

Table R1

Responses to Departmental Comments

1.	Planning Department, Response to Comments	1
2.	Drainage Services Department, Response to Comments	2
3.	Urban Design and Landscape Section, Response to Comments	3
4.	Lands Department, Response to Comments	4
5.	Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, Response to Comments	5
6.	Environment and Ecology Bureau, Response to Comments	7
7.	Transport Department, Response to Comments	8
8.	Highways Department, Response to Comments	10

List of Attachments

Annex 1: Replacement Pages of Planning Statement

Annex 2: Updated Sections

Annex 3: Replacement Pages of Landscape Master Plan

Annex 4: Replacement Pages of Drainage Impact Assessment

Annex 5: Comparison of Planning and Design Merits between the Approved Scheme and the Proposed Scheme

Annex 6: Revised Ecological Impact Assessment

Annex 7: Revised Traffic Impact Assessment

Table R1 – Wo Shang Wai S16 Planning Application – Response to Comments (Planning Application No. A/YL-MP/394)

1. Planning Department, Response to Comments

FSYLE District Planning Office, PlanD Comments received on 27.8.2025 and 5.9.2025 via teleconversations (Contact: Ms. Jessie LAU at 3168 4037)		Responses
1	Will there be any mitigation measures at the basement carpark for flooding events?	A demountable flood barrier may be installed at the entrance to the basement car park as a flood mitigation measure.
2	Please clarify whether the “not less than 1,817m ² open space for designed population of 1,817 residents”, as indicated in the Landscape Master Plan, is included in the “Communal Open Space” of 13,938m ² in the Planning Statement.	Yes, not less than 1,817m ² open space for designed population of 1,817 residents as indicated in the Landscape Master Plan, is included in calculation of “Communal Open Space” (Annex 1).
3	Please confirm the location of the boundary wall mentioned in the EcolA in architectural drawings, and plans and sections in LMP.	Please note that the boundary wall is at the interface between the WRA and residential area portion (Annexes 2 and 3).

FSYLE District Planning Office, PlanD Comments received on 5.9.2025 via email (Contact: Ms. Jessie LAU at 3168 4037)		Responses
1	<u>Planning Statement</u> Table S1 – Please clarify if the same mean site formation level was/is adopted under the previous application No. A/YL-MP/344 and the current application. If affirmative, given the maximum building height (BH) in terms of mPD of 2-storey and 3-storey houses remaining the same, there should have been no change to the maximum BH (in meters) for both 2-storey and 3 storey houses. Now that only the absolute maximum BH in meters for 2-storey houses stay the same, with a slight increase in that for 3-storey houses despite same BH in mPD, please clarify the reasons for such increase. Or, please clearly state the difference between the site formation levels under two different applications should there be any changes.	The height in meters is measured with respect to the mean formation level of the respective houses. The site formation level for the 2-storey houses is at +6.8mPD, resulting in the adjusted absolute building height to be slightly increased to 10m (building height in mPD (i.e. +16.8) remains unchanged). The site formation level for the 3-storey houses in particular is updated to +6.8mPD, resulting in the adjusted absolute building height to be slightly increased to 14.5m (building height in mPD (i.e. +21.3) remains unchanged).

Table R1 – Wo Shang Wai S16 Planning Application – Response to Comments (Planning Application No. A/YL-MP/394)

		Regarding the overall mean site formation level for the whole application site, it is maintained at +6.8mPD, which is the same as the previous application No. A/YL-MP/344. Relevant revision is made in Sections and Planning Statement in Annexes 1 and 2 .
2	Table S1 and Section Plan – The 14.2m absolute building height of 3-storey houses seems inaccurate taking into account of the site formation level of 6.8m as shown in Appendix 2 of the Planning Statement. Please clarify.	The absolute building height is updated to 14.5m. Relevant revision is made in Planning Statement and Sections in Annexes 1 and 2 .
3	Please confirm if there will be no change to the Maintenance and Management Plan (MMP) approved in 2015 and the funding agreement is fully applicable to the current scheme.	Confirmative.

2. Drainage Services Department, Response to Comments

Drainage Services Department Comments received on 5.9.2025 (Contact: Mr. Jacky LEONG at 2300 1432)		Responses
1	<u>Sewerage Impact Assessment</u> No comment on the Sewerage Impact Assessment.	Noted.
2	<u>Drainage Impact Assessment</u> Para. 1.1.6: It appears from the table that the proposed total paved and unpaved area remained unchanged. Please supplement the respective layout plan for the paved areas for the last approved submission and the present submission for reference.	Please see relevant plans supplemented in Appendix B of Annex 4 for your reference.
3	Figure 6: The information regarding the terminal manhole is not provided. Please be reminded to include the terminal manhole in the drainage plan as part of the BD submission.	Noted.

Table R1 – Wo Shang Wai S16 Planning Application – Response to Comments (Planning Application No. A/YL-MP/394)

4	Figure 6: The applicant should agree upon the maintenance responsibility at the interface between the existing system and the opening with the responsible party of the WSW Village Discharge and resolve any disputes. While the details of the opening and its arrangement are not described in detail, the applicant is reminded to ensure that the existing pump head is sufficient to accommodate their drainage design.	Noted. The applicant will be responsible for the maintenance of the inlet chamber, which is located within the Application Site, and will ensure the existing pump head is sufficient to deliver the water to the inlet chamber.
---	---	--

3. Urban Design and Landscape Section, Response to Comments

Urban Design and Landscape Section comments received on 5.9.2025 (Contact: Mr. Samuel HUI at 3565 3957)		Responses
1	<u>Landscape Planning Perspective</u> No adverse comment.	Noted. In Annex 3 , some new trees are proposed at the interface between the residential portion and the wetland buffer area. Please note that this change only involves the relocation of trees within the application site with no change in the number of trees.
2	The applicant is reminded that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting and felling. The applicant is reminded to seek approval for any proposed tree works from relevant department prior to commencement of the works.	Noted.

Urban Design and Landscape Section comments received on 8.9.2025 (Contact: Ms. Nicole LEE at 3565 3945)		Responses
1	<u>Urban Design and Visual Perspectives</u> According to the para. 6.3.3 (d)i of the Planning Statement, the visual corridors and inherent design merits in the approved	The following similar design merits are applied in both schemes: 1. Large communal space at the centre of the site.

Table R1 – Wo Shang Wai S16 Planning Application – Response to Comments (Planning Application No. A/YL-MP/394)

	scheme have been retained in the current proposed scheme. Would applicant please beef up/elaborate the design merits on the proposed scheme and approved scheme on plan(s).	2. Extensive greenery and suitable landscaping are provided around buildings and courtyards. 3. The visual corridors in the Approved Scheme have been generally retained in the proposed scheme. The additional design merits in the proposed scheme compared to Approved Scheme: 4. Increase in buffer planting at the Residential Area Portion fronting the WRA by 2.5m. 5. No swimming pools or landscape water features are located at the WRA boundary. Clubhouse and associated facilities are relocated from the interface boundary between WRA and residential portion, to the central locations of the residential portion. This would minimize any disturbance to the WRA from clubhouse activities in the residential portion. 6. The estimated population is less than the Approved Scheme by 280, resulting in a reduction in population density. The relevant plans are supplemented at Annex 5.
--	--	--

4. Lands Department, Response to Comments

	Lands Department received on 8.9.2025 (Contact: Mr. Jurgen MA at 2443 3019)	Responses
1	According to the Planning Statement, there is no change to the site area and maximum domestic GFA, and the proposed parking provision are based on the lease requirements. Provided that the proposal would not result in exceeding the permitted GFA and parking provisions under lease, I have no comment from the land lease perspective.	Noted.
2	The Landscape Master Plan and Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal submitted by the applicant should be subject to separate application to be submitted for prior approval before implementation of the development proposal.	Noted.

Table R1 – Wo Shang Wai S16 Planning Application – Response to Comments (Planning Application No. A/YL-MP/394)

3	The Conditions of Exchange governing Lot 77 in D.D. 101 contains a Building Covenant that requires the Grantee to develop the said lot for occupation on or before 30.6.2027. Non-completion of the development is a breach of the said Conditions and will amongst other remedies render the lot liable to re-entry by the Government.	Noted.
---	---	--------

5. Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, Response to Comments

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department comments received on 8.9.2025 (Contact: Dr. Azaria WONG at 2150 6932)		Responses
1	<u>Planning Statement</u> S.3.1.2: As compared with the approved s.16 scheme, some of the new buildings are located closer to the WRA (and hence the Deep Bay area). To realise the planning intention of the subject "OU(CDWRA)" zone and to maximise the buffer area between the residential development and the WRA, the applicant is advised to shift the new buildings located adjacent the WRA southwards and "away from Deep Bay" as far as practicable.	The "OU(CDWRA)" zone is intended <i>"to provide incentive for the restoration of degraded wetlands adjoining existing fish ponds through comprehensive residential and/or recreational development to include wetland restoration area. It is also intended to phase out existing sporadic open storage and port back-up uses on degraded wetlands.</i> With reference to the latest 12-months monitoring reports, the implemented WRA has already induced ecological gain, especially increase in number of species of conservation importance utilising the created wetland habitat. <i>"Any new building should be located farthest away from Deep Bay"</i> The WRA was designed and located at the northern portion of Application Site, as buffer area between the residential portion and the WCA. The proposed new buildings with the residential portion, has already considered as far away from Deep Bay. While there are the changes in distance of 8m between the proposed 3-storeys and the implemented WRA, the proposed mitigation measures are considered effective to minimize the potential disturbance impacts, including: - Increase in buffer planting from 2.5m to 5m, with tall trees and shrubs - The clubhouses, as gathering places for residents of the whole development, are moved southwards and replaced by individual residential houses, reducing the nuisance due to the gathering of a larger number of residents near the WRA. - All swimming pools originally located at the very edge of the northern portion are removed. This minimises nuisance due to recreational uses

Table R1 – Wo Shang Wai S16 Planning Application – Response to Comments (Planning Application No. A/YL-MP/394)

		at the water body. That area is reserved as a buffer between the residential blocks and the WRA - 2m solid wall between the WRA and the residential portion. - Orientation and access of buildings is such that all will face and front towards the residential area, minimising the disturbance of human activity next to the WRA. As human activity will be greatest at the front of the buildings, the potential sources of impacts to waterbirds (including noise and night-time lighting) will be concentrated away from the WRA and impacts to waterbirds will be minimised.
2	The above comment on S.3.1.2 of the Planning Statement is also applicable to S.4.4 of the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA).	Our response in item (1) refers.
3	<u>Ecological Impact Assessment</u> S.2 - 4: All existing ecological baseline data collected at the WRA under the ongoing ECF project shall be included in the literature review, the subsequent habitat evaluation and impact assessment related to the WRA. Please update.	The latest 12-month ecological baseline data collected at the WRA under the ongoing ECF project, are included in the literature review (section 2.3 in Annex 6) and impact assessment (section 4.4 in Annex 6) related to the WRA. Please note that the two bi-annual EM&A reports documented surveys and management conducted in the Survey Area and WRA from 1 November 2023 to 30 April 2024 and from 1 May 2024 to 31 October 2024 respectively, which were <u>based on ecological surveys and advice on management undertaken and provided by the appointed Non-Government Organisation (Eco-Institute) during the reporting periods. (section 2.3.2 in Annex 6).</u> The data collected under the ongoing ECF project have been summarized in the bi-annual EM&A reports, the data of which is included in section 2.3.3 in Annex 6. Data within WRA have been included in Table 6 and 7 (Annex 6).
4	S.4.4.1 and S.4.5.1: Please clarify if indirect impacts on wild animals, including the “three-target bird species” mentioned in S.4.4, species of conservation importance and other nocturnal and light-sensitive	The indirect impacts on wild animals are supplemented in section 4.4 of Annex 6 . The residual impacts are supplemented in section 4.9 of the revised EcoIA in Annex 6 .

Table R1 – Wo Shang Wai S16 Planning Application – Response to Comments (Planning Application No. A/YL-MP/394)

	species recorded in the WRA are taken into account when conducting the assessment.	
5	S.4.4.3 and S.4.5.2: In view of the change of building height from 2 to 3 storeys, please review and confirm if additional measures (e.g. increase in width of buffer planting and the use of tall trees as buffer planting along the northern boundary of the residential development portion) are required to mitigate potential disturbance and other indirect impacts on the WRA during both the construction and operational stages.	In the operation stage, additional mitigation measures are proposed to minimize the potential disturbance impacts (section 4.4 in Annex 6 and Updated Sections in Annex 2) - Increase in width of buffer planting within the residential portion from 2.5m to 5m. - Use of tall trees/shrubs as buffer planting in the Green Barrier (buffer planting strip). In the current construction stage, the mitigation measures as approved in the AEIA-120/2008 has been implemented. No additional measures are required.
6	S.4.5.2: Please clarify if the site hoarding will be constructed and maintained by the developer within the residential areas.	The 3m site hoarding has been constructed and will be maintained by the Applicant at the interface of the completed WRA and the residential portion (section 4.5.2. in Annex 6).
7	S.3.1.4: According to Table 7, 16 birds of Flightline 3 flew at 20m or below. Please revise this part.	Reviewed and revised as “Only approximately 1 bird individual was recorded <u>per survey hour</u> utilizing the Flightline No. 3 at the height of 20m or below.” (section 3.14 in Annex 6)

6. Environment and Ecology Bureau, Response to Comments

Environment and Ecology Bureau comments received on 8.9.2025 (Contact: Mr. Tong HUNG at 3151 7076)		Responses
1	We noted in the Planning Statement that "The conservation agent of the Applicant has been carrying out the maintenance and management plan, while the funding agreement is fully applicable to this application." and "No changes proposed to the WRA or at the boundary between the residential area and the WRA.". The applicant should confirm whether there will be no change to the Maintenance and Management Plan ("the MMP") approved in 2015 and that the MMP would be complied with for the subject planning application.	Noted.

Table R1 – Wo Shang Wai S16 Planning Application – Response to Comments (Planning Application No. A/YL-MP/394)

2	In light of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)'s comments for requesting further information and clarifications on matters relating to ecological impact assessment and mitigation measures, the applicant should note that, from the perspective of funding arrangements under the Public Private Partnership Scheme of the New Nature Conservation Policy, if there is a need for the Applicant to implement any additional measures to mitigate any additional ecological impacts, which may have an implication on the amount of funding needed so as to sufficiently support the long-term maintenance and management of the WRA, and hence there may also be a need to review and/or adjust the amount of funding that has to be made to the Environment and Conservation Fund (ECF) to support the long-term maintenance and management of the WRA as well as the signed funding agreement. We reserve the right to further advise on this matter, subject to further information and clarifications to be submitted by the applicant for addressing AFCD's comments.	Noted.
---	---	--------

7. Transport Department, Response to Comments

Transport Department received on 16.10.2025 (Contact: Mr. Victor MA at 2399 2727)		Responses
1	Section 2.1.4: As the development will be completed by 2028, please provide traffic assessment between 2028 and the design year when the new roads proposed by San Tin Technopole are not in place.	Please refer to the Sensitivity Test 1 for the assessment based on the existing junction layouts at Junction A and B for review (Annex 7).
2	Table 2.2: Please provide motorcycle parking spaces at a ratio of 1 per 83 flats. Please also demonstrate that the proposed numbers of visitor parking space, accessible parking space and loading/unloading space are able to cater for the parking demand generated by the proposed development.	Please note that the proposed provision of 37 nos. of motorcycle parking spaces, 5 nos. of visitor parking spaces are provided in accordance with the lease requirement. The 6 nos. of accessible parking spaces is proposed with reference to Regulation 72 of the Building (Planning) Regulations. Since there is nil provision for the loading/unloading bay for house under lease, the 1 no. of loading/unloading bay is proposed for operational use for clubhouse.

Table R1 – Wo Shang Wai S16 Planning Application – Response to Comments (Planning Application No. A/YL-MP/394)

3	Drawing No. 2.2: Please indicate the location of U-turn facilities and drop bar of the proposed development.	Vehicles could make circulation within the internal driveways. The drop bar location will be subject to later detailed design stage. Please find the indicative drop bar location in the revised Drawing 2.2 of revised TIA in Annex 7 .
4	Table 4.4: Taking into account that 2 parking spaces are provided for each flat, please consider to adopt upper limit of the traffic generation / attraction rate.	The upper limit trip rates are adopted in the assessment in the revised TIA accordingly (Annex 7).
5	Table 4.7: In view of the public transport demand, please provide public transport facilities and pick-up/drop-off area including taxi stand for the proposed development. Please also indicate these facilities in Drawing No. 2.2 for reference.	Please note that no taxi stand would be proposed as the operation of taxi within the subject development would be managed and controlled by management staff. Subject to the requirement of existing land grant, there would be nil provision of public transport facilities other than the required internal parking facilities. As shown in the TIA report, the induced public transport demand could be accommodated by the PT service.
6	Drawing No. 4.4: Please check the traffic flows. For example, the traffic flows at Junction I are not tally with Junction C.	The traffic flow is reviewed in both the observed and design years in the revised TIA accordingly (Annex 7).
7	Table 5.1: Please also provide assessment for Junction J & K.	The junction assessment for Junction J and K in the design years are included in the revised TIA accordingly (Annex 7).
8	Section 5.3: Please provide a sensitivity assessment with full intake of San Tin Technopole.	Please refer to Sensitivity Test 2 in the revised TIA accordingly (Annex 7).
9	Annex A: Please check the inputs of junction calculation. For example, please check the road width and traffic flows adopted for the calculation of performance for Junction I.	The parameters of junction assessment are reviewed in the revised TIA accordingly (Annex 7).

Table R1 – Wo Shang Wai S16 Planning Application – Response to Comments (Planning Application No. A/YL-MP/394)

8. Highways Department, Response to Comments

Highways Department received on 16.10.2025 (Contact: Ms. Shirley LEUNG at 2762 3947)		Responses
1	The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) should be reviewed and commented by TD. If any proposed oad improvements in the TIA are considered necessary by TD due to the subject development, they shall be implemented by the Applicant at their own cost, to the satisfaction of TD and HyD.	Noted.
2	The proposed access arrangement to the application site should be commented by TD. HyD is not/ shall not be responsible for the maintenance of any access connecting the application site to Mai Po South Road/ Castle Peak Road – Mai Po. Presumably, the relevant department will provide their comments to you, if any.	Noted.
3	Adequate drainage measures should be provided at the site access to prevent surface water flowing from the site to nearby public roads or exclusive road drains.	Noted.
4	Please also seek comments from Railway Development Office of this Department directly.	Noted.
5	For the impact assessments, which we have no direct input from highways maintenance perceptive, we assumed that the relevant departments will provide you their comments directly. The applicant should highlight in the future submission if there be any latest findings/ recommendations/ revisions that may affect HyD inventories including slope features or require HyD's particular input.	Noted.