

**Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Flat Use,
Tung Chung Town Lot 49, Tung Chung Road North, Lantau Island
(Section 16 Planning Application No. A/I-TCTC/71)**

– Further Information No. 1 –

Item	Comments	Our Responses
1	Comments from Civil Aviation Department on 2nd Pre-application Enquiry submitted on 4 February 2026 (Responsible Officer: Mr. SHUM Ka Lung, Sam; Tel: ██████████) Received on 13 February 2026	
1.1	<p><u>Airport Height Restriction / Lights</u></p> <p>Noting that the applicant has duly acknowledged our previous comments on Airport Height Restriction (AHR) and lighting in the R-t-C table, we have no further comment in this regard.</p>	Noted with thanks.
1.2	<p><u>Aircraft / Helicopter Noise</u></p> <p>We noted that the applicant has included their assessment results on aircraft/helicopter noise in the R-t-C table, as well as the installation of acoustic insulation as the noise mitigation measures. We therefore suggested that the aforementioned aircraft noise assessment results and noise mitigation measures be reflected in the Supporting Planning Statement / Environmental Assessment Report.</p>	The aircraft noise assessment results and noise mitigation measures in the previous R-t-C table have been included in the paras. 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 of the Supporting Planning Statement (Annex B refers) and Section 1.4.6 to 1.4.8 of the Environmental Assessment Report (Annex E refers).
2	Comments from Drainage Services Department on 2nd Pre-application Enquiry submitted on 4 February 2026 (Responsible Officer: Mr. LI Kei Chun, Colin; Tel: ██████████) Received on 13 February 2026	
2.1	For Appendix D to SIA - Please note that peaking factors (including stormwater allowance) should normally be applied to planning of sewerage facilities. Unless the subject sewers were specially constructed or intended for only a short service life, aged sewers will tend to leak over time, and there may be inflow of runoff through manhole covers.	Please note that the downstream sewerage system for connection has been newly constructed under Project NL/2020/05. No misconnections or infiltration defects are anticipated. The planned sewerage system is fully separated from the stormwater system, ensuring that no stormwater infiltrates into the sewerage network. Peaking factors have been adopted on the basis of sewerage flow only, excluding any stormwater allowance.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
3	Comments from Environmental Protection Department on 2nd Pre-application Enquiry submitted on 4 February 2026 (Responsible Officer: Mr. WONG Wing Hong, Andy; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 13 February 2026	
3.1	<u>General</u> Please ensure that the planning statement aligns with the findings of the environmental assessment and the sewerage impact assessment.	Relevant sections of the Supporting Planning Statement (Annex B refers) have been revised.
3.2	<u>Annex D - Revised Environmental Assessment</u> Air Quality Section 4.2.5-4.2.7 – Please supplement buffer distance requirement for odour sources.	Section 4.2.8 of the Environmental Assessment (EA) (Annex E refers) has been supplemented as follows: “With reference to S3.3.9 in Chapter 9 of the HKPSG, a buffer distance of at least 200m is suggested from some community uses that can cause significant odour nuisance, which includes: crematoria, livestock yards, stock wagon washing areas, wholesale fish and poultry markets.”
3.3	Table 4.5, Note (d) and Table 4.6, Note (b) – Please supplement the version number of SAMP.	Noted and version number of SAMP has been supplemented to Table 4.5, Note (d) and Table 4.6, Note (b) of the EA.
3.4	Table 4.6 – Please specify the level of PATH data (L1?).	Noted. Level of PATH data has been supplemented in Table 4.6 of the EA.
3.5	Table 4.7 – Please check if the separation distance for A08 should be 44m according to Figure 4.1b.	Noted. Table 4.7 of the EA has been updated.
3.6	Section 4.4.9 – Please replace “construction dust impact” with “air quality impact”.	Noted and Section 4.4.9 of the EA is updated accordingly.
3.7	Section 4.5.2, RtC#6.17 – Please supplement TD’s agreement on road type when available.	Noted and TD’s agreement on road type will be supplemented when available.
3.8	Section 4.6.2 – According to Figure 4.5, there are some jetties and piers near Ma Wan Chung (e.g. Ma Wan Chung Pier) that fall within the assessment area. Please review if there are any marine emissions that will affect the air quality of the proposed development.	Marine emission from Ma Wan Chung Pier has been discussed in Section 4.6.2 of the EA.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
3.9	Section 4.6.3 – Please indicate the location of Chung Yan Road Sewage Pumping Station and the odour patrol route in a figure. Please also review whether there are any odour from the mooring sites at Ma Wan Chung. Please check with the regional office of EPD to see if there are any odour complaint records in the recent years.	<p>Location of Chung Yan Road Sewage Pumping Station and the odour patrol route has been supplemented in Figure 4.6 of the EA.</p> <p>Odour impact from the mooring sties at Ma Wan Chung has been discussed in Section 4.6.3 of the EA.</p> <p>Recent complaint cases from regional office of EPD were obtained. There are no odour complaint records received against Chung Yan Road Sewage Pumping Station or Ma Wan Chung Mooring Site in the past 5 five years. Five odour complaint cases were received in the vicinity of subject site. 4 of them were from food premises and public toilet at Ma Wan Chung and Ya Tung Estate, 1 of them was from Subject Site. Further investigations were carried out and have been discussed in Section 4.6.4 of the EA.</p>
3.10	Section 8.1.3 and 8.1.4 – Please supplement the conclusion of the air quality during construction phase and the odour and marine emission during operation phase.	Conclusion for air quality during construction phase has been added in Section 8.1.3 of the EA. Conclusion for marine and odour emission during operation phase has been added in Section 8.1.6 and 8.1.7 of the EA.
3.11	Figure 4.1b – Please use larger font size for separation distance with A03.	The font size has been enlarged for A03 in Figure 4.1b of the EA.
3.12	Figure 4.2 – (a) Please show the complete 500m assessment area. (b) Please remove the ASRs and the separation distance that are not mentioned in Table 4.8, and use larger font size for separation distance (12m) with concurrent project P2.	<p>(a) The 500m assessment area has been shown in Figure 4.2 of the EA.</p> <p>(b) Figure 4.1 of the EA has been updated accordingly and in line with Table 4.7.</p>
3.13	Please use consistent terms for RSP/PM10 and FSP/PM2.5.	PM10 and PM2.5 have been revised to RSP and FSP respectively.
3.14	Noise Re. R-t-C 6.29, please provide and append TD's endorsement on traffic forecast data.	TD's endorsement on traffic forecast methodology and traffic consultant's confirmation that traffic forecast is prepared according to the methodology has been supplemented in Appendix 2.1 of the EA.
3.15	Re. R-t-C 6.37, it is noted that the LNRS in the noise model is not removed. Please review. If there is LNRS, please include the name of the road section(s) and mention that application of LNRS is	LNRS has been removed in the noise model.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	incorporated in the base case scenario and the extent of the LNRS is confirmed by the CEDD / HyD.	
3.16	Re. R-t-C 6.42, the overall enhancement of noise reduction by the provision of MPA and SAM cannot be evaluated by simply adding the additional noise reduction offered by individual feature without justification. Besides, an additional 1.5 dB(A) noise reduction, which only one enhancement feature is required, is already enough to achieve full compliance of road traffic noise criteria. The consultant shall further review the noise reduction during detailed design stage when the design of the noise mitigation measures are confirmed.	SAM be applied on frame between outer balcony door and inner sliding panel, as well as ceiling of balcony which can reduce 1.5 dB(A). Section 2.6.11 and Appendix 2.4 of the EA have been revised accordingly. Noise mitigation measures will be further reviewed during detailed design stage with respect to layout development.
3.17	Re. R-t-C 6.46, the typo in S.3.6.1 is not rectified, “The results of predicted fixed noise impact at the selected NSRs for proposed development are well below during the noise criteria.”.	“during” has been removed in S.3.6.1 of the EA.
3.18	Re. R-t-C 6.50, the typo in legend of Appendix 2.1 is not rectified, “300m RADIUS of CATCHMENT ASSESSMENT AREA”	The legend of Appendix 2.1 of the EA has been rectified.
3.19	Re. R-t-C 6.57, it is noted that the detailed footprint of “Tung Chung Area 23 Phase 1 Public Housing Development” is not available when preparing this pre-submission, please update the relevant information during detailed design stage.	Noted. Noise mitigation measures will be further reviewed during detailed design stage.
3.20	S.1.3.2, Figure 1.1b is not found in the pre-submission. Please supplement.	The figure referred should be read as “Figure 4.3”. S.1.3.2 of the EA has been revised accordingly.
3.21	S.2.5.2, the number of flats with noise exceedance is inconsistent with that in Appendix 2.3. Please tally.	S.2.5.2 has been revised to “There are 50 out of 290 number of flats with noise exceedance at the Subject Site, equivalent to a compliance level of 83%.”
3.22	S.2.6.2, last sentence, “The configurations are listed out in Table 2.1 and Table 2.2 below.”	Revised accordingly in S.2.6.2 of the EA.
3.23	S.2.6.3, (i) first sentence, “Predicted traffic noise level at some bedrooms (T2-18, T2-19, T2-22, T2-23, T2-26) exceeded assessment criteria and are up to 75 dB(A) (i.e. 5 dB(A) noise exceedance).”; (ii) The sizes of the habitable rooms mentioned in S.2.6.3 (i.e. about 4sqm to 11sqm) is inconsistent with that in Appendix 2.4, which is about 7sqm to 10sqm). Please tally.	(i) Revised accordingly in S.2.6.2 of the EA. (ii) the rooms sizes in S2.6.2 of the EA is revised accordingly.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
3.24	S.2.6.4, please revise the first sentence which is not understandable “.....therefore, further adjustment is needed by using the equation “10 x log (Rref/Rdesign)”, where Rref and Rdesign refer to the area of the room of the reference case respectively.”	S2.6.4 of the EA has been revised as “.....therefore, further adjustment is <u>applied based on room area of the reference case and the design case</u> , using the equation “10 x log (R _{ref} /R _{design})”, where R _{ref} and R _{design} refer to the area of the room of the reference case <u>and design case</u> respectively.”
3.25	S.2.6.6, since max RNR is adopted to compute the predicted noise level in mitigated scenario, please review whether the last sentence which mentions “For conservative purpose, the assumed noise reduction will be not higher than the predicted noise exceedance of 5 dB(A) in this assessment.” is applicable or not for consistency.	The statement has been removed accordingly in S.2.6.6 of the EA.
3.26	S.2.6.8, please review if the last sentence should be revised as “The indicative design of NPE-Liv-SD_Enh adopted in the Proposed Development is shown in Appendix 2.5.”	Revised accordingly in last sentence of S.2.6.9 of the EA.
3.27	S.2.6.9, first sentence, “Predicted traffic noise at some living rooms’ facades (i.e. balconies at T2-20, T2-21, T2-24 and T2-25) was up to 75 dB(A) .”	Revised accordingly in S.2.6.9 of the EA.
3.28	S.2.6.11, please specify the reference case for noise reduction due to the provision of MPA.	MPA has been removed, therefore this comment is not applicable.
3.29	S.2.6.14, please review if the first sentence should be revised as “In view of 2 reference cases above, noise reduction of not less than 5 dB(A) is considered achievable.”	Revised accordingly in S.2.6.14 of the EA.
3.30	Figure 3.1, please also indicate the location of the DSD Chung Yan Road sewage pumping station.	Location of DSD Chung Yan Road Sewage Pumping Station has been added in Figure 3.1 of the EA.
3.31	S.3.6.2, please add the statement “ The planned fixed noise sources shall be designed to meet the HKPSG requirement. ”	Added accordingly.
3.32	Appendix 2.3, please add a remark for the grey cells marked as “NA”.	Remark for “NA” has been added in Appendix 2.3 of the EA.
3.33	Appendix 2.4, (i) subject to comment 7, please review if the 3dB(A) reduction for enhancement measure namely “SAM(frame & ceiling) + MPA” is applicable and make necessary amendments; (ii) in the last table about the predicted noise level (mitigated scenario), the total no. of premises is 294, instead of 290. Please review.	(i) Enhance measure has been updated to provide SAM only which can reduce 1.5 dB(A) (ii) The total number of premises for the predicted noise level (mitigated scenario) has been revised.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
3.34	Figure 1.1a, a distance of 119m is indicated on the site location plan, please include such mark-up in the legend.	Figure 1.1a of the EA has been renumbered to Figure 1.1 which only show the Subject Site and its 300m Assessment Area. Distance of 119m has been removed.
3.35	<p>Waste Management</p> <p>Planning Statement and EAS Report – It is mentioned that asbestos-containing materials are identified in Section 4.2.4 of the Planning Statement, while Section 5.3.10 of the EAS Report states that “asbestos-containing materials are not expected.” Please clarify whether ACMs are anticipated for the proposed development. If not, please remove the ACMs-related paragraphs to avoid confusion.</p>	Asbestos-containing materials (ACM) are not expected. ACMs-related paragraphs have been removed from the Supporting Planning Statement (Annex B refers).
3.36	Section 5.3.4 (bullet 1) - Please revise “Y Park” to “Y·PARK” as appropriate.	Revised accordingly.
3.37	<p>Section 5.4 –</p> <p>(a) Previous comment has not been duly addressed. The operation phase of the Proposed Development is merely mentioned, but no assessment details are included. Please review and update the conclusion to incorporate the operation phase.</p> <p>(b) Please remove the “M”.</p>	<p>(a) Conclusion for waste generated in operation phase is revised to “During operation phase, the proposed development will generate general refuse. According to the Monitoring of Solid Waste in Hong Kong 2024 prepared by EPD, approximately 0.92 ton of domestic waste would be generated from the proposed development per day.”</p> <p>(b) The “M” is removed accordingly.</p>
3.38	<p><u>Annex F - Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment</u></p> <p>Section 5.1.1: The contributing population in Table 3 of Section 5.1.1 does not tally with that in Appendix D. Please check.</p>	Noted and revised. Please refer to updated Section 5.1.1 of the SIA (Annex G refers).
3.39	Section 5.1.5: Re R-to-C item 6.73: Please provide the correspondence as mentioned.	Noted. Please kindly refer to attached Annex H for information.
3.40	<p>Appendix C:</p> <p>(a) Re R-to-C item 6.72: According to Table 1 and Table 2 of HKPSG Chapter 2, the proposed development should be adopting the UFF for R3. Please review.</p> <p>(b) According to the “General Specification for Swimming Pool Water Treatment Installation” (GS) by ArchSD, the turnover period of swimming pool should not be less than 4 hours (for indoor) or 6</p>	<p>(a) Noted. Please refer to updated Section 4.2.2 and the updated Appendix C of the SIA.</p> <p>(b) Noted. Please refer to updated calculation for swimming pool and backwash discharge estimation in Appendix C of the SIA.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	<p>hours (for outdoor). Please review.</p> <p>(c) In general, a back-wash duration of 7 minutes would be adopted for sand filters according to the GS. Please check and provide the relevant specification for assuming 10 minutes in the calculation.</p> <p>(d) There should be more assumptions prior to arriving at the back wash flow rate 7.81L/s for the swimming pool (e.g. number of filters). Please provide the remaining assumptions in the Table and the peak flow rate from the swimming pool.</p>	<p>(c) Noted. Please refer to updated calculation for swimming pool and backwash discharge estimation in Appendix C of the SIA.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to updated calculation for swimming pool and backwash discharge estimation in Appendix C of the SIA with assumption specified.</p>
3.41	<p>Appendix D:</p> <p>(a) Re R-to-C item 6.75(a): Please also provide the correspondence and updated drawings in the Appendix for record.</p> <p>(b) Re R-to-C item 6.75(b): Please confirm with DSD whether the same Ks value should be adopted for all the segments in the Table.</p> <p>(c) Re R-to-C item 6.75(c): According to our latest information from REP-109 under Agreement No. CE 70/2015 (CE), the ADWF from Ma Wan Chung SPS remaining missing. Please check and update Appendix E as well.</p>	<p>(a) Please refer to Appendix G of the SIA for the correspondence and updated drawings provided by CEDD.</p> <p>(b) The SIA has been circulated to DSD for review and no comment on adopted Ks was received.</p> <p>(c) According to the information from the mentioned deliverable REP-109 under Agreement No. CE 70/2015 (CE), the MWCSPPS will receive the sewage from Area 34 (Ma Wan Chung North) and discharge via twin rising mains along Tung Chung Road North to manhole MN08 and further to FMH-J01. Please refer to updated Appendix D and Appendix E of the SIA incorporating the ADWF from Ma Wan Chung SPS.</p>
3.42	<p>To facilitate review, please provide softcopy of the report (in pdf), Response to Comments and modelling files / calculation spreadsheets (if any), and highlight the revised / updated content of the report in next submission.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
4	<p>Comments from Urban Design Unit, Planning Department on 2nd Pre-application Enquiry submitted on 4 February 2026 (Responsible Officer: Mr. LAM Sau Yin, Timothy; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 13 February 2026</p>	
4.1	<p>According to Appendix C of the TPB-PG No. 41A, discussion on mitigation measures should be included in the visual appraisal.</p>	<p>Discussion of mitigation measures has been included in Section 4 of the Visual Appraisal (Annex E refers)</p>
4.2	<p>Para. 3.3.2 – It is suggested to indicate clearly the width of the proposed setback on the layout plan of the proposed scheme.</p>	<p>The proposed width of the setback has been indicated on Figure 3.2 of the Supporting Planning Statement (Annex A refers).</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
4.3	Para. 4.7.3 – The meaning of the sentence is unclear. Please elaborate on how the wide building separation and proposed building height have helped alleviate the visual impact of the proposed development (e.g. enhance visual permeability).	The mitigation measures on visual impact have been further elaborated in para 4.7.2 of the Supporting Planning Statement .
5	Comments from Landscape Unit, Planning Department on 2nd Pre-application Enquiry submitted on 4 February 2026 (Responsible Officer: Mr. HO Chi Kong, George; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 18 March 2026	
5.1	The proposed levels in the Pink Cross-Hatched Black Area should be indicated on Tree Survey and Felling Plan for reference.	The proposed levels in the Pink Cross-Hatched Black Area are indicated on revised Tree Survey and Felling Plan (Annex J refers).
5.2	In Table 3B of revised Landscape Master Plan, Ophiopogon japonicus is a native species and in Table 3C, Quisqualis indica and Wisteria sinensis (Sims) Sweet are not native species. Please amend accordingly.	Table 3B and Table 3C of the Landscape Master Plan (Annex I refers) have been
6	Comments from Civil Engineering and Development Department on Formal Submission (Responsible Officer: Ms. LU Yulin, Kimberly; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 19 March 2026	
6.1	For para 2.2.1 regarding the planning of Area 24A, please consider the mark up below.	The Supporting Planning Statement (Annex B refers) has been revised accordingly.
6.2	For para 4.4 on sewerage, please be reminded that the applicant shall conduct its own sewerage impact assessments for the satisfaction of DSD and other relevant authorities.	A sewerage impact assessment has been conducted by the Applicant. Comments from DSD and other relevant authorities have been sought.
7	Comments from Environmental Protection Department on Formal Submission (Responsible Officer: Mr. WONG Wing Hong, Andy; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 19 February 2026	
7.1	The applicant's planner advised the following on 9 March 2026: 1) The Supporting Planning Statement and Environmental Assessment (including the modelling files & calculation spreadsheets) submitted in 2nd Pre-submission (February 2026) and the current formal submission are the same, except for the incorporation of the layout plans of the proposed scheme in Appendix 1.1. No update have been made to the main text,	Please refer our response on Items 3.1 - 3.24 above.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	<p>figures, or other appendices.</p> <p>2) For the SIA, the differences between the 2nd Pre-submission and the current formal submission are : (i) Section 1.1.1 - project background, and (ii) Appendix A - Master Layout Plans. The rest of the SIA report remains unchanged.</p> <p>3) Our previous comments will be addressed in the forthcoming Further Information.</p> <p>As our previous comments have not yet been addressed in the current submission, the comments provided during the 2nd circulation of the pre-submission remains valid.</p>	
7.2	<p>Furthermore, please find our additional comments on Environmental Assessment below.</p> <p><u>Water Quality</u></p> <p>S6.3.2, S6.3.3, S6.5, S6.8 and relevant sections - Please note that ProPECC PNs 1/94 and 5/93 have been superseded by ProPECC PNs 2/24 and 1/23 respectively, please update.</p>	Noted and relevant Sections of the EA are updated accordingly.
7.3	<p>S6.7 -</p> <p>(a) Please clarify whether the wastewater will be conveyed to planned public sewerage system, please supplement the proposed ADWF, the STW / SPS to be conveyed.</p> <p>(b) Noted that outdoor swimming pool will be provided in the clubhouse, please ensure the backwash from the swimming pool and any wastewater generated from private recreational facilities should be properly managed.</p>	<p>(a) Section 6.7.2 of the EA is supplemented as follows: “The wastewater generated from the development area, with an estimated Average Dry Weather Flow (ADWF) of 316 m³/day, will be conveyed to the planned public sewerage system constructed under Public Works Contract No. NL/2020/05 Tung Chung New Town Extension – Site Formation and Infrastructure Works at Ma Wan Chung, and subsequently discharged to the existing Chung Yan Road Sewage Pumping Station.”</p> <p>(b) Section 6.7.3 of the EA is supplemented as follows: “Wastewater generated from the swimming pool backwash and clubhouse facilities has been duly considered in the sewerage impact assessment and will be properly managed in accordance with relevant requirements and regulations.”</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
7.4	To facilitate review, please provide softcopy of the report (in pdf), Response to Comments and modelling files / calculation spreadsheets (if any), and highlight the revised / updated content of the report in next submission.	Noted.
8	Comments from Lands Department on Formal Submission (Responsible Officer: Mr. AU Wai Hung, Felix; Tel: [REDACTED]) Received on 25 March 2026	
8.1	I would like to stress that the land status of the Site changed after the execution of the land grant document for the Site on 2.2.2026. The Site is now known as TCTL 49 and is governed by Conditions of Exchange dated 2.2.2026 (the Conditions of Exchange"). The lots mentioned in the subject application, i.e. Lot Nos. 1766 RP, 1768 RP, 1770 RP, 1771 RP, 1774 RP in D.D.3 TC, along with the relevant adjoining Government land, are no longer in existence. Therefore, the applicant is reminded to update the submission to reflect these changes.	The entire submission has been revised.
8.2	Lastly, I would like to reiterate that the proposed amendments in the subject Application may not fully comply with the relevant conditions in the Conditions of Exchange, particularly concerning GFA exemptions for private parking spaces and ancillary areas serving such parking spaces. The lot owner is reminded that a separate application is required to be submitted for consideration by LandsD at its absolute discretion acting in its capacity as a landlord, and there is no guarantee that such application will eventually be approved by LandsD. If the application is approved by LandsD, it will be subject to such terms and conditions as may be imposed by LandsD at its absolute discretion, including payment of premium and administrative fee(s). Details can be referred to LAO Practice Note Issue No. 9/2025.	Noted.

Encl.

Annex A – Replacement Pages of Application Form

Annex B – Updated Supporting Planning Statement

Annex C – Updated Schematic Architectural Drawings

- Annex D – Updated Traffic Impact Assessment**
- Annex E – Updated Environmental Assessment**
- Annex F – Updated Drainage Impact Assessment**
- Annex G – Updated Sewerage Impact Assessment**
- Annex H – Email Correspondences with DSD**
- Annex I – Updated Landscape Master Plan**
- Annex J – Updated Tree Felling and Prservation Proposal**
- Annex K – Updated Visual Appraisal**

Compiled by: KTA

Date: 27 March 2026

File Ref: 20260327_S3176_FI(1)_R-to-C