Section 12A Rezoning Application - Request for Amendment to the approved Lung Yeuk Tau and Kwan Tei South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-LYT/19 from "Residential (Group C)" Zone and "Agriculture" Zone to "Residential (Group A) 2" Zone at Various Lots in D.D. 83 and Adjoining Government Land, Lung Yeuk Tau, New Territories (Y/NE-LYT/16)

Ref.: ADCL/PLG-10248/L005

Table | 1

Response-to-Comments

Request for Amendment to the Approved Lung Yeuk Tau and Kwan Tei South Outline Zoning Plan No.S/NE-LYT/19 from "Residential (Group C)" Zone and "Agriculture" Zone to "Residential (Group A)2" Zone at Various Lots in D.D. 83 and Adjoining Government Land in D.D. 83, Lung Yeuk Tau, New Territories

Responses-to-Comments Table

Date	Department		Comments	Responses
21.03.2023	Railway	1. P	Please be advised that the site location of the captioned	Noted. The proposed development has incorporated a 13m building
	Development	а	application may have conflict with the possible railway scheme	setback to the north of the application site along Sha Tau Kok Road
	Office, Highways	b	being studied by this office to serve the New Territories North	and provides a reserve for any future infrastructural improvement.
	Department (HyD)	N	New Town. In order not to jeopardize the possible railway	
		s	scheme under planning, we have reservation on the subject	
		р	planning application at this stage. Please note that all related	
		s	submissions should be circulated to this office for comment,	
		а	and Non Building Area and/or Railway Reserve could be	
		re	equired to be imposed onto the captioned site if the planning	
		а	application proceeds.	
		2. It	t is noted that the estimated flat number of the development is	The additional passenger demand for MTR East Rail Line associated
		3	3,305. Please assess the impact to the East Rail Line arising	with the Proposed Development is estimated to be no more than 733
		fr	rom the development and propose mitigation measures (e.g.	persons during the peak hour, which is only 0.9% of the maximum
		lo	ong haul bus) in TIA (Appendix 3).	carrying capacity of the East Rail Line, i.e. 82.500 passengers / hour
				/ direction. Hence, the additional passenger demand is negligible,
				and will not result in adverse impact.
				Detail of the assessment is included in Chapter 4 of the revised TIA
				(see Enclosure 3).

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
24.4.2023	Antiquities and	1. "Please note a portion of the application site on Lot 854 partially	Noted with thanks. Heritage conservation has been given due
	Monuments Office	falls within Queen's Hill Site of Archaeological Interest ("SAI")	consideration, please refer to the revised Planning Statement Para.
	(AMO)	whilst majority of the site is in close proximity to the SAI. An	5.11.1 to 5.11.5 (See Enclosure 1).
		assessment of impact on heritage conservation, therefore,	
		should be included in the Planning Statement for AMO's	
		comment and agreement."	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
26.4.2023	Building	1. If the existing structures are erected on leased land without	Noted with thanks.
	Department (BD)	approval of the Buildings Department (BD) (not being a New	
		Territories Exempted House), they are unauthorized under the	
		Buildings Ordinance (BO) and should not be designated for any	
		approved use under the captioned application.	
		2. Before any new building works are to be carried out on the	Noted with thanks.
		application site, prior approval and consent of the Building	
		Authority (BA) should be obtained unless they are exempted	
		building. works or commenced under the simplified requirement	
		under the Minor Works Control System. Otherwise they are	
		Unauthorized Building Works (UBW). An Authorized Person	
		(AP) should be appointed as the coordinator for the proposed	
		building works in accordance with the BO.	
		3. For UBW erected on leased land, enforcement action may be	Noted with thanks.
		taken by the BA to effect their removal in accordance with BD's	
		enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary. The	
		granting of any planning approval should not be construed as	
		an acceptance of any existing building works or UBW on the	
		application site under the BO.	
		4. If the proposed use under application is subject to the issue of	Noted with thanks.
		a licence, please be reminded that any existing structures on	
		the application site intended to be used for such purposes are	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		required to comply with the building safety and other relevant	
		requirements as may be imposed. by the licensing authority.	
		5. The site shall be provided with means of obtaining access	Noted with thanks.
		thereto from a street under Regulation 5 of the Building	
		(Planning) Regulation B(P)R) and emergency vehicular access	
		shall be provided under Regulation 41D of the B(P)R.	
		6. The development intensity shall not exceed the permissible as	Noted with thanks.
		stipulated under the First Schedule of (BP)R). If the site is not	
		abutting on a specified street having a width not less than 4.5m,	
		the development intensity shall be determined by the Building	
		Authority under Regulation 19(3) of the B(P)R at building plan	
		submission stage.	
		7. The provision of open space about domestic buildings shall	Noted with thanks.
		comply with the requirements as stipulated under Second	
		Schedule of B(P)R.	
		8. You may wish to note that in general there is no requirement	Noted with thanks.
		under the BO in respect of provision of car parking spaces for	
		a proposed development. However, the applicant's attention is	
		drawn to the provision of accessible car parking spaces	
		designated for the use of persons with a disability as per the	
		requirements under the B(P)R 72 and Division 3 of Design	
		Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008 if BFA requirements are	
		applicable to the subject development.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		9. Criteria under PNAP APP-2 Appendix C shall be complied with	Noted with thanks.
		if GFA of car parking, loading and unloading areas under	
		Regulation 23(3)(b) of the B(P)R is to be excluded.	
		10. Sustainable building design requirements and pre-requisites	Noted with thanks.
		under PNAP APP-151 and APP-152 shall be complied with if	
		GFA concession for green and amenity features and non-	
		mandatory/ non-essential plant rooms and services is to be	
		exempted/ disregarded.	
		11. Formal submission under BO is required for any proposed new	Noted with thanks.
		works, including any temporary structure, site formation works	
		like filling of ponds and land and site formation drainage works.	
		Detailed comments under BO on individual sites for private	
		developments such as permissible plot ratio, site coverage,	
		emergency vehicular access, private streets and/or access	
		roads, barrier free access and facilities, compliance with the	
		sustainable building design guidelines (SBD), etc will be	
		formulated at the formal building plan submission stage.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
2.5.2023	Lands	This office has the following. comments on the captioned s.12A	
	Department	planning application from land administration point of view:	
	(LandsD)	The inclusion of Government land into application site is subject	Noted with thanks.
		to application and approval for a land exchange. There is no	
		guarantee that the land exchange application if submitted will	
		be approved and such application will be considered by Lands	
		Department acting in the capacity of Landlord at its sole	
		discretion. This rezoning application or approval (if given) shall	
		not pre-empt the consideration and decision of the approving	
		authority for the land exchange, if submitted by the applicant.	
		The area and extent of Government land included in the	
		application site has not yet been verified at this stage	
		2. Lot No. 782 RP in D.D. 83 is not included in the applicant site	The applicant has made every effort to deliver a comprehensive
		and will become isolated by the proposed development.	development at the site by amalgamating the scattered lots since
		Standalone R(C) development on Lot 782 RP in D.D. 83	previous years. While the inclusion of Lot 782 RP in D.D. 83 would
		becomes infeasible. Please consider if the exclusion	benefit the proposed development, the applicant has been unable to
		Lot 782RP in D.D. 83 from the rezoning exercise is desirable.	reach the lot owners after several attempts. Therefore, adequate
		Although Para. 5.4.2 of the Planning Statement stated that the	access to Lot 782 RP has been reserved along Hai Wing Road.
		existing access (presumably both vehicular and pedestrian	
		access) at. Dao Yang Road/Hai Wing Road will be maintained	
		for Lot No. 782 RP in D.D. 83, this is a private agreement	
		between the Applicant and the owner of the lot concerned and	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		cannot be enforced under lease. You may consider to impose	
		conditions under planning regime to ensure compliance.	
		3. The area and private lots to the south of Dao Yang Road (such	Noted with thanks. It is reiterated that although part of the existing
		as Lot Nos. 856 and 2144 in D.D. 83) and east of Hai Wing	Hoi Wing Road is under private ownership, the current access would
		Road (such as Lot Nos. 778 and 780 in D.D. 83) will be blocked	be maintained to serve local residents. Access to other lots, such as
		by the proposed development. The application stated that the	782RP, 792RP, 792 S.A. ss.1, 803 S.A. ss.2 RP, 803 S.A. ss.2. S.A,
		existing access at Dao Yang Road/Hai Wing Road will be	803 RP, and 804 S.A. ss.2, would be reserved for local residents and
		maintained. If vehicular and pedestrian access can be	would not be blocked, as specified in the MLP and revised Planning
		maintained by the proposed development to the existing users	Statement.
		of Dao Yang Road and Hai Wing Road, please consider	
		suitable planning conditions be imposed for this rezoning	
		application.	
		4. Please advise if the proposed disposition of the buildings and	Please note that the proposed disposition of the buildings and Master
		Master Layout Plan proposed in the Planning Statement is	Layout Plan proposed in the Planning Statement is not a requirement
		indicative and advisory only rather than a requirement of the	of the proposed rezoning.
		proposed rezoning (if approved).	
		5. Any requirement to provide urban design or specific facilities	Noted.
		such as the 13m building setback will not be included in the	
		land document if no relevant B/Ds agree to act as the approving	
		and monitoring authority under lease.	
		6. Part of Lot No. 854 in D.D. 83 falls within Queen's Hill Site of	Noted with thanks.
		Archaeological Interest, Archaeological Site No. AM01-1654.	
		Advice from AMO should be sought.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		7. The lot owners are required to seek a land exchange from'	Noted with thanks.
		Lands Department (LandsD) to implement the proposed	
		development if approved by the Town Planning Board (TPB).	
		In the event the subject application under S. 12A of the Town	
		Planning Ordinance (TPO) is accepted or partially accepted by	
		the TPB with a set of clear development parameters (including	
		but not limited to the proposed user, gross floor, area and car	
		parking provisions, as appropriate) defined / firmed up and	
		further submission to the TPB (including applications) for	
		permission under S. 16 of the TPO after the corresponding	
		amendment to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) has been made)	
		is not required, the lot owners may submit a request for	
		streamlined processing of land exchange application.	
		Depending on the circumstances of each case, LandsD at its	
		sole and absolute discretion may, upon receipt of such valid	
		request and subject to payment of the administrative fees)	
		(including fee payable to the Legal. Advisory and Conveyancing	
		Office, if required) by the lot owners, commence the	
		streamlined processing of the land exchange application on a	
		without prejudice and non-committal basis while Planning	
		Department (PlanD) is taking forward the relevant OZP	
		amendment.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		8. The lot owners are reminded that once the accepted or	Noted with thanks.
		partially accepted proposal is reflected in the OZP and	
		approved under S. 9 of the TPO, a formal application for	
		land exchange by lot owners to LandsD is still required.	
		Every application submitted to LandsD will be considered on its	
		own merits by LandsD at its absolute discretion acting in its	
		capacity as a landlord and there is no guarantee that the land	
		exchange application will eventually be approved by LandsD.	
		If the application for land exchange 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 fees).	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
2.5.2023	Transport	Comments from TENTE	
	Department (TD)		
		Section 2.8 - Please also add junctions between Jockey Club	Additional assessment for the 3 requested junctions are added to the
		Road and Lok Yip Road / San Wan Road, between Fanling	revised TIA. Please refer to the attached TIA for details (see
		Station Road and San Wan Road, and between Sha Tau Kok	Enclosure 3).
		Road and Shi Wan Road in your assessment.	
		2. Section 2.11 - Please advise me of the date of the traffic survey	Updated traffic surveys were carried out on the following dates to
		carried out in year 2019. In addition, the traffic flow in year 2019	collect the latest traffic data during the AM peak period (0700 - 0900
		may be affected by the social events and it is noted that the	hours), and the PM peak periods (1700 - 1900 hours):
		surveyed traffic flow at some junctions is significantly lower	i) Thursday, 11 th May 2023, and
		than that in our record, please review your assessment.	ii) Friday, 12 th May 2023
			Subsequently, the revised TIA adopted the results of the updated
			traffic survey (see Enclosure 3).
		3. Table 2.3 - Based on our knowledge, existing traffic flow at J02	Existing traffic flow at J02 has been updated based on the latest
		appears to be on the lower side. Please review.	traffic surveys carried out in May 2023. Please refer to the revised
			TIA for details (see Enclosure 3).
			[Note: Table 2.3 is revised as Table 2.1 in the revised TIA.]
		4. Table 2.4 - Please provide the details on how the design flows	The design flows are reviewed and updated based on different road
		are assumed. It is also observed that the design flow for the	and carriageway types, number of lanes, and width. Please refer to
		dual-2 RR is higher than that of the dual -2 DD. Please clarify.	the revised TIA for details (see Enclosure 3).
			[Note: Table 2.4 is revised as Table 2.2 in the revised TIA.]
		5. Table 3.4 - Please review the size of the Motorcycle Parking	Dimension of motorcycle parking space, and LGV loading / unloading
		Space and LGV Loading /Unloading Bay.	bays are corrected to meet the current design standard as follow:

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
			i) Motorcycle = 2.4m (L) x 1.0m (W) x min. 2.4m (H), and
			ii) LGV = 7.0m (L) x 3.5m (W) x min. 3.6m (H)
		6. Table 4.1 Please justify why the "mean" traffic rates are	Trip rates for "Private Housing" provided in the TPDM is only
		adopted given the remoteness of the development site.	available for unit with average flat size 60m ² or larger; whereas the
			average flat size for the Proposed Development is only 44m², which
			is 27% smaller. Hence, it is opined the use of mean rates for larger
			flat size has provided a conservative, i.e. higher, estimation on traffic
			generation.
		7. Section 4.6 Please explain why "2014-based TPEDM" was	The latest "2019-based TPEDM" is adopted in the revised TIA (see
		referred in your assessment but not the latest version of	Enclosure 3).
		TPEDM. Please also explain why the	
		8. 2026 2034 traffic growth factor is calculated by the equation	The traffic growth factor is calculated as follow:
		(1+X ₁) ⁵ but not (1+X ₁) ⁸ .	2026 to 2034 traffic growth factor = (1+X1) ⁸
		9. Section 4.7 Please seek comments from PlanD on the new	PlanD comment on this specific topic is sought, and the following
		development to be considered in the TIA.	reply was received:
			"All technical assessments should include the existing developments
			and the planned/committed developments including approved valid
			planning applications and planning and engineering studies which
			could be found within the public domain via Town Planning Board's
			Statutory Planning Portal 2, the Planning Department's website and
			the Planning Enquiry Counters."

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
			In additional to the information obtained from the Town Planning
			Board's Statutory Planning Portal 2, and Planning Department, new
			developments listed in the revised TIA are also obtained from other
			public domains including the website of District Council, Housing
			Department, Civil Engineering and Development Department etc.
			Hence, the list of new developments included is opined
			comprehensive.
		10. Section 4.9 Please clarify if the proposed improvement	The proposed improvement works to be implemented by others are
		works would be completed after year 2031 (i.e. year of	all expected to complete and operational by 2031. In view the
		population intake), and hence demonstrate that the assumed	Proposed Development will complete in 2031, the assessment year
		assessment year of 2034 is the worst case scenario from traffic	of 2034, i.e. 3 years after the completion date, is considered the worst
		angle.	case scenario from traffic viewpoint when comparing with the
			completion year.
		11. Table 4.5 - Please provide the details on how the design flows	The design flow are reviewed and updated based on different road
		are assumed.	and carriageway types, number of lanes, and width. Please refer to
			the revised TIA for details (see Enclosure 3).
		12. Section 4.15 - We may have further comments on this section	Noted.
		subject to your review on the traffic model and assumption	
		adopted in the TIA.	
		13. Section 4 - Please assess the traffic impact due to the proposed	Traffic assessment for the proposed junction of the Proposed
		junction. Please also provide the LOS assessment on existing	Development with Sha Tau Kok Road is included, which shall operate
		footpath.	with capacity. Please refer to Table 4.5 of the revised TIA for details.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
			Pedestrian assessment for nearby footpath sections and signalized
			crossing are also added. These facilities are expected to operate with
			capacity with the additional pedestrian flow associated with the
			Proposed Development. Please refer to the revised TIA for details
			(see Enclosure 3).
		14. Figure 2.2 - Please indicate the Area of Influence (AOI) on the	The AOI is added to Figure 2.1 of the revised TIA (see Enclosure 3).
		figure.	[Note: Figure 2.2 is changed to become Figure 2.1 in the revised TIA]
		15. Figure 4.2 and Figure 4.3 - Based on the two figures, vehicles	There are 3 possible routes from the Proposed Development to
		are assumed to enter Fanling Highway westbound via. Sha Tau	Fanling Highway westbound (So Kwun Po Interchange), and Table
		Kok Road and San Wan Road. Please review if this assumption	1 below compares the details amongst these routes.
		is valid given the route via. Ma Sik Road and So Kwun Po Road	
		is a shorter route.	TABLE 1 COMPARISONS OF 3 POSSIBLE ROUTE
			TO FANLING HIGHWAY WESTBOUND

Date	Department	Comments		Re	esponses	
			Routing	Distance ⁽¹⁾	Estimated	Number of Signalised
					Travel Time(1)	Junctions along route
			via Ma Sik Road	3.2 km	8 min.	8
			via Jockey Club	3.6 km	8 min.	7
			Road			
			via San Wan Road	3.6km	8 min	5
			(1) Information provided	by the HKeM	obility website, Tra	insport Department.
			Table 1 shows th	at although	the route via	Ma Sik Road is the
			shortest, i.e. 3.2 kn	n, but distar	ices via Jockey	Club Road and via Ma
			Sik Road is only 0	.4km longe	r, which is neg	gligible. In addition, the
			estimated travel tin	nes are ider	ntical amongst	all 3 routes.
						Jockey Club Road pass
			through 8 and 7 sig	gnalised jun	ctions respecti	vely, whereas the route
			via San Wan Roa	ad only pas	sses through	5 signalised junctions.
			Hence, the route vi	a San Wan	Road is less lil	kely to be stopped, and
			is opined more attr	active to dri	vers.	
				•		and Jockey Club Road
						anling North NDA and
			Fanling Area 17 by	2031; con	sequently, the	travel times via Ma Sik
			Road and via Jock	cey Road a	re expected to	increase in the future.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
			Whereas, traffic condition along San Wan Road is expected to
			remain similar to the existing condition, and the travel time will not be
			significantly increased.
			Therefore, the route via San Wan Road is chosen.
		Comments from TONI	
		Traffic Impact Assessment Report	
		1. Para. 2.2, Table 2.1 and Figure 2.1 - The existing public	The list of public transport services and stop locations are updated
		transport services may change from time to time. Please	(as of 31 May 2023) in the revised TIA attached.
		ensure that the existing public transport (PT) services are up-	
		to-date prior to each submission in future. It is observed some	
		of the existing PT services, such as KMB 78B and CTB 56A,	
		were not incorporated in your table. Please suitably update the	
		she service details of the PT services in your table. In	
		addition, there is a GMB stop of GMB 503/503K opposite to the	
		Queens Hill Public Transport Terminus, please also update the	
		figure concerned.	
		2. Para. 2.10 It is noted that only one-hour survey was	The traffic surveys were carried out for 2 hours for each peak AM and
		conducted for both AM and PM peak. Please advise the reason	PM peak period, i.e. 0700 – 0900 and 1700 – 1900 hours. The traffic
		and your source and definition of "peak hour" for the junctions	data was then summarized to identify AM and PM perk hour, and the
		concerned.	peak hour traffic data was extracted for traffic analyses.
		3. Para. 2.11 Please advise if the peak hour traffic flow in 2019	The revised TIA has been updated to adopt latest traffic data
		also refer to the same survey period mentioned in para 2.10.	collected in May 2023.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		4. Table 3.1 - Please specify the number of population in the table.	The estimated population is added to Table 3.1.
		5. Para. 4.8 and Table 4.3 - Please be reminded to take into	Table 4.3 shows a comprehensive list of other new developments
		account the intensification of FLN and KTN NDA when	identified within the AOI and the surrounding area, which included
		conducting the assessment. Please also be reminded to	the Fanling North NDA, and various public housing developments in
		include all the planned/ proposed developments in the	Fanling.
		summary table in liaison with relevant departments. It is	
		observed that some of the proposed developments, such as	Comment from Planning Department on information regarding these
		Fanling Area 48, Tong Hang, etc. are not included.	new planned developments has been sought. Please refer to our
			response to TENT's comment no. 9 above for details.
		6. Please advise the Area of Influence of your TIA.	The AOI is indicated in Figure 2.1 of the revised TIA.
		7. The TIA report did not conduct any assessment on the potential	Assessment on the potential impact of public transport services
		impact of public transport services in connection with the	associated with the Proposed Development are included the revised
		proposed development. The Consultant should conduct a	TIA, which includes the following:
		detailed assessment and comprehensive transport plan which	- Occupancy and utilization of the existing public transport
		include but not limited to the followings:	available;
		The assessment of the existing public transport;	- Estimation on demand and mode of public transport
		The estimated demand on public transport;	services;
		 The modal split of different modes of transport; 	- Review on impact of the existing public transport services;
		Availability of transport facilities to cater for the	and
		commuting needs of the proposed development;	- Mitigation proposals to accommodate the additional
		The plan should be further supplemented with relevant	passenger demand.
		utilization surveys, recommendation on enhancement	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		of existing services and/or proposed new services,	Please refer to the revised TIA attached for details.
		etc.;	
		The transport plan should meet the growing demand	
		with concrete service details (e.g. PT mode, frequency,	
		fleet size, origin-destination, etc) and recommendation	
		on the availability of terminating facilities (eg. provision	
		of charging-enabling facilities, spaces for ancillary	
		facilities, kiosks, toilets, etc according to Transport	
		Planning & Design Manual (TPDM)) and reflect in the	
		TTIA report.;	
		For any service proposal, the consultant may consider	
		spare capacity of relevant PT facilities at the proposed	
		terminating points to cater the new service, If the	
		proposed new service is to serve as railway feeder,	
		relevant spare capacity of the relevant rail lines should	
		be indicated.	
		The frequency, fleet size, origin- destination, etc. of the	
		proposed PT plan in TTIA. For the destinations of the	
		long-haul bus routes, if any, please ensure the	
		destinations are based on actual utilization surveys	
		from similar residential areas nearby. Please also	
		ensure there are sufficient transport facilities at the	
		destination to cater for the proposed PT services.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		8. It is noted that the expected population will be around 10,000.	Noted. Mitigation proposals on existing public transport service to
		Please review if a Public Transport Terminus should be	accommodate the additional passenger demand associated with the
		provided under the scope of this project to cater for the public	Proposed Development are included in the revised TIA attached.
		transport needs of new population intake. Otherwise, please	
		advise how the existing transport facilities could oater for such	
		transport demand.	
		9. Please indicate the ingress and egress of the proposed	Figures 3.3, 4.1 and 4.2 of the revised TIA attached show the
		development and the associated traffic flow in the drawing for	requested information on vehicular access of the Proposed
		our reference and review.	Development, and the associated traffic flows.
		Supporting Planning Statement	
		1. The planning section should include the assessment on the	Noted. Please refer to para 5.3.5 of the Planning Statement (see
		impact on public transport services apart from the traffic impact	Enclosure 1).
		as mentioned in para. 5.4.4.	The revised TIA also included assessment on public transport
			services (see Enclosure 3).
		2. While franchised bus services and GMB services are available	Noted. Mitigation proposals on existing public transport service to
		in the vicinity of the proposed development, we would like to	accommodate the additional passenger demand associated with the
		highlight that the existing PT services and facilities have almost	Proposed Development are included in the revised TIA attached (see
		been fully utilized, especially the feeder services to/from	Enclosure 3).
		Fanling and Sheung Shui Station. It is foreseeable that there	
		would be capacity problem without provision of any new PT	
		services and facilities. Please provide your detailed	
		assessment / analysis on the availability of PT services, and	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		facilities to cater for the passenger demand arising from the	
		proposed development to support your application re. the	
		above-mentioned comments on your TIA report.	
		3. We do not agree with your conclusion that in para. 6.6.1 and	To support the conclusion in para 6.6.1 and 7.1.2, the revised TIA
		7.1.2 since the TIA did not cover any assessment on public	attached included assessment on public transport services (see
		transport service and should be further revised for our further	Enclosure 3).
		review.	
		4. We would like to highlight that all your conclusions related to	Noted.
		traffic and public transport matters in your supporting planning	
		statement for the proposed development is subject to further	
		review with your submission of a revised TIA to address the	
		above-mentioned comments and other comments from	
		relevant parties concerned. Please also circulate your revised	
		submission to our Bus and Railway Branch for comments.	

Date	Department		Comments	Responses
25.5.2023	Urban Design and		Landscape	
	Landscape	1.	Having reviewed the submitted information, the applicant	Noted.
	Section, Planning		clarified in Enclosure 1 and Enclosure 2 – Appendix 4 that total	
	Department		190 nos. of existing trees were surveyed within the site	
	(UD&L)		boundary. 8 and 26 nos. of them are proposed to be retained	
			and transplanted respectively. 172 nos. of new trees are	
			proposed to be planted within the site for the loss of 156 nos. of	
			existing trees. 7359.3m² of greenery area, which is more than	
			30% of the site area, and 10,027m2 of open space would be	
			provided for the target population (i.e. 9,915 occupants).	
			Detailed Comments/ Advisory Comments on Enclosure 2 -	
			Appendix 4 of Planning Statement - Tree Preservation and	
			Landscape Proposal	
		2.	No additional buffer planting is provided along the southern and	The Site is in narrow slender form, but it accommodated residential
			eastern site boundaries. Our previous comment remains valid.	towers, clubhouse, shopping arcade, EVA and common landscape
				areas. The disposition of the proposed buildings and EVA has taken
				into account the design requirement like building separation, light
				penetration, air corridor and fire service. It is very difficult to provide
				wide planting verges for buffer planting along the boundaries.
				Besides, there are open storages, workshops, temporary structures
				and village houses abut to the Proposed Development, with their
				normal access within the Application Site Boundary. Footpaths
				should be allowed along the south and west boundaries for daily use

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
			of the Locals. Vertical greening is considered as an effective means
			to provide a soft-planted edges along the boundaries in consideration
			of spatial, maintenance and security requirements.
			In this submission, the landscape design has also been reviewed to
			provide more trees, shrubs and vertical greening along the boundary
			in order to enhance the edge greenery (see Enclosure 4).
		3. The applicant should explore the opportunity for tree planting	Noted. Tree planting opportunities has been maximized in this
		to meet 1:1 in terms of aggregated DBH as far as	submission (see Enclosure 4). It is proposed that 209 heavy
		practicable when there is available planting space and sufficient	standard trees with average 100mm, 120mm and 150mm DBH will
		growing space.	be planted for compensation of 156 removed trees. Therefore, the
			compensation ratio will be enhanced to be 1:1.34 and 1:0.71 in
			terms of quantity and quality respectively.
			Although the compensation ratio in terms of aggregated DBH cannot
			achieve 1:1, the planting strategy follows that sufficient space should
			be provided for the planting of compensatory trees taking into
			account the adequate space required to cater for the establishment
			and healthy growth of the trees up to maturity, in order to ensure that
			the greenery opportunity within the site is optimized where
			practicable.
		4. It is noted that vertical green wall is only proposed along the	There are open storages, workshops, temporary structures and
		northeastern site boundary. The applicant should clarify and	village houses abut to the Proposed Development with their normal

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		provide more information on the proposed treatment of the	access within the Application Site Boundary. Footpaths should be
		interfacing between the southeastern/western site boundaries	allowed along the southern boundary for daily use of the Locals.
		and the surroundings.	
			Portion of Dao Yang Road at west falls within the Application Site.
			This portion will be preserved as existing conditions for use of the
			road users.
			In this submission, the landscape design has been reviewed to
			provide more trees, shrubs and vertical greening along the boundary
			in order to enhance the edge greenery (see Enclosure 4).
		5. According to the Vertical Green Wall Details (Dwg. no. LD106	To clarify, the existing neighbours abut to the Site are mainly used
		and LD107), solid wall with wire rope facing to the proposed	for workshops, storages, temporary structures and village houses
		residential development is proposed for the vertical greening.	with partition solid walls or coregulated sheets. Besides, the Site is
		The applicant should critically review whether such proposed	narrow slender form but it accommodated residential towers,
		landscape treatment could help to provide smooth transition	clubhouse, shopping arcade, EVA, parking lots and common
		between the development and the adjoining	greenery. It is difficult to provide wide planting verges for buffer
		neighbours as mentioned in Section 5.1.2 in Appendix 4.	plantings along boundaries. Solid wall with wire rope facing to the
			proposed residential development is proposed for greening,
			maintenance and security purposes.
		6. In Landscape Master Plan (Dwg. no. LMP02), the 'Entrance to	Noted. Landscape Master Plan, dwg. no. LMP02 has been revised
		Shopping Arcade' is indicated with proposed	accordingly (see Enclosure 4).
		shrubs/groundcovers, which does not tally with Landscape	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		Master Plan (Dwg. no. LMP01). Please review and revise	
		accordingly.	
		7. Further to the above, spot levels at landscape areas on Dwg.	Noted. Colored spot levels have been added for clarity (see
		no. LMP02 are difficult to read. Please review.	Enclosure 4).
		8. The landscape treatments and proposed layout in Landscape	Noted. Landscape Section, dwg. no. LD102 has been revised
		Section (Dwg. no. LD102) does not tally with the Landscape	accordingly (see Enclosure 4).
		Master Plan. Please rectify.	
		9. In Communal Open Space Provision (Dwg. no. OS01), some	Noted. Communal Open Space Provision, dwg. no. OS01 has been
		landscape areas should not be counted as open space, such as	reviewed and revised accordingly. In this submission, the roofs of
		the landscape areas along the EVA near Tower 1, 4 and 5. The	the residential flats have been utilized as communal open spaces for
		applicant is reminded that countable open space should be	the enjoyment of the occupants (see Enclosure 4).
		functional and usable for active recreation and/or passive	
		recreation in accordance with HKPSG Ch.4 Recreation, Open	
		Space and Greening.	
		10. The applicant should be advised that approval of the application	Noted. Separate submission for tree works will be submitted to
		does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning,	relevant government department in detailed design stage.
		transplanting and felling under lease. The applicant is reminded	
		to seek approval for any proposed tree works from relevant	
		departments prior to commencement of the works.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		<u>Urban Design</u>	
		Detailed Comments / Advisory Comments	
		Responses to Comments Table (RtoC) on Revised MLP	
		11. RtoC (Item 4) – It would be advisable for the applicant to provide	Noted. Widths of setbacks have been indicated on A-P-101F (see
		widths of setbacks of proposed shopping arcade on the revised	Enclosure 2).
		MLP for ease of reference.	
		12. RtoC (Item 5) -The levels of the proposed EVA adjoining the	The level of the proposed EVA adjoining the shopping arcade is
		shopping arcade are different among the revised MLP (Roof)	12.0mPD and the level of G/F of the shopping arcade is 12.15mPD.
		(12.15mPD), revised MLP (G/F) (12.2mPD), Section A-A and	The drawings have been revised (see Enclosure 2).
		landscape master plan (12mPD). The applicant may wish to	
		clarify/rectify.	
		13. Section 3 - The applicant may consider to provide brief	Noted. Determination of visual envelope has been further
		discussion on the determination of visual envelope for complete	elaborated in Section 5.1 and 5.2 of the text report (see Enclosure
		information.	5).
		14. With reference to Fig. 2, it seems that no viewing point (VP) is	Noted. A viewing point (8) – Jogging Trail at Tsung Shan which
		selected from the north of the Site. Please consider to	is located to the north of the Site has been added for reference (see
		incorporate a VP at Tsung Shan.	Enclosure 5).
		15. Para. 6.3.5 – With reference to Fig. 2, Hang Mei Tsuen Park is	To clarify, there is no viewpoint at Hang Mei Tsuen Park and relevant
		not selected as a VP under the VIA, while discussion on VP7 is	paragraphs have been deleted accordingly. Besides, discussion on
		missing. Please review and revise as appropriate.	VP7 has been added accordingly (see Enclosure 5).
		16. Judging from the photomontage at VP1, it appears that the	Noted. Photomontage at VP3 has been reviewed and revised
		viewing direction (which is to the south rather than the east	accordingly (see Enclosure 5).
		towards the Site) is incorrect. Moreover, the building bulk and	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		height as shown in the photomontage appears to be smaller and	
		lower than those of the proposed development at VP6. Please	
		ensure the accuracy of submitted photomontages and review	
		the visual appraisal as appropriate.	
		17. With reference to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41	Noted. The housing development in the "R(A)1" site have been
		on Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning	included in photomontages and visual appraisal (see Enclosure 5).
		Applications to the Town Planning Board, known planned	
		developments as permitted by the statutory plans such as the	
		housing development in the "R(A)1" site should be taken into	
		account in the VIA. Please consider to reflect the "R(A)1"	
		development in the photomontages and visual appraisal as	
		appropriate.	
		18. Section 6 and Table 1.0 -Please ensure the consistency	Noted. Relevant sections and tables have been reviewed and revised
		between the VP analysis and the summary table, for instance,	accordingly (see Enclosure 5).
		visual sensitivity at VP3 and VP6 are rated as "medium" in	
		Paras. 6.3.1 and 6.3.4, but indicated as "low" in Table 1.0.	
		19. Section 7.5 and Table 4.0 – Comparing the submitted	Noted. The rating of magnitude change of visual change at VP4 and
		photomontages at VP4 and VP5, the magnitude of the visual	VP5 has been reviewed and revised accordingly (see Enclosure 5).
		change at VP4 appears to be more substantial as a large portion	
		of existing open sky would be obstructed by the proposed	
		development. While the visual impact at VP5 would be slightly	
		to moderately adverse, moderately adverse visual impact at	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		VP4 would be more justified. Please review and revise the	
		ratings of visual obstruction, effect on visual resources and	
		overall visual impact at VP4 as appropriate.	
		20. Para. 8.4 and Table 4.0 - According to Table 4.0, the overall	Noted. Relevant paragraphs have been reviewed and revised
		visual impact of the proposed development would range from	accordingly (see Enclosure 1 and Enclosure 5).
		"negligible to slightly adverse" to "moderately adverse", instead	
		of "negligible to moderately adverse" in Para. 8.4. Please	
		review/rectify. In this connection, please review and revise	
		the conclusion about the overall visual impact of the proposed	
		development in Item (g) of the Executive Summary and Paras.	
		5.5.6, 6.6.2, 6.1.3(g) of SPS accordingly.	
		Air Ventilation	
		21. The proposed development in the Site, with a site area over 2	Noted with thanks. Air ventilation considerations of the application
		ha and an overall PR of 5 or above as well as a total GFA over	site and the proposed development are evaluated. Please refer to the
		100,000 sq.m, may have potential adverse impact on the	revised Planning Statement Para 5.10.1 to 5.10.16 (see Enclosure
		pedestrian wind environment of the surrounding areas.	1).
		the absence of sufficient information/justification, such impact	
		cannot be ascertained. Having said that, it is noted that some	
		air ventilation measures, such as an about 19m-wide building	
		separation between Tower 1/ 4 and an about 13m building	
		setback from Sha Tau Kok Road-Lung Yeuk Ta, etc. have been	
		provided, the applicant may wish to elaborate in this regard and	
		provide further information, including prevailing wind directions	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		with support of the site wind availability data available at PlanD's	
		website, discussions on the existing wind performance taking	
		into account surrounding site context and the potential wind	
		performance with the proposed development.	
		<u>SPS</u>	
		22. Para. 5.5.3 of the SPS and Illustration 5 (Enclosure 1 refers) –	Noted with thanks. The relevant description in VIA has been revised
		With reference to the revised MLP, among the four proposed	accordingly (see Enclosure 5).
		building separations, two are about 7m (between Tower 4/Tower	Planning statement has been revised accordingly, Illustration 5-I and
		5) and 11m (between Tower 2/Tower 3) in width. According to	Illustration 5-II are supplemented (see Enclosure 1).
		the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, the minimum width	
		of the air corridor along its path between buildings shall not be	
		less than 15m. Moreover, the proposed building separation	
		between Tower 1/Tower 2 seems to be obstructed by other	
		towers in different wind directions; and unlike what is indicated	
		in Para. 5.5.3, none of the proposed building separations are	
		not less than 20m in width on the revised MLP. The applicant	
		may wish to present clear and sufficient specifications for the	
		proposed air ventilation measures of the proposed development	
		on Illustration 5, and this plan should be provided with scale.	
		23. As a general remark, 'building separation' or 'air path' would be	Noted. Relevant terms in VIA have been reviewed and revised
		a more appropriate term than 'wind corridor' for the proposed air	accordingly (see Enclosure 5).

Further Information (2) Responses-to-Comments Table 4 July 2023

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		ventilation measures within the Site (e.g. Paras. 5.2.2, 5.5.3 of	
		the SPS and Bullet Point 3 under Para. 4.2.1 of the VIA).	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
4.5.2023	Water Supplies	Major Comments on the Application/Main Reasons of Objection:	Noted with thanks. The WSIA has been revised (see Enclosure 6).
	Department	We have the following comments on the WSIA, appendix 7 of the	
	(WSD)	planning statement:	
		1. Table 3.1, please use 300 1/head/day for fresh, water unit	Noted. 300 1/head/day has been adopted for fresh water unit
		demand of the residential development,	demand of the residential development.
		2. Table 3.1, please use 104 1/head/day for flushing water unit	Noted. 104 1/head/day has been adopted for flushing water unit
		demand of the residential development	demand of the residential development/
		3. Table 3.1, service trade of 40 1/head/day is required in your	Noted. Service trade of 40 1/head/day has been adopted.
		water demand estimation according to WSD DI 1309.	
		4. Table 3.1 and Appendix B, as service trade will cover store,	Noted. Table 3.1 and Appendix B have been revised accordingly.
		canteen etc, associated with the residential development,	
		please remove the water demand estimation from "Staff of	
		residential development", "Staff of retail shop", "Staff of	
		restaurant".	
		5. Table 3.4Please use 250mm dia. Instead of 300mm dia. for the	Noted and revised accordingly.
		proposed fresh water main.	
		6. Appendix B Discrepancies were found in the calculation of	The maintenance of the pool is assumed to be carried out once a
		water demand from swimming pool. Please clarify the	year, and the duration to fill up the pool after maintenance is
		frequency for maintenance of the pool is I per year or I per	estimated to be 30 days. Calculation of water demand from
		month and revise the calculation.	swimming pool has been included in the total fresh water demand of
			the Proposed Development.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		Other Detailed Comments:	
		Existing water mains as shown in the enclosed sketch are inside the	Noted. If diversion of existing water mains is required, the Authorised
		proposed lot and will be affected. The applicant is required to either	Person (AP) will submit all the relevant proposal to WSD during the
		divert or protect the water mains found on site.	detailed design stage in the future.
		If diversion is required, existing water mains inside the proposed lot	
		are needed to be diverted outside the site boundary of the proposed	
		development to lie in Government land. A strip of land of minimum	
		1.5 m in width should be provided for the diversion of existing water	
		mains. The cost of diversion of existing water mains upon request	
		will have to be borne by the grantee/applicant; and the applicant	
		shall submit all the relevant proposal to WSD for consideration and	
		agreement before the works commence.	
		If diversion is not required, the following conditions shall apply:	Noted.
		a) Existing water mains are affected as indicated on the site plan	
		and no development which requires resiting of water mains will	
		be allowed.	
		b) Details of site formation works shall be submitted to the Director	Noted.
		of Water Supplies for approval prior to commencement of	
		works.	
		c) No structures shall be built, or materials stored within 1.5 /3	Noted. Such arrangement of the access will be reviewed by the AP
		metres from the centre line(s) of water mains) shown on the	during the detailed design stage in the future.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		plan. Free access shall be made available at all times for staff	
		of the Director of Water Supplies or their contractor to carry out	
		construction, inspection, operation, maintenance and repair	
		works.	
		d) No trees or shrubs with penetrating roots may be planted within	Noted.
		the Water Works Reserve or in the vicinity of the water mains)	
		shown on the plan. No change of existing site condition	
		may be undertaken within the aforesaid area without the prior	
		agreement of the Director of Water Supplies. Rigid root	
		barriers may be required if the clear distance between the	
		proposed tree and the pipe is 2.5m or less, and the barrier	
		must extend below the invert level of the pipe.	
		e) No planting or obstruction of any kind except turfing shall be	Noted.
		permitted within the space of 1.5 metres around the cover of	
		any valve or within a distance of 1 metre from any hydrant	
		outlet.	
		f) Tree planting may be prohibited in the event that the Director of	Noted.
		Water Supplies considers that there is any likelihood of damage	
		being caused to water mains.	
		* adopt 1.5 metres for water mains below 600mm dia. And 3 metres	Noted.
		for water mains of 600mm dia. And above.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
11.5.2023	Highways	1. I supposed there will be a run-in out between the applicant site	Noted with thanks.
	Department (HyD)	and the Sha Tau Kok Road - Lung Yeuk Tau. The proposed run-	
		in out arrangement and the Traffic Impact Assessment for the	
		run-in/out at Sha Tau Kok Road - Lung Yeuk Tau should be	
		commented and approved by TD;	
		2. The run-in/ out should design and construct them in	Noted with thanks.
		accordance with prevailing HyD Standard Drawings to the	
		satisfaction of HyD and TD	
		3. Adequate drainage measures should be provided to prevent	Noted with thanks.
		surface water running from the application site to the nearby	
		public roads and drains.	