

Responses to Comments

Comments received from:

1.	PlanD/UD&L	2
2.	Public Comments.....	2

1. PlanD/UD&L

Section/ Para.	Comment(s)	Response(s)
Application Form - Section 9	(a) "no tree felling" is selected in the tick box but two trees will be affected and felled due to the development. Please review.	Please note that there would be no tree felling in our application site. Application form is revised.
Planning Statement - Section 3.1.7	(b)(i).The consultant is stated that T380 and T381 are within the Application Site. However, referring to Figure 35, neither of mentioned trees are within the application site. Please verify.	As there is no tree felling, Figure 35 is deleted.
	(b)(ii). According to DEVB TC(W) No. 4/2020, the Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal (TPRP) shall be prepared and submitted to the Tree Works Vetting Panel (TWVP) of the project proponent or project department, instead of being submitted directly to DEVB. For details, please refer to paragraph 13 of the Circular."	As there is no tree felling, clause 3.1.7 is deleted.
Planning Statement - Section 3.1.8	(b)(iii). It is noted that the consultant proposed "Landscape features are designed to achieve maximum convenience and efficiency for the usage of water treatment works areas ...Photomontages of the overall Proposed Development is provided in Figure 36 to 40." However, the stated landscape features could not be found in the mentioned figures. The proposed landscape feature should be indicated in a landscape plan for reference.	Clause 3.1.8 is revised below "...Photomontages of the overall Proposed Development is provided in Figure 22." (revised to A4 size)
Planning Statement - Section 4.3.3.2	(b)(iv). Please refer to comment item (b)(ii) above and review accordingly.	As there is no tree felling, clause 4.3.3.2 is revised. We would also like to clarify the status of the GLA is proposed. Relevant replacement drawings are attached.

2. Public Comments

Section/ Para.	Comment(s)	Response(s)
	It is high time that we be provided with a clear definition of what exactly MINOR means. In this instance it is actually an increase of 100% so the term is clearly a misrepresentation. There should be a limit to the abuse of this term.	Comparing the total GFA of the proposed sludge treatment plants (i.e. 4,136m ²) which is about 12% of the total GFA of the Project (around 34,600m ²), among which the major facilities will allow up to 4-story buildings high on the OZP. Each application for minor relaxation of

Section/ Para.	Comment(s)	Response(s)
		<p>building height restriction will be considered by the Town Planning Board on a case-by-case basis subject to the individual planning circumstances and merits of the proposals. The proposed minor relaxation of building height restriction for sludge treatment plants are integral to the reprovisioning and upgrading of Tsuen Wan Water Treatment Works, providing an essential infrastructure to serve the public while addressing various operational and site constraints. The comprehensive project scope encompasses the East Wing, West Wing, Staff Quarters, Administration Building, and the peripheral areas adjacent to the TWWTW. Given that the proposed height restriction relaxation applies to only a small percentage of this aggregate site area, the modification should be formally categorized as minor in scope. We therefore consider the proposal is acceptable.</p>
<p>Planning Statement</p>	<p>No images provided of the finished building, one has to rely on the as ever effusive description provided on page 21. The steel fins sound dodgy. Steel can corrode and rust in harsh conditions and the location is on a hill side so subject to the impact of heavy rainfall and storms. But then Binnies is not big visuals.</p>	<p>Please note that a photomontage of the proposed development is incorporated in Figure 22 to show the finished building.</p> <p>For the appearance of the proposed development, materials with higher resistance to corrosion will be adopted at the detailed design stage.</p>