# Attachment 1

**RESPONSES-TO-COMMENTS TABLE** 

Comments/ Suggestions		Applicant's Responses					
Α.	Comments from Environmental Protection Department received from Plant (Contact person: Mr. WONG Wing Hong, Andy, Tel no.: 2835 1127)	anning Department on 14.10.2025:					
	Please find our comments below for your follow up.						
	Planning Statement						
1.	Section 5.4.1 – Please include land contamination assessment.	Please note that Section 5.4.1 of the Supplementary Planning Statement ("SPS") is revised accordingly and please refer to <i>Attachment 2</i> for the replacement page.					
	Preliminary Environmental Review						
	<u>General</u>						
2.	Please check the typo in the report header: MINOR RELAXATION OF BUILDING <u>HEIGH</u>	Please note that the Header is revised accordingly.					
	Air Quality						
3.	Table 5-3 – Please confirm if 10th peak 24-hr and annual PM10 in 2019 exceeded AQO.	Please note that the 10 <sup>th</sup> peak 24-hr and annual PM10 in 2019 exceeded AQO and please refer to <i>Attachment 3</i> for the replacement pages of the Preliminary Environmental Review ("PER") for revised Table 5-3.					
4.	Table 5-4 – Please supplement PATH background for grids (19,32) and (18,31), which are also covered by the 500m assessment area.	Please note that Table 5-4 of PER is revised and supplemented with PATH background with grids (19,32) and (18,31) ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).					
5.	Section 5.4 – Please assign ASR ID and present the data for representative ASRs of the proposed development in a table and indicate in a figure.	Please note that Table 5-5 and Figure 5.1 of the PER are revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).					
6.	Section 5.5.3 –						
	(a) Please supplement FSP and RSP in line 2.	(a) Please note that FSP and RSP are added in Section 5.5.3 of PER ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).					
	(b) Please supplement the number of mechanical equipment to be used per time over the work site.	(b) Please note that the number of mechanical equipment to be used per time over the work site will be kept to minimum and subject to the selection of the Contractor and future construction management.					
	(c) Please clarify the meaning of "Current operation of PMEs will be avoided".	(c) Please note that Line 4 of Section 5.5.3 of PER is revised as "Concurrent operation of PMEs will be avoided" ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).					

		Applicant's Responses			
7.	Table 5-6 – For Note [3], please check if there is update in the EAS version.	Please be informed that the requested information for the latest EAS versions of HKHA Public Housing Developments at Areas 133A, 133B, and 133C has been sent out as shown in <i>Attachment 4</i> . Please note that no further information was received and EAS (April 2024) is the latest version obtained.			
8.	Section 5.5.5 – Please state the dates of the EM&A Reports reviewed.	Please note that Section 5.5.5 of the PER is revised as "Review of EM&A reports from Aug 2020 to Aug 2025" ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).			
9.	Section 5.5.7 – Please review whether the measures in DEVB's TC No.13/2020, Timely Application of Temporary Electricity and Water Supply for Public Works Contracts and Wider Use of Electric Vehicles in Public Works Contracts and DEVB's TC No.1/2015, Emissions Control of NRMM in Capital Works Contracts of Public Works are also applicable to this Project.	Please note that Sections 5.5.9 and 5.5.10 of the PER is added with reference to the mentioned technical circulars ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).			
10.	Section 5.5.8 –  (a) Line 2 should read "Regulations".  (b) Please revise to "0.001%" in line 8.	Noted and revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).			
11.	Section 5.6.2 and Table 5-7 - CEDD's Roadworks and Noise Mitigation Measures Design Report mentioned that the road configuration was at a preliminary design stage. Please be reminded that if TD have advised other road type for the concerned roads, the buffer distance will need to be reviewed again.	Noted.			
12.	Section 5.6.5 – Please move header to the same page.	Noted and revised accordingly (Attachment 3 refers).			
13.	Section 5.6.6 – Please revise to "adverse air quality impact" in line 3.	Noted and revised accordingly (Attachment 3 refers).			
14.	Section 5.6.8 – Please supplement the separation distance according to deliverable Pl49.	Noted and revised accordingly (Attachment 3 refers).			
15.	Section 5.6.10 – Please revise to "no adverse <u>air quality</u> impact" in line 4.	Noted and revised accordingly (Attachment 3 refers).			

Com	ments/ Suggestions	Applicant's Responses				
16.	Section 5.6.11 –  (a) Please supplement if ProPECC PN 2/96 will be followed.  (b) Please indicate the locations of exhaust vent and fresh air intakes on a figure.	<ul> <li>(a) Please note that Section 5.6.11 of the PER is supplemented with reference to ProPECC PN 2/96 Control of Air Pollution in Car Parks.</li> <li>(b) The location of exhaust outlet and fresh air intake of mechanical ventilation will be proposed at the detailed design stage. In any event, it is proposed that the mechanical ventilation to be designed facing away from nearby air sensitive use and not approaching the buffer zone of nearby roads to ensure no to cause nuisance to occupants of air sensitive use.</li> </ul>				
17.	Section 5.7.6 – Line 2 should read "ASRs".	Noted and revised accordingly (Attachment 3 refers).				
18.	Figure $5.1$ – Please indicate PATH grids (19,32) and (18,31). Please check the scale of the map and confirm the 500m assessment area is presented correctly.	Noted and revised accordingly (Attachment 3 refers).				
19.	Appendix 5.1 – The fonts are corrupted. Please rectify.	Noted and revised accordingly (Attachment 3 refers).				
	Noise					
20.	Since helicopter noise and aircraft noise are covered, please describe these noise sources in the "Introduction" for completeness.	Noted and Section 6.1.1 is revised to include helicopter noise and aircraft noise ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).				
21.	Please confirm and supplement the thickness of the window pane by adding the wording "the openable window is well-gasketted with at least 6mm thick window panel" where appropriate.	Please be confirmed the openable window will be well-gasketed with at least 6mm thick window panel and Section 6.3.22 in the PER accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).				
22.	The current presentation of railway noise impact assessment is unclear to conclude that adverse railway noise impact is not anticipated. Please review and make reference to the approved TCLE EIA report as well.	Please note that Figure 5.2 and Sections 6.5.7 - 6.5.11 and 6.5.13 of the PER are revised ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).				
23.	Section 6.3.9 - It seems that there is no Appendix A about management office. Please review.	Please refer to the Appendix 1 of the SPS (i.e. Architectural Drawings) for the indicative location of the management office at G/F.				
24.	Section 6.4.13 and Section 6.4.18, please review if "Figure 6.4" should read as "Figure 6.5".	Please note that Sections 6.4.6 and 6.4.13 of the PER are revised and Section 6.4.18 of the PER remains unchanged ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).				

Com	ments/ Suggestions	Applicant's Responses
25.	Section 6.6.1 - "With reference to the TCNTE <b>EIA</b> Report (AEIAR-196/2016), potential helicopter noise impacts are anticipated due to <b>Government Flying Services</b> (GFS) and business helicopter operations."	Noted and revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).
26.	Section 6.6.3 and Section 6.6.7, please replace "EIA report" with "TCNTE EIA report".	Noted and revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).
27.	Section 6.6.4 -  (a) Please state clearly what "HKBAC" refers to.	(a) Please note that HKBAC refers to Hong Kong Business Aviation Centre. Section 6.6.4 of the PER is revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).
	(b) Please clarify if the last sentence should read as "According to the TCNTE EIA report, there had only been 2 flight events".	(b) Noted and Section 6.6.4 of the PER is revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment</i> 3 refers).
28.	Section 6.6.5 - Please describe the distance between the subject site and GFS & HKBAC.	Please note that the separation distances from the GFS and HKBAC to the nearest NSR (T1-O03) are 5.5km and 5.2km respectively as shown in Figure 6.7 of the PER ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).
29.	Section 6.6.6 - "The flight paths extracted from the TCNTE EIA report are given in Appendix 6.7 and Figure 6.6."	Noted and revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).
30.	<ul> <li>Section 6.7.3 -</li> <li>(a) Please correct the typo in the heading to "Evaluation of Potential Helicopter Aircraft Noise Impact".</li> <li>(b) Please revise "the predicted NEF 25 contours of the 3 Runway System (3RS) for year 2030 and year 2032 would be away from the boundary of TCE".</li> <li>(c) The sentence "upon the full commissioning of the 3RS, currently planned for 2023" is not updated. Please review.</li> <li>(d) (d) Please revise "The boundary of the application site will be away from the predicted NEF 25 contours for all the operation modes for airport including the existing two runway system and the under the operation of 3RS"</li> </ul>	Noted and revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).
31.	The figures in Table 6-2 and Table 6-7 regarding the base scheme scenario is inconsistent. Please review.	Noted and revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).

Com	ments/ Suggestions	Applicant's Responses			
32.	Table 6-4 - It seems that the maximum relative noise reduction required for proposed living room is not 3.4 dB(A). Please review.	Please note that the maximum relative noise reduction required for proposed living room is 2.8dB(A) and Table 6-4 of the PER is revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).			
33.	Table 6-15, last row - Please correct the typo from NEF "85" to NEF "25".	Noted and revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).			
34.	Appendix 6.3 - Some NAPs are highlighted in yellow. Please clarify the meaning of highlighted NAPs.	Noted and revised accordingly (Attachment 3 refers).			
35.	Figure 6.5 and Appendix 6.5 -  (a) Please indicate the location of spectators for the calculation.	(a) Since the detailed information of the Sports Ground is not available at this stage, it is assumed Spectators are located in NW and SE of the Sports Ground in this assessment. The x- and y- coordinates of the NSRs and noise sources will be added in Appendix 6.5. The assessment locations of the NSRs and noise sources will be plotted in Figures 6.5a to 6.5e.The proposed development of Sports Ground is committed to complete a EIA, the noise impact of the sports ground will be further assessed under the EIA requirement.			
	(b) Please review all distances between the NSRs and the fixed noise source, which seem to be incorrect.	(b) Please note that distances between NSRs and fixed noise sources are reviewed in Figure 6.5 and Appendix 6.5 of the PER respectively.			
36.	Appendix 6.8 - To avoid confusion, please remove Figures about NEF contour for year 2011 and year 2021.	Please note that NEF contour for year 2011 and year 2021 are removed in Appendix 6.8 of the PER accordingly ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers).			
37.	Other specific comments on noise model are appended in <b>Annex I</b> :				
	<ul> <li>(a) Please check the heights of some segments of Roads L6 and P1 which do not match to those in Figure 3.1 "Location of application site and its environ".</li> <li>(b) A segment of Shun Long Road is not set as "pervious". Please check.</li> <li>(c) Please draw the parapets of Shun Long Road.</li> <li>(d) Please check the barrier height of the parapets of North Lantau Highway, which is <i>unreasonably</i> high.</li> <li>(e) The height of common flat roof should be 23.3mPD according to Master Layout Plan in Appendix 1 "Architectural Drawings". Please review.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>(a) Please note that the Height of segments are revised accordingly.</li> <li>(b) Noted.</li> <li>(c) Please note that Shun Long Road is added with parapet.</li> <li>(d) Please note that barrier height of parapets of North Lantau Highway is revised accordingly.</li> <li>(e) Noted. Please note that the height of common flat roof is revised accordingly.</li> </ul>			

Comments/ Suggestions		Applicant's Responses			
	(f) The lengths of the fins for T2-O29 and T2-O32 in the model are 1.06m and 1.12m respectively. They should be 1.0m according to Table 6-3 "Proposed vertical architectural fins". Please review.	(f) Please note that the lengths of the fins for T2-O29 and T2-O32 are revised accordingly.			
	Waste Management				
38.	<ul> <li>(a) 1st row - The waste indices of 0.238 m³/m² GFA and 0.498 m³/m² GFA appear not to be available in the Guide. Please review the data source and provide the relevant extracted pages to facilitate the vetting.</li> <li>(b) 1st and 3rd row - Please clarify why the waste index of 0.498 m³/m² GFA is used for calculating inert C&amp;D material, while the waste index of 0.250 m³/m² GFA is applied for non-inert C&amp;D material for Housing Projects. Given that 90% of C&amp;D materials are inert, the remaining 10% would consist of non-inert material. Please explain the rationale for adopting these two different indices for the calculations.</li> <li>(c) 1st row - Please note the different between the terms "public fill" and "public fill reception facilities". The Remark should be revised as "According to Hong Kong Waste Statistics for 2023, a total of 90% of construction waste generated will be used as public fill."</li> <li>(d) 3rd row - Please specify that the figure of 0.250 m³/m² GFA is the generate rate of construction waste.</li> <li>(e) 1st and 2nd rows - It is unclear whether 14,205m³ or 17,046m³ (i.e. 14,205m³ + 2,841m³) of inert C&amp;D materials will be generated. Moreover, for the 2nd row, it is confusing to mention "recycled as much as practicable" for reused inert C&amp;D materials. Therefore, it is suggested to combine these two rows as a single row named "Inert C&amp;D Materials", specifying the quantity in the 2nd column and the on-site reuse quantity in the 3rd column.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>(a-b, d) Please note that the waste index of inert C&amp;D materials and non-inert C&amp;D materials are made reference to "A Guide for Managing and Minimizing Building and Demolition Waste" published by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University in May 2001. The construction waste generation rate for Housing Projects in Hong Kong is 0.250m3/m² GFA.</li> <li>(c) Noted and revised accordingly (<i>Attachment 3</i> refers).</li> <li>(e) Noted and revised accordingly (<i>Attachment 3</i> refers).</li> </ul>			
	Sewerage Impact Assessment				
39. 40.	<ul> <li>Table 2-2 -</li> <li>(a) According to PI49-03, the proposed FSD quarters and fire station at Area 136 has been relocated to Area 135. Please revise as appropriate.</li> <li>(b) Please revise the term "Area 52" as "Area 52 (E6)" for clarity.</li> <li>Table 4-2 and Appendix D - Please adopt UFF 0.28m³/day for the staff of management office and revise the assessment accordingly.</li> </ul>	Noted and please refer to <b>Attachment 5</b> for the replacement pages of the Sewerage Impact Assessment ("SIA") for revised Table 2-2.  Noted and revised accordingly ( <b>Attachment 5</b> refers).			

Com	ments/ Suggestions	Applicant's Responses				
41.	Table 6-2 - The results of the Table do not tally with Appendix F. Please check.	Noted and revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 5</i> refers).				
42.	Appendix C - Please also include the as-built details of the related manholes in Appendix F for checking (e.g. invert levels, gradients, length, inner pipe diameter, etc.).					
43.	Appendix F - Please check that the pipe capacity, lengths and percentage capacity used of pipes are at variance to PI49-03.	Noted and reviewed accordingly ( <i>Attachment 5</i> refers).				
В.	Comments from Food and Environmental Hygiene Department received	d from Planning Department on 14.10.2025:				
	(Contact person: Ms. TO Man Yim, Mandy, Tel no.: 3141 1223)					
1.	According to the G/F Plan of Appendix 1, an area for RS & MRC with 1 no. of RCV is noted. Please remind the applicant that if domestic waste collection service in the development is required from FEHD in future, prior comment from FEHD on the detailed waste collection plan (including swept path analysis), collection mode and design of the refuse collection point should be sought. Provision of service may not be possible if there is restriction(s) or safety consideration(s) on manoeuvre of refuse collection vehicles to the designated collection point(s) for domestic refuse in the development.					
C.	Comments from Landscape Unit of Planning Department received from (Contact person: Ms. TSUI Hiu Wai, Isabella, Tel no.: 3565 3951)	Planning Department on 14.10.2025:				
1.	Please refer to our following comments from landscape planning perspective:  Advisory Comments  Landscape Master Plan - G/F (Dwg. No. LP_001)  a) It is noted that the spacing of the trees along northern boundary is 7m. Please review if spacing can be reduced to 5m to accommodate more tree planting.	a) Noted. The proposed 7m tree spacing is in consideration from its matur				

Com	ments/ Suggestions	Applicant's Responses			
	b) The width of the planters on the inner side of the fence along the southern boundary and near the guard booth is around 3m (i.e. similar width as the width of the planter along the northern boundary) and should be sufficient for at-grade tree planting. Please review if new trees of suitable form and size can be introduced at those planters.	b) With reference to the sections in drawing no. LP_006 in Appendix 1 of SPS, please note that insufficient space for the tree crown is allowed along the southern boundary due to the limited headroom. If tree is planted in this southern boundary planter, it is a high risk for the conflict between the tree crown with the building structure. With reference to the elevation in drawing (Appendix 1 of SPS - Boundary Fence Wall refers), tall shrubs are already proposed and we opine that it can be designed in the detailed design stage.			
	Advisory Remarks to the Applicant				
2.	The Applicant is reminded that approval of the S.16 application under Town Planning Ordinance does not imply approval of the site coverage of greenery requirements under DEVB TC(W) No. 3/2012. The site coverage of greenery calculation should be submitted separately to relevant authorities for approval.	Noted.			
D.	Comments from Housing Department received from Planning Departme	nt on 14.10.2025:			
	(Contact person: Mr. LAU Kar Kay, Alan, Tel no.: 2761 5310)				
1.	Please be reminded that the planned fixed noise sources at the proposed PMQ shall not affect the public housing developments at TC 133 A, B and C.	Noted. Please be confirmed that the design of fixed plant will comply with HKPSG requirement and will take Public Housing development at TC133A, B and C into consideration. Acoustic treatment will be incorporated in design as appropriate.			

Com	ments/ Suggestions	Applicant's Responses				
E.	Comments from Transport Department received from Planning Department	nent on 17.10.2025:				
	(Contact person: Mr. LEE Lap Man, Raymond, Tel no.: 2399 2423)					
	Please find our comments below regarding the Traffic Impact Assessment.					
	A. Comments from Transport Operations					
	Lack of Assessment on Public Transport Services	Re. Items F1-6				
1.	The TIA does not include an assessment of the increase in population and its impact on public transport services in the vicinity.	Reference is made to (i) <b>Section 2.4 – Development Parameters</b> and (ii) <b>Chapter 4 – Public Transport Demand and Services Proposals</b> of the Traffic Impact Assessment study for the increase in population within Tung				
2.	There is no evaluation of the projected demand for public transport services resulting from the development, including buses, shuttle buses, feeder services, taxis, and public light buses.	Chung New Town Extension (" <b>TCNTE</b> ") under Agreement no. CE69/2015 (CE) commissioned by Civil Engineering Development Department ("TIA of CE69/2015(CE)").				
3.	The absence of this analysis raises concerns about the adequacy of existing public transport infrastructure to accommodate the additional population and the potential need for enhancements.	<b>Table 2-5</b> in <b>Section 2.4</b> of the TIA of CE69/2015(CE) indicated that the assumption for the number of flat at the Application Site is <b>the same</b> as the current Planning Application (A/I-TCE/6), i.e. 432 nos.				
	Need for a Comprehensive Review of Public Transport Facilities	According to <b>Chapter 4</b> of TIA of CE69/2015(CE), it was concluded that the public transport demand arising from the latest population in TCNTE				
4.	The applicant should conduct a comprehensive review to determine the necessity of providing public transport facilities within or near the development.	(including the latest proposal at the Application Site) could generally be accommodated by the public transport provision. Therefore, the Proposed JPOMQ is not anticipated to induce adverse impact on public transport services.				
5.	This review should include an analysis of pedestrian connectivity, footpath networks, and access to nearby public transport nodes, such as MTR stations and bus stops.					
6.	If the review identifies gaps or inadequacies, the applicant should propose mitigation measures, such as the provision of shuttle bus services, dedicated pick-up/drop-off zones, or improvements to pedestrian infrastructure.					
	B. Comments from Traffic Engineering					
7.	Re. R-to-C Item L.1 – Please provide the record of agreement from the target residents, i.e. HKPF, on the number of car parking spaces.	Please refer to <b>Attachment 7</b> for the record of agreement from HKPF on 87 car parking spaces.				

Com	ments/ Suggestions	Applicant's Responses						
8.	Re. R-to-C Item L.2 – Please provide advice from the relevant authority, i.e. Buildings Department, about the disabled private car parking spaces.	Reference is made to the Paragraph 8 of Division 3 Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008 (2025 Edition) published by Buildings Department (extracted below).						
		8. Ratio of Accessible Parking Spaces						
		(1) Adequate numbers of accessible car parking spaces shall be provided with proper access, proper designation and directional signage in the carparks.						
		Obligatory Design Requirements						
		(2) Total No. of Car Parking Space Required No. of Accessible in Lot Car Parking Spaces						
		1-50 1						
		51-150 2 151-250 3						
		151-250 3 251-350 4						
		351-450 5						
		Above 450 6						
9.	Re. R-to-C Item L.3 – Please provide the record of agreement from the target residents, i.e. HKPF, on the number of bicycle parking spaces.	With the provision of 87 car parking spaces in the Proposed JPOMQ, 2 (two) accessible parking spaces are required.  Please refer to <i>Attachment 6</i> for the record of agreement from HKPF on 22 bicycle parking spaces.						
10.	Re. R-to-C Item L.3 – The relevant responses have not been reflected in the TIA report. The study/assessment of bicycle parking spaces is not presented in the report and the whole topic about cycle parking is not presented in the TIA report. Please review.	Noted and please refer to <b>Attachment 8</b> for the replacement pages of the Traffic Impact Assessment ("TIA") for revised Table 2.2.						

Com	nments/ Suggestions	Applicant's Responses				
F.	Comments from Civil Aviation Department received from Planning Depa (Contact person: Mr. LI Man Lung, Luke, Tel no.: 2910 6906)	rtment on 17.10.2025:				
1.	Aircraft/helicopter noise is expected be audible to the future residents due to the close proximity of the subject site to the flight paths/helicopter routes of Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA), though it is mentioned in the updated Section 6.6 and 6.7 in the Preliminary Environmental Review that the relevant noise criteria could be met, based on the 3RS EIA study results. In fact, we are aware of aircraft noise complaints from the residents in Tung Chung from time to time. As a good practice to minimize the potential aircraft/helicopter noise nuisance to future residents, we maintain our views that appropriate noise mitigation measures (e.g. use of acoustic insulation) should be considered, and future residents should be duly alerted of the potential noise caused by aircraft and helicopter operations into and out of the HKIA.	Noted.				
G.	Comments from Planning Department received from Planning Department (Contact person: Ms. WAN Wai Yan, Vivian, Tel no.: 2158 6173)	ent on 17.10.2025:				
1.	<ul> <li>To supplement the justifications to relax the BH restriction from 70 mPD to 105 mPD (i.e. an increase of 35 m), the applicant should provide:</li> <li>a) detailed assumptions (e.g., which assumptions are being used, such as floor-to-floor height, site coverage, development constraints, etc.) for the indicative scheme of 15 domestic storeys under the 70 mPD BH restriction as mentioned in para. 5.1.1 of the Planning Statement and elaborations on why the domestic block of 15 domestic storeys (above 1-storey transfer plate and 3-storey podium) could be achievable under the 70 mPD restriction;</li> <li>b) comparisons amongst the proposed scheme of 27 domestic storeys with a BH of 105 mPD (MiC), BH of 100mPD (non-MiC) and the 15 domestic storey scheme with a BH of 70 mPD; and</li> <li>c) sites constraints and considerations restricting layout design for a more transparent layout design or stepped building height profile.</li> </ul>	(a, b) The proposed site coverage of residential tower of the Proposed JPOMQ has already maximised to 37.5%, the permissible site coverage for domestic buildings situated at Class B over 61m under the Building (Planning) Regulation ("B(P)R"). The Proposed JPOMQ also optimised the architectural layout to fulfil requirements for prescribed window and Sustainable Building Design Guideline ("SBDG"). Under the BH restriction of 70mPD, as the BH will still exceed 61m, the permissible domestic site coverage remains at 37.5% and could not be further increased. Thus, the same architectural layout of 105mPD scheme would still apply. In this regard, the flat production will be reduced to 240 units under the BH restriction of 70mPD as the number storeys will be correspondingly reduced by 12 storeys. For ease of reference, please refer to the table below for the general assumptions under the BH of 70mPD and 105mPD.				

Comments/ Suggestions	Applicant	's Respon	ses				
	вн	No. of domestic Storeys	GFA (m²)	PR	No. of Units	F-t-f-h (m)	Site Coverage (above 15m)
	<70mPD	15#	18,025	3.7	240	3.02	Approx. 37.5%
	105mPD (w/ MiC)*	27	31,694	6.5	432	3.02	Approx. 37.5%
	98.61mPD (w/o MiC)*	27	31,694	6.5	432	2.8	Approx. 37.5% sfer plate (additiona
	0.3m) and roo # Please refei which demon of 70mPD.	to the Sectionstrated only 1	on Plans of Ar	toreys o	ould be ac	ix 1 of SPS	or ease of reference der the BH restriction
	TUNG CHUNG AREA 133C		FLAT  FLAT	ODIUM GARDEN CARPARK	FLAT  FLAT	10/F  25/F  25/F  25/F  10/F  10/F  25/F  25/F  27/F  17/F	PROPOSED BUILDING HEIGHT  TORKER  BUILDING HEIGHT  #STRUCTION (OVER)  Torgett  ##################################

Comments/ Suggestions		Applicant's Responses							
		c) As indicated footprint is la (including the and abovegro (i.e. site area Building (Plant restricts the a Therefore, the meet the targe	argely co traffic no und carp of 4,876 ning) Reg allowable e Propose	nfined ise miticark). Gom <sup>2</sup> ), the gulation floor sed BH c	by vagation iven the perm of up to pace pace pace for the pace pace pace pace pace pace pace pac	rious designessures, are limited site of 37.5% is a per floor for nPD is the rious measures.	n and si adoption of e area for coverage Iready ma the resion	te consof MiC redevelor ("SC") (ximised lential t	straints method opment under d which towers.
2.	To justify the scale of the proposed staff quarters, please supplement development information of existing police married quarters in Hong Kong to ascertain that the current proposed scheme is of a similar development scale and it is not excessive when compare with existing police married quarter developments (i.e. no. of flats, average flat size, floor-to-floor height, building bulk etc.)	Please find the table below for the broad information of three (3) other police married quarters (" <b>PMQs</b> ") in Hong Kong. It can be seen that the development intensity of the Proposed JPOMQ is on par with other PMQs and the Proposed BH is also similar to Fan Garden and Western Police Married Quarters. It is the Government's intention to continue improve the living environment of Government staff by providing more spacious (in terms of flat size and ceiling height) units in the Government staff quarters. In recent departmental quarter project such as Fire Station-cum-ambulance Depot with Departmental Quarters and Facilities in Area 72, Tseung Kwan O (under construction), the f-t-f-h of department quarters has been increased to around 2.95m. Therefore, adjustment to the average unit size and f-t-f-h have been continuously under review.							
		Police Married Quarters (Completion Year)	Site Area (m²) (Approx)	Plot Ratio	No. of Units	Average Unit Size (m²)*	No. of Storeys	BH (mPD)	F-t-f- h (m)
		Tuen Mun Wu Hong Police Quarters (2010)	3,600	5	336	58.8	22	71	2.8
		Fan Garden (2021)	13,850	6	1,184	57.3	29-31	108.4	2.8
		Western Police Married Quarters (Under Construction)	3,672	12.821	540	57.3	31-32	104	2.8
		Fire Station-cum- ambulance Depot with Departmental Quarters and Facilities in Area 72, Tseung Kwan O (Under Construction)	3,015	4.93	132	50	12 (domestic)	61.6	2.95
		Proposed JPOMQ (Under Planning)	4,876	6.5	432	60.6	30	105	3.02
		* In Saleable Floor Are	ea		ı			1	

Com	ments/ Suggestions	Applicant's Responses			
3.	To justify the necessity of increasing the development density of the site, please supplement if there is any planned and identified sites for police married quarters in Hong Kong, particularly in Northern Metropolis (NM).	Please note that currently there are three (3) planned sites reserved for PMQs and they are located in Northern Metropolis (" <b>NM</b> "). However, the development programme for these sites have yet to be determined.			
4.	Please clarify whether the proposed development parameters excludes the 10% GFA and SC concessions for floors adopting Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) method permissible under Joint Practice Note (JPN) No. 8 and Section 42 of the Buildings Ordinance (BO).	Please be confirmed that the proposed development parameter and GFA calculation does not include the 10% concession of GFA for MIC floor area by adopting MIC for construction under JPN No.8 on "Enhanced Facilitation Measures for Buildings Adopting MiC", which is subject to approval of the Building Authority.			
5.	The Applicant is required to take note of JPN No. 8 and provide details of the propose BH of JPOMQ without the use of MiC construction method for reference. Please also clarify whether the use of MiC construction method would result an increase of BH exceeding 4% (supplement on the requirements of paras. 10 to 13 of JPN 8).	The Applicant noted the JPN No. 8 in regard to the support for minor relaxation of BH restriction up to 4% of the total storey height of MiC floors, irrespective of the actual additional vertical space taken up arising from the adoption of MiC. In comparison with the typical staff quarters units and under the same assumption for ceiling height, the use of MiC method would result in an additional f-t-f-h of about 0.22m (equivalent to about 7.3% of the storey height) to accommodate the thickened double slabs between the MiC modules.			
6.	For para 3.2.4 of the planning statement, please clarify whether the "8 DQs mentioned in the 2014 Policy Address" include the application site or not.	Please be clarified that the eight (8) department quarters (" <b>DQs</b> ") mentioned in the 2014 Policy Address does not include the Application Site.			
7.	We note that the VIA has concluded that the proposed development would incur slightly adverse visual impact to the surrounding developments in TCE. Please consider to indicate the suggested/identified mitigation measures on the photomontages which, as mentioned, are for illustration purpose.	Noted and please refer to <b>Attachment 9</b> for the replacement pages of the Visual Impact Assessment ("VIA") for revised Figures 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 and Section 6.5 which have further elaborated on the mitigation measures.			
Н.	Comments from Urban Design Unit of Planning Department received fro	m Planning Department on 17.10.2025:			
	(Contact person: Mr. LAM Sau Yin, Timothy, Tel no.: 3565 3940)				
	Visual Impact Assessment				
1.	Para. 6.2.4 – Given more of the open sky view and open sea view would be blocked by the Junior PMQ with the proposed minor relaxation of building height, it is suggested to revise the rating of "Effects on Visual Resources" from "negligible" to "slightly adverse".	Noted and Para. 6.2.4 and Table 5.1 of the VIA is revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 9</i> refers).			

Comments/ Suggestions		Applicant's Responses			
2.	Regarding the design consideration listed in Section 4.3, please see our comments below:	Noted.			
3.	The Consultant may wish to clarify whether the design considerations listed in Section 4.3 are also regarded as mitigation measures. If affirmative, please beef up the Section 6 to demonstrate how these measures could effectively reduce the visual impact due to the minor relaxation of BHR. It is also suggested to include a new Section before the Conclusion to state clearly the mitigation measures.	Noted and please refer to Section 6.5 of the VIA for the elaboration of the mitigation measures ( <i>Attachment 9</i> refers).			
4.	The Consultant may wish to discuss how the design of the building enables the development to conform to the overall visual context and the intended stepped building height concept of Tung Chung Extension (TCE) as a mitigation measure.	Noted and please refer to Para. 6.5.2 and revised Figure 6.1 of the VIA for the discussion on how the Proposed JPOMQ conform with the overall visual context and stepped building height concept of TCE ( <i>Attachment 9</i> refers).			
5.	It is noted that the development would provide set back from the northern boundary, so that structures of the proposed development would not encroach into the planned breezeway in Area 133. However, this design feature is absence from this VIA. The Consultant may wish to discuss this as a mitigation measure in the VIA as well.	Noted and please refer to Section 6.5 of the VIA ( <i>Attachment 9</i> refers).			
6.	The Consultant may also consider to show the mitigation measures on a plan, similar to Figure 4.1 of the Supplementary Planning Statement for easy reference.	Noted and please refer to Section 6.5 and revised Figures 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 of the VIA for the elaboration of the mitigation measures ( <i>Attachment 9</i> refers).			
7.	The photomontages do not reflect the design considerations, such as landscape treatment, the large shrubs and green hedge. Please update the photomontages accordingly.	Noted and Figures 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 are revised accordingly ( <i>Attachment 9</i> refers).			
8.	The Consultant please check whether the model of the proposed development encroached the planned breezeway in Figure 6.2.	Noted and please be clarified the area falling within the "G/IC" zone is proposed as at-grade landscaped area to respect the planned breezeway.			

Comments/ Suggestions		Applicant's Responses			
I.	Public Comment				
	During the formal publication period of the S16 Planning Application, two (2) public comments were received with one (1) comment in objection and one (1) providing comments by MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL"). The comments are summarised below:				
	Opposing Views				
1.	Government staff quarters should be phased out to encourage home ownership.	It is the Government's policy to provide departmental quarters for married disciplined services staff to not only retain and attract talents, but also boost morale, subject to availability of resources. The Application Site has been reserved for development of a police married quarters and this S16 Planning Application seeks to fully utilise the development potential of the Application Site.			
2.	Concerned with the privacy of the users of nearby educational and sports facilities as extensive surveillance equipment will be installed at the Proposed JPOMQ.	Please note that the CCTVs installed at the Application Site are for the purpose of deterrence and prevention of crime and ensuring the safety of the residents of the Proposed JPOMQ. No CCTVs will be installed towards the surroundings of the Site (i.e. educational and sports facilities) as the main purposed of the CCTVs are for security and safety of the residents and not for surveillance purposes. The installation and usage of CCTVs would be in accordance with the codes of practice as stipulated under the Hong Kong Law.			
		Please find the Guidance on CCTV Surveillance Practices from Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data in the link below: <a href="https://www.pcpd.org.hk/english/publications/files/CCTVpractices_e.pdf">https://www.pcpd.org.hk/english/publications/files/CCTVpractices_e.pdf</a>			
3.	The stepped building height profile of the Tung Chung East will be jeopardised.	With consideration of the approved BHs (125mPD to 135mPD) under Application No. A/I-TCE/4 at Area 133 (i.e. to the west of the Site), the proposed BH of 105mPD for the Proposed JPOMQ will preserve a distinct height variation and descending BH profile towards the waterfront (Figure 5.1 of the SPS refers).			

# **Responses to Comments Table**

Comments/ Suggestions		Applicant's Responses		
4.	The Application Site is not in line with the planning intention of the "G/IC" zone and should be developed for community facilities.	As mentioned in the response to Item J1 above, the Application Site has been reserved for development of a police married quarters and is in line with the planning intention of the "G/IC" zone, which is intended "primarily for the provision of Government, institution or community facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organizations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments".		
	Other Comments			
5.	MTRCL raised concerns regarding the potential noise impact of train operations on future residents of the Proposed JPOMQ and suggested the Applicant to conduct a quantitative noise assessment based on the latest layout. MTRCL also commented on the designation of the area sensitivity rating for the southeast façade of Tower 1 and the east and south facades of Tower 2. Moreover, MTRCL indicated that if there is a programme mismatch between Proposed JPOMQ and surrounding developments, further noise assessments should be carried out.	No objection to this S16 Planning Application is noted. Figure 5.2 and Sections 6.5.7 - 6.5.8 and 6.5.11 of the PER are revised ( <i>Attachment 3</i> refers) to further elaborate on the potential railway noise impact. According to the railway noise impact assessment result from TCLE EIA report (AEIAR-235/2022) and Tung Chung New Town Extension EIA Report (AEIAR-196/2016), the Proposed JPOMQ would unlikely subject to significant adverse railway noise impact. The railway noise impact will be reviewed again in the detailed design stage, if necessary.		

Date: October 2025 File Ref: ASD/TCNTE