

Section 16 Planning Application for Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly), Shop and Services (Medical Consulting Room including Clinic) and Public Vehicle Park (Private Car Only) in "Village Type Development" Zone at Lots 76 S.G (Part), 76 S.H (Part) in D.D. 101 and adjoining Government Land, Mai Po, Yuen Long

Table of Content

Responses to Departmental Comments

	Page
1. Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department	1
2. Drainage Services Department	6
3. Environmental Protection Department	7
4. Social Welfare Department	12
5. Transport Department	13

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.	Comments of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department received on 12.5.2025 and 2.6.2025	
1.1	Comments from nature conservation perspective	
1.1.1	<p>RtC Item 1.1.12: We are concerned that the breeding egrets may use different trees over the years. Even they don't use the other trees, the removal of all the adjacent trees may change the site condition and expose the trees T1, T4, T8 and T9 in a way that the breeding egrets dislike. As ardeids are sensitive to environmental changes and disturbance and they tend to use the same location for breeding for years, from conservation point of view, it is suggested that to retain the trees used by the breeding ardeids and within the egret area as far as possible unless there is an overriding risk to public safety. It is also noted from the Tree Treatment Schedule that among all the 10 trees along the southeastern boundary of the application site that are proposed to be felled, only one tree was assessed as having poor health. None were assessed as having poor structural condition nor high possibility of failure.</p>	<p>In consideration of the actual condition and requirement during construction, removal of existing structure, such as hoarding and raised planter wall are necessary, which shall have worse impact to the existing trees currently attaching to these structures, so that some trees, especially on the South-eastern side should be removed.</p> <p>In consideration to minimize the impact and disturbance to the habitat of Ardeids, we propose to plant a group of new trees at the South-eastern side before removal of certain nos. of existing trees (most of the trees are <i>Macaranga tanarius</i> var. <i>tomentosa</i> (血桐), which are very common species), so that the Ardeids can be nesting at the same location.</p> <p>Please refer to further elaboration on Section 3.4 of the LP (see Appendix A).</p>
1.1.2	<p>RtC Item 1.1.17: Two rows of new tree planting are proposed at the northwestern side of the application site. Please advise the height of the new planting when the proposed development start to operate and whether these trees are effective in screening out the disturbance from the proposed development during the operation phase.</p>	<p>With reference to the drawing no. CP_001, 6m high <i>Cinnamomum burmannii</i> (陰香) and 4m high <i>Sterculia lanceolata</i> (假蘋婆) are proposed (see Appendix A). They are Evergreen and Native species in Hong Kong, which should be effective in screening out the disturbance from the proposed development during the operation phase.</p>
1.1.3	<p>Section 3.3.3: It is stated that camera traps were used in the mammal survey. Please mark the locations of the camera traps at Fig. 3.1.</p>	<p>A camera trap was installed near the mixed woodland to survey if any mammal is active in the habitats adjacent to the Application Site and the Study Area, with the consideration of security concerns and availability of installation within the Study Area. The location of the camera trap is supplemented at Fig. 3.1 (see Appendix B).</p>

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.1.4	Table 4.3: Please provide a breakdown table showing the percentage of recorded flightlines at different height categories (similar to Table 4.4) for Flightlines A to G.	Table 4.3 is supplemented with the percentage of recorded flightlines at different height categories (see Appendix B) .
1.1.5	Sections 4.1.1, 4.1.10: Please specify whether the application site encroaches onto the Priority Site for Enhanced Conservation or the proposed SPS WCP.	The Application Site does not encroach onto the Priority Site for Enhanced Conservation or the proposed SPS WCP, Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.10 are revised (see Appendix B) .
1.1.6	Section 4.2.23: Please supplement that a major flightline i.e. Flightline E representing 26.8% of the recorded flightlines was along the southwestern boundary of the application site, and confirm whether this flightline was within the application site and whether it was over the proposed T1.	The recorded flightline E was a major flightline identified flying across the Tam Kon Chau Road along the southwestern boundary of the Application Site. The flightline was recorded not flying over the layout of proposed T1. Section 4.2.22 is revised accordingly (see Appendix B) .
1.1.7	Section 5.1.1: Please also specify the maximum height of the structures on the roof above the ground level for T1 to T3.	The maximum heights of the structures on the roof above the ground level for T1 to T3 are supplemented in Section 5.1.1 (see Appendix B) .
1.1.8	Section 5.3.10: Table 4.4 shows that the majority of flightlines are at 10m-15m. They may be impacted by installation of facilities at the roof of T2 and T3. Please evaluate whether the Flightline C & D (15m, 20m) will be obstructed by the installation of facilities atop T2 & T3 (which constitute to a max height of 15m) and review the impact severity.	<p>To clarify, the majority of flights in Table 4.4 are at the range of 10m – 15m, and were recorded to climb to the major heights mentioned in Table 4.3 for each recorded flightline, sectioned 4.2.24 is supplemented.</p> <p>To avoid potential obstruction to the recorded flightline, T2 and T3 are strategically designed to be low-rise with only 2 residential floors, leaving MEP facilities atop the buildings. Although the site constraints, the positioning and stepped design of the facilities atop T2 and T3 are still designed to avoid overlapping with the recorded flightlines C and D to take due consideration for conservation of the egret and its flightlines.</p> <p>In addition, the layout of the MEP facilities atop T2 and T3 are revised, preserving about 65% and 80% of the roof area respectively to avoid obstruction with the recorded flightlines and preserve significant air space, thus the impact is minor. Section 5.3.10 is revised accordingly (see Appendix B).</p>

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.1.9	Figure 5.2: The marking of the location of Mai Po Village Egretty may be misleading. Instead of a point, please mark the extent of the entire egretty like in Figure 6.5.	The indication of Mai Po Village Egretty of Figure 5.2 is revised as same as the extent of the egretty in Figure 6.5 (see Appendix B).
1.1.10	RtC Item 1.1.19/ Section 6.4.4: Please specify the time and month restriction of noisy construction activities to minimise the impact on overwintering birds.	The time and month of restriction of noisy construction activities includes restricting to the timeframe from the period of 1 hour after sunrise to 1 hour before sunset during October to March if any night roost of overwinter birds is found within 100m of the Application Site during pre-construction survey and construction phase.
1.1.11	The trees used by the breeding ardeids and within the egretty area should be retained as far as possible unless there is an overriding risk to public safety.	Noted. Please refer to further elaboration on Section 3.4 of the LP (see Appendix A).
1.1.12	I have no objection to planting a group of new trees at the south-eastern side before pruning/ removal of trees with an overriding risk to public safety as a compensation measure.	Noted. Please refer to further elaboration on Section 3.4 of the LP (see Appendix A).
1.1.13	However, the new trees should be of heavy standard. And the trees species (yellow shaded ones in App B_5_CP_001.pdf) should be able to enhance the current egretty, thus instead of 6 <i>Grevillea robusta</i> , 13 <i>Dimocarpus longan</i> and some <i>Terminalia mantaly</i> , the proponent should consider tree species used in the current egrettries, especially MPV and MPLV (i.e. mixing <i>Dimocarpus longan</i> with <i>Ficus microcarpa</i>). The planting should be conducted during the non-breeding season.	Noted. Heavy standard trees with DBH 120mm as indicated in the report and Drawing No. CP_001 are provided (see Appendix A). As indicated in drawing CP_001, a mix of 2nos. Native species (<i>Cinnamomum burmannii</i> and <i>Ficus microcarpa</i>) and 1no. Exotic species (<i>Dimocarpus longan</i>) is proposed at the South-eastern side of the site (see Appendix A).

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.2	Comments from the Wetland Conservation Parks perspective: <u>Replacement Pages of Planning Statement</u>	
1.2.1	Section 2.1.2: Please revise the Section to read: "...SPS WCP Management Office (i.e. a facility related to the SPS WCP, but located within the San Tin Technopole) and is situated to the immediate east of the Application Site). The overall development context..."	Section 2.1.2 of the planning statement has been revised accordingly (see Appendix G) .
	<u>Revised EcolA</u>	
1.2.2	Section 4.1.9: The obsolete TPB Guideline No. 12B was quoted here, please update to read: "TPB Guideline No. 12 C ".	Section 4.1.9 is revised accordingly (see Appendix B) .
1.2.3	Section 4.1.10: Under the 4 th function, the sentences "The Park will be developed in phases...full operation of San Tin Technopole" concern the programme of the establishment of the SPS WCP but not its function. Please place the concerned text in a new line under the general Section 4.1.10 instead.	Section 4.1.10 is revised accordingly (see Appendix B) .
1.2.4	Section 4.2.5: Please revise the typo " <i>Ficus</i> F <i>microcarpa</i> ".	The typo in Section 4.2.5 is revised as "Ficus microcarpa" (see Appendix B) .
1.2.5	Section 4.2.8: Please revise the typo " Hip -Hop Shing Wai".	Section 4.2.8 is revised accordingly (see Appendix B) .

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.2.6	<p>Section 7.1.8: Please revise the Section to read: "...designed to enhance biodiversity, compensate for ecological and fisheries impacts, and provide eco-education and recreation, and introduce ecologically friendly and modernized aquaculture. With core wetland habitats...ensures minimal cumulative impacts on the SPS WCP; supporting its long-term ecological and recreational goals."</p> <p>In addition to migratory birds, the ponds in the SPS WCP also serve as foraging sites for the ardeids at the Mai Po Village Egrettry. Please clarify.</p> <p>The statement "The ecological surveys indicate that ponds near the Application Site, close to developed areas and roads, host a significantly lower abundance of these birds." seems to be not demonstrated or substantiated from the survey results. There is no definition or separate category for "ponds near the Application Site, close to developed area and roads". In fact, the ponds near the Application Site are feeding sites for the ardeids from the Mai Po Village Egrettry (Fig. 4.10). Please clarify.</p>	<p>Section 7.1.8 is revised accordingly (see Appendix B). Three abandoned ponds were recorded located adjacent to the Application Site during the survey, of which the pond to the south is situated to the south of Tam Kon Chau Road and recorded with heavily overgrown vegetation and abandonment; the pond to the west was recorded with human disturbance and abutment with the Tam Kon Chau Road and open storage; the pond to the north is located adjacent to the road for access of heavy trucks to an open storage and was recorded left abandoned.</p> <p>With reference to the EIA report of the San Tin / Lok Ma Chau Development Node (CE 20/2021 (CE)), the flightlines were recorded flying above and across three of the abovementioned ponds, with more than 80% of the breeding ardeids likely traveling towards to ponds at Mai Po, San Tin, and Sam Po Shue, that are located in the core wetland habitats within the proposed Sam Po Shue Wetland Conservation Park, which are potentially the major feeding sites for the ardeid from the Mai Po Village Egrettry.</p> <p>In addition, there was no species of conservation importance from the survey within these three ponds adjacent to the Application Site according to the EIA report. Under current application, only low abundance of common species (e.g. Chinese Pond Heron and Little Grebe) were recorded within those abandoned ponds during the ecological survey. Thus the three ponds recorded adjacent to the Application Site are having lower potential to be the feeding sites for the ardeids from the Mai Po Village Egrettry.</p>



	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
2.	Comments of Drainage Services Department received on 15.5.2025	
	<u>Drainage Impact Assessment:</u>	
2.1	Appendix A: With the proposed layout plan, please provide a corresponding area of paved/unpaved area in this DIA for consideration.	The paved and unpaved areas corresponding to the proposed layout plan (i.e., 6058.3m ² for paved area and 2370.6 m ² for unpaved area) have been incorporated into the calculation in Appendix A of the revised DIA (see Appendix C) .
2.2	Appendix B: please supplement a layout plan to show where the site photos were taken and their respective perspective.	The layout plan has been supplemented in Appendix B of the revised DIA (see Appendix C) .
2.3	Appendix C: Except for the change in heading, it is still not clear about the change in drainage impact of the proposed site due to the development. Please show clearly the assessment of the pre-and post-development scenario.	The pre-development scenario has been added in Appendix C and the change has been added in S3.2.6 of the revised DIA (see Appendix C) . The Application Site has its own independent drainage pipe and ditch that also discharges into the Mai Po Tributary before development. The proposed internal pipe will connect to the manhole SMH1012333 after development. The peak flow rates under 50-year return period will increase from 0.84 m ³ /s to 1.08 m ³ /s in the storm pipe SWD1019988 (from manhole SMH1012333 to SMH1012334), from 0.80 to 1.05 m ³ /s in the storm pipe SWD1019989 (from manhole SMH1012334 to SNF1002684) after the development of Application Site. However, the receiving public drain from the manhole SMH1012333 to the outlet SNF1002684, with a maximum capacity of 1.82m ³ /s, is sufficient to cater the storm runoff from both the Application Site as well as the Catchment A.
2.4	No further comments on the Sewerage Impact Assessment.	Noted.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.	Comments of Environmental Protection Department received on 16.5.2025	
	<u>Air Quality</u>	
3.1	Section 2.1.1: Please revise "on" in line 1 to "upon and arising from" in line 1.	Section 2.1.1 is revised accordingly (see Appendix D) .
3.2	Tables 2.3 and 2.4 and Section 2.3.2: Please compare the pollutant concentrations with the updated AQO criteria and parameters in Tables 2.3 and 2.4, and update Section 2.3.2 as appropriate.	AQO in Tables 2.3 and 2.4 are updated and pollutant concentrations in Table 2.3 and path grid levels in Table 2.4 are compared to the updated AQO criteria and parameters. S2.3.2 is revised accordingly (see Appendix D) .
3.3	Section 2.5.1: Suggest to delete "(i.e. use of ultra-low sulphur diesel)" in line 8.	Section 2.5.1 is revised accordingly (see Appendix D) .
3.4	Section 2.5.2: Please add "or dusty" after "heavy" in the 2nd last line, and revise "minimize" in the last line to "control".	Section 2.5.2 is revised accordingly (see Appendix D) .
3.5	Section 2.5.3: Please revise "avoid adverse" in the 2nd last line to "control the" and delete "and dust" in the last line.	Section 2.5.3 is revised accordingly (see Appendix D) .
3.6	Section 2.6.3: Please delete "for Local Distributor as well as" in line 8, and add "from Castle Peak Road – San Tin" after "impact" in the 2nd last line.	Section 2.6.3 is revised accordingly (see Appendix D) .
3.7	Section 2.6.4: As mentioned in our previous comment (R-t-C item 5.15), TD's endorsement on the road type of Tam Kon Chau Road as local distributor should be sought in order to support that 5m buffer distance requirement in Table 3.1 of Chapter 9 of HKPSG can be applied. Otherwise, please provide detailed justifications why it could be considered as local distributor.	Noted. TD has been consulted on road classification of nearby roads. TD's endorsement will be provided once available /in due course.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.8	Section 2.6.5: Please add "from vehicular emission" after "impact" in the 2nd last line.	Section 2.6.5 is revised accordingly (see Appendix D).
3.9	Section 2.6.6: Beside referring to the findings of San Tin / Lok Ma Chau Development Node EIA as mentioned in Section 2.6.7, please confirm if there is any existing or planned odour source (e.g. sewage treatment works, livestock farm, etc.) identified within 200m assessment area in the desktop review or site surveys and supplement in this section.	It is confirmed that no existing or planned odour source (e.g. sewage treatment works, livestock farm, etc.) is identified within 200m assessment area in the desktop review or site surveys. Section 2.6.6 is supplemented (see Appendix D).
3.10	Section 2.6.8: Please revise ">15m" in line 9 to "about 23m (>15m)", and revise "any nearby" to "the nearest air-".	Section 2.6.8 is revised accordingly (see Appendix D).
3.11	Section 2.6.10: Please check if "<200m ³ /day" can be revised as "about 158m ³ /day".	Revised and "About 238 m ³ /day" is now used to tally with the revised SIA report (see Appendix D).
3.12	Sections 2.8.1 and 2.8.2: Please conclude if any mitigation measures during the operational phase will be required.	As no adverse odour impact from the proposed STP is expected, no mitigation measures during the operational phase will be required. The conclusion is added to S2.8.2 (see Appendix D).
3.13	Section 8.1.3: Suggest to revise " , odour from the proposed STP" in line 1 to "and odour impact".	Section 8.1.3 is revised accordingly (see Appendix D).
3.14	Figure 2.2: Please indicate the air sensitive use (e.g. restaurant, canteen, café and etc.) on G/F fulfill the buffer distance requirement or provide in separate figure.	Figure 2.2-1 is added to indicate the air sensitive uses on G/F can fulfil the buffer distance requirement (see Appendix D).
3.15	Figure 2.5: Please indicate the direction of exhaust for the proposed STP on the map.	The direction of exhaust for the proposed STP is indicated in Figure 2.5 (see Appendix D).

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
	<u>Noise</u>	
3.16	We wish to reiterate that, given that practicable and feasible noise mitigation measures are available and no insurmountable noise impact would be anticipated, the applicant is required to submit a proper Noise Impact Assessment and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein under an Approval Condition to the satisfaction of the DEP or the TPB. The NIA submission requirement should allow for the review, exploration, demonstration and implementation of appropriate noise mitigation measures to ensure full compliance with the relevant noise criteria and requirements under ProPECC PN, HKPSG and NCO during the operational phase of the proposed development.	Noted.
3.17	<p>During the preparation of the NIA for compliance with the Approval Condition, the applicant is reminded on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Existing fixed noise source impacts (unless there is confirmation on the cessation of operations before intake of the site) and any planned fixed noise sources in its surrounding area, including those in the San Tin Technopole Development area shall be properly addressed. (ii) Road traffic noise impacts arising from the surrounding road networks, including local access roads should be properly addressed. (iii) The applicant shall also pay attention in their traffic forecast for those local access road. The applicant shall seek endorsement of the traffic forecast by TD. In case TD has no comment on the methodology for traffic forecast only, the consultant should provide written confirmation from the respective competent party (e.g., traffic consultant) that TD's endorsed methodology has been strictly adopted in preparing the traffic forecast data, and hence the validity of traffic data can be confirmed. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. TD's endorsement will be provided in due course.</p>

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
	<u>Water Quality</u>	
3.18	S5.4.6 (ii) & (iii) sub-heading: Please revise to "Sewage generated from construction workforce" and "Accidental Spillage of Chemicals" so as to align with S5.4.3 and S5.4.4.	Section 5.4.6 is revised accordingly (see Appendix D).
	<u>Waste management and land contamination</u>	
3.19	Section 6.1.3: This section is land contamination-related. Please incorporation it into the corresponding sections in Chapter 7.	S6.1.3 is removed. This paragraph is incorporated into S7.4.3 (see Appendix D).
3.20	Table 6.1: For clarity, please revise the sentence as follows: (i) Site Clearance - Non-inert C&D material such as timber should be..... (ii) Building construction - Non-inert C&D materials that cannot be reused.....	Table 6.1 is revised accordingly (see Appendix D).
3.21	Section 6.3.22: Please clarify how the figure of 0.0011/kg/person/day was derived, as this figure is not directly available in the cited report.	Per capita disposal rate of MSW is 1.44 kg/person/day in 2023. Average daily quantity (tpd) of total MSW disposed of at landfills in 2023 is 10,884 tonne per day (tpd), 10884000 kg per day. Using the above 2 values (Total Daily MSW Disposed / Per Capita Disposal Rate) to derive population in 2023, that is around 7560000 people. Average daily quantity of clinical waste disposed of and no disposed of at landfills is 2tpd and 6tpd in 2023 respectively, which is in total 8000kg per day. Dividing the total quantity of clinical waste generated per day by the population in 2023, we get 0.001058 kg /person /day, which is rounded up to 0.0011kg /person/day. For Section 6.3.21, the estimated daily domestic waste generation is updated according to the change in estimated population (see Appendix D). There will be a total of 859 people including staff and workers, which will generate about 765kg of waste per day.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.22	Section 7.3: Please review the relevance of Cap. 354 and Cap. 354C in this chapter.	Cap. 354 and Cap. 354C are irrelevant and thus removed from Chapter 7 (see Appendix D) .
3.23	<p>Section 7.4.2 & Appendix 7.1: Some structures were observed in the aerial photos of 1985 and 1999. Please clarify what these structures were and whether any potential land contamination issues were involved.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>1985</p>  </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>1999</p>  </div> </div> <p><u>Sewerage Impact Assessment</u></p>	<p>Based on past aerial photos, the general land use in the surroundings are rural in nature. With limited information available, it is believed that the structures were temporary in nature or other permitted public works or buildings in existence on the date of the 1st publication of the OZP. We believe that there were no potential land contamination issues</p> <p>Nonetheless, we have no objection for stipulation of appropriate planning condition, which requires the submission of land contamination assessment and implementation of the agreed remedial actions (if required) prior to commencement of construction for the proposed development.</p>
3.24	Table 4.1: Please clarify if there is any other sewage flow generation from the proposed development e.g. kitchen, restaurant, canteen, cafe, shop, laundry etc. and estimate the sewage flow generation as appropriate.	The relevant calculation of the SIA report have been revised (see Appendix E) .
3.25	Please supplement with layout plan of each floor of the proposed development.	The layout plan has been supplemented in the revised SIA (see Appendix E) .

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
4.	Comments of Social Welfare Department received on 12.5.2025	
4.1	Regarding item 6.7, private car parking is not a provision for RCHE and should not be included in the proposed RCHE.	<p>It is required to provide ancillary private car parking spaces for RCHE since there will be parking demands for incoming visitors, staff and etc. This proposal is required to satisfy also TD's requirements on car parking provisions. In the course of the subject planning application, TD have no comment about the proposed private car parking provisions.</p> <p>We also want to reiterate that the proposed RCHE will be a privately-operated RCHE. As such, there will be no financial burden for SWD in future. The Developer will be responsible for future management and maintenance of the private RCHE including its ancillary car park upon operation.</p> <p>Please note that the indicative Master Layout Plan (see Appendix G) serves to purpose of the subject S16 planning application <u>only, but not for application of corresponding licence</u>. SWD's concerns, such as boundary, colouring or demarcation of different uses on plans for application of the required license will be dealt with separately at subsequent licencing stage after approval of the subject S16 planning application.</p>
4.2	Regarding item 6.8, not only rooms, all the proposed facilities/area for the RCHE should also be shown in a specific colour in each drawing/plan.	Relevant drawings has been revised accordingly (see Figures 3.1 to 3.12 of Appendix G).
4.3	Regarding item 6.14, all facilities of the RCHE should solely serve the RCHE and be solely used by residents of the RCHE. If shop, daily provision outlet, cafe, restaurant, canteen, and healthcare/wellness centre, etc are not solely used by residents of the RCHE, they should not be included in the RCHE boundary.	The boundary presents the boundary of the proposed development under the subject S16 planning application. The proposed development includes (i) a private-operated RCHE; (ii) Shop and Services; (iii) Public Vehicle Park; and (iv) ancillary facilities of this proposed development. All facilities are to be shown on the MLP in support of the S16 planning application for consideration of the Town Planning Board.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
4.4	Regarding item 6.17, please clarify if there is/are any general store(s) (儲物室) for storage and keeping things for daily use or use in the future. If this facility is not provided in the RCHE, please indicate any alternative arrangement.	General storage have been provided at G/F to 8/F of the proposed RCHE.
4.5	It is noted that the heading of page 27 to 30 of the "Responses to Departmental Comments" does not tally with the original application. Please ask the applicant to check and revise.	Noted.
5.	Comments of Transport Department received on 12.5.2025	
5.1	Please include all the junctions between major roads (i.e. Fanling Highway and San Tin Highway) to the proposed development in the AOI.	Noted. After reviewing main access routes of this project and surrounding road networks, 2 more junctions assessments are included in the TIA report, namely Junction F -Shek Wu Wai Road / Slip Road of San Tin Highway, Junction G – Mai Po Lung Road / Shek Wu Wai Road. Please refer to Table 2.2 and Table 5.1 (see Appendix F) .
5.2	Please provide pedestrian assessment including, but not limited to, pedestrian crossings and width of footpath from nearby public transport facilities to the proposed development.	Noted. Pedestrian assessment is provided in the revised TIA report. Please refer to section 6.3 (see Appendix F) .
5.3	Section 3.2.1: Apart from Drawing 3.1, please provide details of the proposed road improvement works including, but not limited to, road width, traffic signs and road marking for allowing full-2-way 2 lane access to the site. In addition, Tam Kon Chau Road is not managed by TD. The project proponent should consult Lands Department and take up the management and maintenance of the improved road section as appropriate.	Noted. Please refer to Drawing 5.3 (see Appendix F) .

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
	The proposed vehicular access to the development is very close to the junction of Castle Peak Road - San Tin (CPR-ST) and Tam Kon Chau Road. Traffic queue at the vehicular access may affect the traffic flow at CPR-ST. Please consider to relocate the vehicular access away from CPR-ST. Please also conduct traffic queue analysis and indicate the locations of drop bars at the vehicular access, if any.	Noted. The traffic queue analysis is included in the revised TIA report. Please refer to section 5.3 (see Appendix F).
5.4	It is noted in Section 3.3.2 that 6 consulting rooms will be provided. Please update table 3.1 to include the consulting rooms.	Noted. The 6 consulting rooms are included in Table 3.1 of the revised TIA report (see Appendix F).
5.5	Table 3.2: Please supplement the utilization rates of the parking spaces of relevant RCHE in the table.	Noted. Considering Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex with similar scale as this project, the survey of parking spaces utilization of Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex is conducted during peak hour and included in the revised TIA report. Please refer to the revised Section 3.2.2 (see Appendix F).
5.6	Section 3.3.2: Please advise the management arrangement of the proposed public car parking spaces in the development.	Noted. Please refer to paragraph 3.3.6 (see Appendix F).
5.7	Table 3.3: Please make reference to other similar developments and consider to provide lay-bys for ambulances. In addition, please consider to provide addition lay-bys for taxi/private car and loading/unloading spaces for goods vehicles.	Refer to other similar developments, an additional lay-by for ambulance is proposed, please refer to Table 3.3 (see Appendix F).
5.8	Section 4.1.12: Growth rates adopted in the traffic forecast based on strategic roads and rurals roads might not be able to obtain a realistic forecast and there will be major development near the site (i.e. San Tin Technopole). The traffic and road works associated with San Tin Technopole shall be taken into account in the traffic forecast.	Noted. The growth rate is reviewed using the latest data set of the AADT 2023 and the TPU population projections. The traffic and road works associated with San Tin Technopole are considered in the traffic forecast. Please refer to section 4.1 (see Appendix F).
5.9	Table 4.9: Please include RCHE with similar scale as the proposed development in the estimation of trip generation/attraction rates (e.g. Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex in Table 3.2). In addition, please provide details on remarks (3) and (4).	Noted. Traffic survey for the trip generation/attraction rates of Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex is conducted and included in the revised TIA report. Please refer to Table 4.8 (see Appendix F).

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
5.10	Section 4.2.8: Traffic flows arising from adjacent developments including, but not limited to, San Tin Technopole and the developments in Table 4.7 should be taken into account.	Noted. According to the official website of San Tin Technopole, the first population intake in San Tin Technopole is expected in 2031. Therefore, the traffic flow generated by the initial phase of San Tin Technopole development is considered in the revised TIA report. Please refer to paragraph 4.1.11 and Table 4.5 (see Appendix F) .
5.11	Section 5.1: Please take into account the junction improvement works under San Tin Technopole based on their gazette documents.	Noted. Based on San Tin Technopole gazette documents, the improvement works of: Junction D – Shek Wu Wai Road / Castle Peak Road, Junction F -Shek Wu Wai Road / Slip Road of San Tin Highway, and Junction G – Mai Po Lung Road / Shek Wu Wai Road is included in the revised TIA report. Please refer to the revised paragraph 5.1.2 (see Appendix F) .
5.12	Section 5.2: Please advise the responsible party to implement the proposed works and the completion year of the proposed works. In addition, the existing bus stop is too close to the proposed roundabout. Please relocate the bus stop away from the roundabout and provide an exclusive straight ahead lane for CPR-ST eastbound.	Noted. According to the official website of San Tin Technopole, the first population intake in San Tin Technopole is expected in 2031. Therefore, the road networks are supposed to be completed before or by 2031, and Junction D – Shek Wu Wai Road / Castle Peak Road will be upgraded to 4-arm signalized junction. In this case, the improvement work of Junction D – Shek Wu Wai Road / Castle Peak Road is included in the revised TIA report. Please refer to paragraph 5.1.2 (see Appendix F) .
5.13	Tables 5.3 and 5.4: Please show the formulation of the capacity in the tables (i.e. 150pcu/hr & 500pcu/hr).	Noted. Please refer to the remark of Table 5.3 and Table 5.4 (see Appendix F) .
5.14	Section 5.3.3: Please also advise the V/C after passing the widened road section of Tam Kon Chau Road for reference.	Noted. Please refer to Table 5.3 (see Appendix F) .
5.15	Please provide the estimated peak hour public transport demand to be derived from the proposed development (e.g. noting the proposed development is a residential care homes fore the elderly, please provide the estimated public transport demand to be generated by their residents, staff and visitors etc.	Noted. Please refer to section 6.2 (see Appendix F) .

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
5.16	Please advise the actual walking distance between the proposed development and the nearest bus stops (both bounds) and confirm if appropriate pedestrians crossing facilities are available.	Noted. Please refer to paragraph 2.2.2 (see Appendix F).
5.17	Subject to the assessment of the new public transport demand to be derived from the proposed development, please ascertain the impact to the public transport services and assess whether these PT services should be enhanced / new PT services are required.	Noted. Please refer to section 6.2 (see Appendix F).
5.18	Subject to the updates to the proposed enhancement of PT services (if any), sufficient PT facilities should be provided to support the operation of the relevant PT services.	Noted. Please refer to section 6.2 (see Appendix F).