Boundary;
- (g) to note CE/RD, RDO of HyD's comments that the Site including the proposed access road falls within the NOL Administrative Route Protection Boundary, the owner of the subject lot ("the lot owner") shall satisfy itself as to the extent of the railway to be constructed within the NOL route protection boundary. Lot owner shall ensure that the activities to be carried out within the NOL route protection boundary will not cause disruption to the construction, use and operation of the NOL. If required by the Government or MTR Corporation Limited, the lot owner shall at his own expenses, relocate the proposed structures to facilitate the implementation of the NOL. The lot owner shall, at all times, permit the Government, MTR Corporation Limited or other duly authorized officers, servants and contractors without payment of any nature whatsoever the right of ingress, egress and regress to, from and through including occupation and staying at the lot or any part of the lot at all times with or without tools, vehicles, machinery or equipment to carry out works, and for the purposes of any survey, inspection, examination, maintenance, operation, improvement or development in connection with the NOL. The development in connection with the NOL includes, but not limited to, using the lot or any part of the lot as temporary works site, or temporary carriageway or footpath, etc., for the construction of or re-construction of NOL;

- (h) note DEP's comments that "a residential development of not less than 2,000 flats and not served by public sewerage networks by the time a flat is occupied" is designated project (DP) under Item P.2 and F.4, Schedule 2 Part 1 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO). An environmental permit is required for the construction and/or operation of a DP. It is the obligation of the applicant to meet all statutory requirements under relevant pollution control ordinances and provide necessary mitigation measures. In order to minimize environmental nuisance to nearby sensitive receivers during the construction period, the applicant is advised to adopt appropriate pollution control measures/good practices set out in the EA report submitted, as well as relevant Professional Persons Environmental Consultative Committee Practice Notes and Recommended Pollution Control Clauses for Construction Contracts which are available at EPD's website;
- (i) note DAFC's comments that the Site touches on some abandoned ponds to the west and to the south of the Site. It appears that part of these ponds would be filled. From fisheries viewpoint, any filling of pond is not recommended. Fish ponds, regardless of its status, should be reserved for fish culture activities. The practicability of the proposed access road (with reprovisioning of Au Tau Fisheries Office, if necessary) is still subject to further detailed studies/ liaison/ approval from concerned departments on various issues, including but not limited to land matters, tree preservation, ecological mitigation measures (if any required) alongside implementation of a satisfiable re-provisioning proposal of Au Tau Fisheries Office;
- (j) note CBS/NTW, BD's comments that the Site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street under the Buildings (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) 5 and emergency vehicular access shall be provided under the B(P)R 41D. Otherwise, the development intensity shall be determined by the Building Authority under B(P)R 19(3). It appears that the Site will include some existing local tracks serving other private lots. They may have to be excluded from the site area calculation for the purpose of plot ratio and site coverage assessment under the Buildings Ordinance (BO). Presumably the subject development will be developed as one single entity. Otherwise, each of any subdivided lots shall be self-sustainable and treated as separate lot in its own identity for complying with the BO and the allied regulations. Transfer of plot ratio and site coverage between sites is not permitted. Area of any associated internal street/access road required under section 16(1)(p) of the BO may have to be deducted from the site area for the purpose of plot ratio and site coverage calculations and have to comply with the requirements laid down in Building (Private Streets and Access Roads) Regulations and no structure shall be built over or under such internal streets under the BO section 31(1). Formal submission under the BO is required for any proposed new works, including any temporary structures. Proposed clubhouse should be accountable for GFA under the BO, unless exempted. The new QBE requirements (Quality and Sustainable Built Environment requirements) and the new GFA concession policy are applicable to the proposed development. Detailed checking will be made at the building plan submission stage;
- (k) note D of FS's comments that detailed fire service requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans and referral from relevant

licensing authority. Furthermore, the emergency vehicular access (EVA) provision in the Site shall comply with Section 6, Part D of the "Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Building 2011 under the B(P)R 41(D) which is administered by the BD;

- (l) note CE/C, WSD's comments that existing water mains will be affected (**Plan A-2** of the RNTPC paper). The developer shall bear the cost of the necessary diversion works;
- (m) note CE/MN, DSD's comments that the applicant is reminded to include the fall-back option of the proposed sewerage alignment in the revised SIA to be submitted in the future. For the revised Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) in FI(2) submitted on 16.11.2018, the applicant should note that (i) Responses to Comments Item 11.1: The said information cannot be found in Figure F5. The consultant should clarify. (ii) Response to Comments Item 11.1 and Figure F4: The consultant should provide the approximate levels of the peripheral channels to demonstrate that the channel can smoothly intercept overland flow. It is also noted that the peripheral channels would convey flow from Phase A to Sha Po Tsuen Channel via Phase B, which works has no confirmed programme. In addition, the proposed peripheral channel is seen not to serve the catchment at the south of the site. The consultant should review. (iii) Responses to Comments Item 11.1 and Master Layout Plan: According to the Master Layout Plan, KT2 is proposed to be decked over the Sha Po Tsuen Channel will be maintained as an open channel. These information should be clearly mentioned in the text and shown in the drawings. Moreover, the deck over section should not affect the drainage capacity of the existing channel. (iv) Section 2.2.1: "KT2" is not indicated in the drawings. (v) Section 3.1.4, 4th line: "CE45/2007 (DS)" should read as "CE 46/2007(DS)" (vi) Section 4.3.1, Figure F4 and Responses to Comments Item 11.3: In accordance with the topographic survey plan in Annex F4, the proposed main access will block the overland flow of some existing sub-catchment areas and also some overland flow directions are incorrectly shown. The applicant should refer to the comments provided for FI(2). (vii) Table F8: The ground level of the proposed drainage system is much higher than the existing ground level which will result in the blockage of overland flow from areas outside the Site. In addition, the Locations A-F are not shown in Figure F4. (viii) It is the responsibility of the developer to seek explicitly the consents and agreement of the proposed works from all other Government departments and to obtain requisite statutory approval for use and occupancy of land from the relevant authorities. (ix) The ground level should be indicated in the Layout Plan of Plan Road of Proposed Development for checking. Detailed are shown in the comments provided for FI(2). For the Sewerage Impacts Assessment (SIA) in FI(2) submitted on 16.11.2018, the applicant should note (i) Responses to Comments Item 11.7.2: The new pumping arrangement should have its full accessories to meet the operation and maintenance requirements of Sewage Treatment Division 1 of his Department. The consultant should clearly record this requirement in Section 6.3. DSD reserved his rights to comment in the detailed design stage. (ii) It is noted that the increase of estimated sewer flow b about 27% with no major change in the sewage disposal scheme. The SIA needs to meet the full satisfaction of EPD, the planning authority of sewage infrastructure. DSD's comments on the SIA submitted are subject to views and agreement of EPD;

- (n) note CTP/UD&L, PlanD's comment that for the tree survey information, as the tree survey of Phase A was conducted in August and September 2015 and February 2016, the applicant is required to incorporate an updated tree survey information in the Landscape Master Plan to facilitate further design development and the anticipated Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal. For the revised LMP:
- Lay-by area: To better serve the residents, circulation path should be allowed along the layby to facilitate access to residential blocks. "Private gardens" located adjacent to the layby areas, which may hinder effective circulation path network, should be reviewed. Moreover, entrance to residential blocks/club house should also be indicated in the LMP.
  - Holding nursery: The applicant is required to clarify whether there is direct maintenance access between the holding nursery and the proposed residential development. Moreover, it seems the "right of way to third party lot" is not connected to existing formed footpath;
- (o) note S for S's comment that as the Site is in proximity to Shek Kong Airfield, the applicant should take into account the noise and safety concerns from flying activities;
- (p) note SWD's comment that as the proposed day care centre for the elderly is located on top of a 2-storey block for retail/ transport interchange, the applicant should ensure that sufficient lift service in terms of size and number should be provided to facilitate easy access by the frail users and smooth operation of the day care centre for the elderly. The size of the lift(s) should be able to accommodate 2 wheelchair users and 2 personal care worker each at one time. Upon satisfactory completion of works by the developer, the Government will reimburse the developer the actual cost of construction or the consideration sum as stipulated in the land lease (to be confirmed by concerned departments before the lease modification), whichever is the lesser, according to the established practice. The applicant should be advised that openable window(s) should be installed in the medical consultation room for natural ventilation and infection control. The applicant should take into account in the detailed design stage; and
- (q) note DEMS's comments that in the interests of public safety and ensuring the continuity of electricity supply, the parties concerned with planning, designing, organizing and supervising any activity near the underground cable or overhead line under the application should approach the electricity supplier (i.e. CLP Power) for the requisition of cable plans (and overhead line alignment drawings, where applicable) to find out whether there is any underground cable and/or overhead line within and/or in the vicinity of the Site. They should also be reminded to observe the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation and the "Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines" established under the Regulation when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.

