
Attachment 1

**Responses to Comments Table
(Departmental Comments)**

Table of Contents

Responses to Departmental Comments

	Page
1. District Planning Office/ Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East	1
2. Social Welfare Department	3
3. Environmental Protection Department	5
4. Drainage Services Department	9
5. Transport Department	9
6. Fire Services Department	10
7. Lands Department	11

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.	Comments of District Planning Office/ Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East	
1.1	The application premises (the Premises) fall within an area zoned "Residential (Group C)" ("R(C)") subject to a maximum plot ratio of 0.4 and building height restriction of 3 storeys (9m) including car park on the draft Mai Po and Fairview Park Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-MP/9. According to the Notes for "R(C)" zone, the proposed Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE) is classified as 'Social Welfare Facility', which is a Column 2 use and requires planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). According to the applicant's proposal, the application involves conversion of some existing shop units partly vacant and partly occupied by a retail store on G/F of Palm Springs Plaza for the proposed RCHE with 90 bed spaces. There will be no change to the existing building bulk.	Noted.
1.2	Please provide operation details of the proposed RCHE, including but not limited to: (i) Proposed visiting hours and whether there is any visitor arrangement for the proposed RCHE. (ii) Proposed number of staff members working in the proposed RCHE, and the number of staff members that would stay overnight. (iii) Proposed pedestrian and vehicular access routes to/from the main entrance of Palm Springs to the entrances of the proposed RCHE.	The visiting hours of the Proposed RCHE will be from 10am to 8pm daily. A maximum of 2 visitors per bed will be allowed at the same time and prior reservation is required. There will be 32 no. of staff working in the Proposed RCHE, among which 29 no. will be working day shift and 3 no. will be working night shift (i.e. staying overnight). The proposed pedestrian and vehicular access routes are illustrated in Figures 2 and 3 of the revised Traffic Review Report (see Appendix E).
1.3	Please provide the floor-to-floor height of the Premises.	The floor-to-floor height of the Application Premises is 3.5m as per the approved GBP record plan.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.4	Please provide the total floor area and floor plans of the Palm Springs Plaza. Besides, please also provide the occupancy rate of the Palm Springs Plaza in the past five years.	According to the approved GBP record plan, the Palm Springs Plaza has a total GFA of about 6,186.5m², and the floor plans as extracted from the record plan are enclosed in Appendix A for reference. Regarding the occupancy of the Palm Springs Plaza, please find the vacancy rate in the past five years for general reference: • About 8.9% in year 2022 • About 13.8% in year 2023 • About 13.1% in year 2024 • About 10.7% in 2025 • About 28.3% in 2026 (as at August) The data above indicates that the vacancy rate has been generally on the rise in recent years, likely due to the changing pattern of shopping habits of the community in recent years (e.g. the increasing trend of online shopping and mainland-bound consumption).
1.5	Please clarify if visitors to the proposed RCHE require prior consent from Palm Springs as the Premises are located within a private residential development where presumably public access may not be allowed.	Visitors to the Proposed RCHE would not require any prior consent from Palm Springs. Visitors to the Proposed RCHE can access Palm Springs Plaza freely as the commercial centre is opened to the public.
1.6	The Premises are partly located at a raised platform at a level slightly higher than the plaza area with a few stairs. Such level difference might not be elderly-friendly. Please advise if there will be any proposed measures e.g. barrier-free design to cater for the proposed RCHE.	In view of the mentioned level difference, barrier-free design in the form of ramp will be provided for the Proposed RCHE. The detail of such barrier-free design will be formulated during the subsequent GBP submission stage and will comply with relevant regulations / requirements, such as the Code of Practice for Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) and the Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008.
1.7	The distance between the nearest house across Sunflower Path and the proposed RCHE would be about 12m. Please advise if there are any measures to tackle with the potential issues of overlooking and privacy.	Windows inside the Proposed RCHE will be equipped with curtains. Staff of the Proposed RCHE will also actively manage the opening and closure of curtains for privacy purpose. In addition, it can be observed that both sides of Sunflower Path are planted with existing trees, which help providing natural shielding as well. Hence, the potential issues of overlooking and privacy would be nil / minimal.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.8	The applicant has claimed in the Planning Statement that the existing carparking spaces and loading/unloading (L/UL) bays provided for the existing Palm Springs Plaza are considered sufficient to also cater for the proposed RCHE. While there is no parking and L/UL requirements under Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), normally from an operation perspective, development of such kind will at least require a designated L/UL for emergency services. Please advise if any L/UL bay(s) will be reserved for the exclusive use of the proposed RCHE to ensure its smooth operation upon completion.	According to the submitted Traffic Review Report, the traffic impacts imposed on the local road network by the Proposed RCHE are nil / minimal, and no insurmountable traffic impact is anticipated. There are also no parking or loading/unloading facility requirements as stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines for RCHE. With reference to RCHEs of similar scale, the current 207 car parking spaces and 7 loading/unloading bays at Palm Springs Plaza are sufficient to serve both the Proposed RCHE and the remaining retail / commercial businesses. Among the 7 loading/unloading bays, at least one bay will be designated for the exclusive use of the Proposed RCHE.
2.	Comments of Social Welfare Department	
2.1	<u>Service Perspective</u> No objection to the application subject to the following conditions: (a) the design and construction of the proposed residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) shall be in full compliance with prevailing statutory and licensing requirements; and (b) the proposed RCHE shall incur no financial implication, both in capital and recurrent, to the Government.	Noted.
2.2	In view of the application premises (the Premises) for the proposed RCHE being located on the ground floor of an existing shopping centre in an established residential development, the applicant's attention should be drawn to the following requirements during the detailed design stage of the proposed RCHE: (a) every room used for habitation, e.g. Dormitories, Sick/Isolation Rooms, or for the purposes of an office or kitchen in the RCHE should be provided with adequate natural lighting and ventilation with openable windows;	Noted.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
2.2 (Con't)	(b) while communal bathrooms/toilets are to be adopted, the proposed RCHE should be provided with adequate bathrooms and toilets including those for female, male and disabled to meet operational need; (c) the provision of an attached bathroom/toilet to Sick/Isolation Room is more desirable from service perspective; and (d) the clear width of every passage and doorway should not be less than 1050mm and 800mm respectively, so as to facilitate residents using wheelchairs or walking aids to enter or pass through any rooms, including bedrooms and toilets/bathrooms, without assistance and unnecessary difficulty. <u>Licensing Perspective</u>	
2.3	No comment at this stage. Detailed comments will be provided at the licence application stage.	Noted.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.	Comments of Environmental Protection Department	
3.1	<u>Air Quality</u> As revealed in the submission, Palm Springs Boulevard and Sunflower Path are the open roads located to the south and north of the Premises. Please confirm whether the road network in vicinity of the Premises is used as emergency vehicular access such that buffer distance requirements do not apply. If not, and the roads are being used as private/internal roads, please provide descriptions on the characteristics and traffic conditions to justify the usage of vehicles of the roads such that they are not anticipated to give rise to adverse air quality impact on the air sensitive receivers (ASRs) of the proposed RCHE. If negative, the relevant buffer distance requirements under Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines Chapter 9 should be observed and followed.	The Sunflower Path is an internal road with gate bar. This road is connected to 10 houses and the ancillary carpark which serves the Palm Springs Plaza, and so there would be very limited number of private cars travelling along this internal road. As such, it is not anticipated that this internal road would induce any adverse air quality impact on the air sensitive receivers of the Proposed RCHE. For the Palm Springs Boulevard, the eastern section close to Castle Peak Road is a local road on government land leading to Palm Springs Plaza, while the western section falls within the same private lot of Palm Springs Plaza as an internal road leading to the drop-off / pick-up area in front of Palm Springs Plaza. Since this access road mainly serves the Palm Springs, it is considered to be an internal road that there would be limited number of vehicles travelling on it. Also, the separation from the air sensitive use of the Proposed RCHE is around 10m to the Palm Springs Boulevard. With limited traffic travelling on this internal road and with sufficient buffer distance, it is anticipated that this internal road would not induce any adverse air quality impact on the air sensitive receivers of the Proposed RCHE. For details, please refer to the Air Quality Impact Review enclosed in Appendix B.
3.2	Please confirm if there is any public transport interchange or car park in the vicinity of the Premises. If any, it is advised to address the air quality impact on the ASRs of the proposed RCHE.	There is an ancillary carpark serving the Palm Springs Plaza to the west of the ASRs of the Proposed RCHE. This ancillary carpark is a charged carpark with private car parking spaces for the Palm Springs Plaza. As such, only the visitors to the Palm Springs Plaza will use this carpark. With such limited usage, it is anticipated that this ancillary carpark would not induce any adverse air quality impact on the ASRs of the Proposed RCHE. For details, please refer to the Air Quality Impact Review enclosed in Appendix B.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.3	Please advise if there is any chimney/industrial emission source within the 500m assessment area of the project, and any proposed in the application. If any, it is advised to address the air quality impact on the ASRs of the proposed RCHE.	Based on the site visit carried out in June 2026, there is no chimney/industrial emission source within the 500m assessment area of the Application Premises. The uses surrounding the Application Premises are mainly residential houses.
3.4	Please confirm if there is any odour emission source (e.g. short-term waiver, livestock farm, etc.) within the 500m assessment area of the Premises. If any, it is advised to address the impact on the ASRs of the proposed RCHE.	The Proposed RCHE is located at the center of Palm Springs surrounded with clusters of residential houses. There are no odour emission sources within 500m from the Application Premises. The nearest potential odour emission source is the on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) serving the Palm Springs, but the separation from this STP to the Proposed RCHE is around 530m, which is outside the 500m assessment area.
3.5	The air quality impact on nearby ASRs during the construction phase of the proposed RCHE should be covered and relevant mitigation measures should be implemented to control the potential impact. The Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust) Regulation and other relevant regulations and guidelines should be observed and followed. <u>Noise Impact Review</u>	Please be clarified that the Proposed RCHE only involves alteration and addition (A&A) works to the ground floor of the Palm Springs Plaza. All the works will be carried out indoor, and the works would involve mainly the decoration or renovation works. Therefore, it is anticipated that no major construction works or dusty works will be involved.
3.6	S.1.3.1: It is stated that the proposed RCHE is located at the western part of the ground floor of Palm Springs Plaza (the Plaza), therefore, there is no fixed noise sources affecting the proposed RCHE. Please clarify whether any electrical and mechanical (E&M) systems are located in the Plaza and, if so, indicate the location of the E&M system; and review and confirm accordingly that there will be no airborne or structure-borne noise transmission from those systems. Furthermore, the existing car park at Palm Springs is located to the west of the Premises. Please confirm whether there will be any heavy vehicles parking there, and if so, the ways to address the associated noise nuisance.	Based on the approved General Building Plan, the E&M room (including pump room and generator room) is located on the roof of the eastern end of the Palm Springs Plaza. Since the Proposed RCHE is located on the ground floor of the western end of the Palm Springs Plaza, there is no line of sight from the Proposed RCHE to the E&M rooms. As such, there will be no air-borne noise transmission from these E&M facilities to the Proposed RCHE.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.6 (Con't)		Potential structure-borne noise transmission may be due to the operation of pump. However, since there is a commercial floor between the pump room located on the roof and the Proposed RCHE located on the ground floor, and they are also located at two different ends of the Palm Springs Plaza, it is anticipated that there would be no structure-borne noise transmission impact to the Proposed RCHE. The existing ancillary carpark is a charged carpark with private car parking spaces for the Palm Springs Plaza. As such, only the visitors of the Palm Springs Plaza will use this carpark. With such limited usage, it is anticipated that this ancillary carpark would not induce any adverse noise impact on the Proposed RCHE. The above information has also been included in Sections 2 to 4 of the revised Noise Impact Review (see Appendix C).
3.7	S.1.3.2: The submission identifies Palm Springs Boulevard as the sole noise source affecting the proposed RCHE. Please clarify the characteristics of Sunflower Path, located to the north of the Premises and accordingly, provide a qualitative assessment or justify why it was not being assessed in the submitted Noise Impact Review.	The Sunflower Path is an internal road with gate bar. This road is connected to 10 houses and the ancillary carpark which serves the Palm Springs Plaza, and so there would be very limited number of private cars travelling along this internal road. As such, this internal road is not anticipated to induce any adverse noise impact on the Proposed RCHE. The above information has been included in Section 2 of the revised Noise Impact Review (see Appendix C).
3.8	S.2.2.1 and S.2.2.3: Transport Department's (TD's) endorsement on the traffic forecast should be obtained. 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) to demonstrate 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.	Noted. Please refer to Appendix E for TD's endorsement on traffic forecast.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
	<u>Sewerage Impact Assessment</u>	
3.9	S.1.2.4 and S.3.1.3 – Please clarify and state if the sewage from the proposed development is discharged to the on-site sewage treatment plant via internal sewers within Palm Springs. If yes, please delete Section 3.1.3 accordingly.	The sewage from the Proposed RCHE will be discharged to the on-site sewage treatment plant via internal sewers within Palm Springs. Section 3.1.3 has been deleted in the revised SIA report (see Appendix D) .
3.10	S.2.1.1 – Please clarify the extent of sewerage network.	Section 2.1.1 of the SIA report has been revised accordingly (see Appendix D) .
3.11	Table 2.1 – Please check the specific trade of J4.	The “J4” mentioned should be for “Wholesale & Retail”. The typo has been rectified in the revised SIA report (see Appendix D) .
3.12	S.2.3.2 – Please clarify if the survey is to demonstrate the current scenario or the proposed scenario.	The survey is to obtain information on the existing use of Palm Springs Plaza for the calculation of the sewage generation in the proposed scenario.
3.13	Table 2.2 – (i) please check the specific trade of J4. (ii) please check the sewage flow of “Retail”. (iii) please check the total number of employees and sewage flow under “F&B”. (iv) please check the specific trade adopted under “F&B”.	 The “J4” mentioned should be for “Wholesale & Retail”. The typo has been rectified in the revised SIA report (see Appendix D) . The number of employee should be 181 (5186.7m ² /28.6m ² per employee). Therefore, the sewage flow remains to be 50.8m ³ /day (see Appendix D) . The total number of employee under F&B is rounded up from 1 to 2 (see Appendix D) . The “J10” mentioned should be for “Restaurants & Hotel”. The typo has been rectified in the revised SIA report (see Appendix D) .

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
4.	Comments of Drainage Services Department	
4.1	It is noted that the subject application involves converting an area of about 974m ² on the G/F of Palm Springs Plaza to the proposed residential care home for the elderly (RCHE). I have no in-principle objection to the application from drainage point of view.	Noted.
4.2	An approval condition on the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) should be stipulated.	Noted.
4.3	It should be noted that the current SIA still requires refinement to meet necessary requirements: (a) Table 2.1 and 2.2 - It is noted that applied flow factors of commercial flows for F&B was J11 Community, Social, Personal Services instead of J10 Restaurants & Hotels. Please review.	The SIA has been revised accordingly (see Appendix D).
4.4	Environmental Protection Department should be consulted as regards any sewage disposal aspects of the subject application.	The subject Planning Application has also been circulated to the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and comments from EPD on the SIA has also been received and addressed above.
5.	Comments of Transport Department	
5.1	Please elaborate the means of transportation to/from the application premises (the Premises).	The visitors of the Proposed RCHE may take private car, taxi, bus services (Route 76K) and GMB services (Route 75) to/from the Proposed RCHE. Figure 2 of the revised Traffic Review Report shows the pedestrian routing from the nearby bus stop to the Proposed RCHE (with a walking distance of about 600m and walking time of about 9 minutes) (see Appendix E).

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
5.2	Please clarify the pick-up/drop-off and loading/unloading arrangements of the Premises and provide a drawing to illustrate the arrangements.	The taxi could pick-up/drop-off at the layby outside of the Palm Springs Plaza. For cars, it could park at the ancillary carpark of Palm Springs Plaza located at the west of the Application Premises. A total of 7 loading/unloading bays are provided at the ancillary carpark for the existing Palm Springs Plaza. At least a minimum of 1 loading/unloading bay would be exclusively used by the Proposed RCHE. The lorry/light bus/ambulance would use this exclusively loading bay for the pick-up/drop-off and loading/unloading activities. Figure 3 of the revised Traffic Review Report shows the traffic routings to/from the Proposed RCHE under the above arrangement (see Appendix E).
6.	Comments of Fire Services Department	
6.1	No in-principle objection to the application subject to fire service installations (FSIs) and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services.	Noted.
6.3	In consideration of the design/nature of the application, FSIs are anticipated to be required. Therefore, the applicant is advised to submit relevant layout plans incorporated with proposed FSIs to FSD for approval. In addition, the applicant should also be advised as follows: (a) the layout plans should be drawn to scale and depicted with dimensions and the nature of occupancy; (b) the location of the proposed FSIs to be installed should be clearly marked on the layout plans; and (c) licensing requirements, if any, would be formulated upon receipt of the referral from the relevant licensing authority.	Noted.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
6.3	The applicant is reminded that if the proposed structures are required to comply with the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 133), detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of the formal submission of general building plans.	Noted.
6.4	Please be advised that for any application involving a school, child care centre, RCHEs or residential care homes for persons with disabilities, the height restrictions as stipulated in the respective Regulations and Code of Practice should be observed.	Noted.
7.	Comments of Lands Department	
7.1	No objection to the application.	Noted.
7.2	The Remaining Portion of Lot No. 4750 in Demarcation District No. 104 ("the Lot") is held under the Conditions of Exchange dated 28 September 1980 ("the Conditions") as modified by relevant modification letters, and shall not be used for any purpose other than private residential purposes, and such non-industrial development (of which the total GFA for non-industrial (excluding godown, office, residential, hotel and / or service apartment) purposes shall not be less than 6,000m ²) in accordance with the Master Layout Plan.	Noted.
7.3	The proposed "Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly)" will be in breach of the Conditions governing the Lot, including but not limited to the user restriction.	Noted.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
7.4	Having considered the forgoing, if planning permission is given by the Town Planning Board, the applicant has to apply for a waiver (or such other land instrument as the Government may consider appropriate) for the proposed use. The applicant is reminded that every application submitted to LandsD will be considered on its own merits by LandsD at its absolute discretion acting in its capacity as landlord and there is no guarantee that the application will be approved. The said application if approved would be subject to such terms and conditions, to be imposed by LandsD in the landlord capacity at its sole discretion, including but not limited to payment of premium / waiver fee and administrative fee.	Noted.
7.5	Any requirements for technical arrangement such as traffic, sewerage and noise impact, etc. should be subject to comments from relevant Government departments.	The subject Planning Application has also been circulated to the Environmental Protection Department, Drainage Services Department and Transport Department. The comments from the above mentioned departments have also been received and addressed above.
7.6	The applicant shall seek Social Welfare Department's comments on the proposed use.	The subject Planning Application has also been circulated to the Social Welfare Department (SWD) and SWD has no objection to the Proposed RCHE. Detailed comments from SWD will be provided at the license application stage.