

Attachment 1 Responses-to-Comments Table

Comments from Related Departments

Page No.

1. Agriculture Fisheries and Conservation Department, dated 4 January 2024.....	2
2. Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland North Division, North Section, dated 2 April 2024	2
3. Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland North Division, North Section, dated 10 April 2024	2
4. Environmental Protection Department, dated 9 April 2024	3
5. Lands Department, District Lands Office, North, dated 23 February 2024.....	11
6. Leisure and Cultural Services Department, North District Leisure Services Office, dated 16 January 2024	12
7. Leisure and Cultural Services Department, New Territories North Tree Team, dated 16 January 2024	12
8. Planning Department, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Landscape Unit dated 5 January 2024	12
9. Planning Department, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 16 January 2024 .	14
10. Social Welfare Department, dated 10 January 2024.....	18
11. Transport Department, NT Regional Office, Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division, North Section, dated 3 January 2024.....	19
12. Transport Department, NT Regional Office, Transport Operations (NT) Division, Sai Kung & North Section, dated 3 January 2024	20
13. Water Supplies Department, New Works Branch, Construction Division, System Planning Section, dated 2 April 2024.....	20

1.	Agriculture Fisheries and Conservation Department, dated 4 January 2024	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have no comment on the FI provided by the applicant and our earlier comments are still valid. 	Noted.
2.	Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland North Division, North Section, dated 2 April 2024	
	<p>Comments on the revised SIA</p> <p>Section 5 - Please indicate that the project proponent will be responsible for the implementation, operation and maintenance of the proposed STP.</p>	Noted, please refer to Section 5.1.3 of Annex A – Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment for details.
3.	Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland North Division, North Section, dated 10 April 2024	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please be advised that the 5th edition of Stormwater Drainage Manual has been updated pursuant to its Corrigendum No. 1/2022, 1/2024 and 2/2024. Please review the relevant calculations pursuant to the latest drainage guideline. Figure 3.1: Please also show the expected flow path of the area on the other side of Ping Che Road. For instance, contribution from the side branch of SMH10023241 was not mentioned in the calculation. Should the relevant pipeworks be also serving the relevant area, please also include them in the hydraulic analysis. In terms of climate change adjustment, please also include design allowance pursuant to Section 6.8(e) of the Corrigendum No. 1/2022 of the Stormwater Drainage Manual. It is noted that the upgrading of the existing drainage networks is requisite and essential to cater for the proposed development, please advise the undertaking party and timeline of the upgrading works to substantiate on the feasibility. The provision of stormwater harvesting system and storage tank is mentioned in the 	<p>Noted. The calculation has been revised. Please refer to Sections 4.2 to 4.3, Appendix B, C and D of Annex B – Revised Drainage Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Noted. The area on the other side of Ping Che Road has been included in the hydraulic calculation. Please refer to Section 4.1.4, Appendix B, C and D of Annex B for details.</p> <p>Noted. The climate change adjustment has been included in the calculation – the 16.0% of rainfall increase due to climate change is adopted as worst-case scenario. Please refer to Appendix B of Annex B for details.</p> <p>Noted. As stated in Section 2.4, the Application Site falls within the NTN Development, which included a drainage works. Please also refer to Section 4.3.11 of Annex B for details. Further assessment will be conducted to determine if upgrading works is required.</p> <p>Noted. As stated in Sections 4.4.4 and 4.4.8 of Annex B, the stormwater harvesting system</p>

	DIA, please elaborate on the location, sizing of the storage tank and the potential impacts to the public drainage system.	will be further study in later stage to explore the feasibility.
4.	Environmental Protection Department, dated 9 April 2024	
	<p>Environmental Assessment Report</p> <p><u>Noise Perspective</u></p> <p>1. Section 6.3.5</p> <p>Please document TD’s agreement on the traffic forecast data in the report once available. In case TD has no comment on the methodology for traffic forecast only, the consultant should provide written confirmation from the respective competent party (e.g. traffic consultant) that TD’s endorsed methodology has been strictly adopted in preparing the traffic forecast data, and hence the validity of traffic data can be confirmed.</p> <p>2. Section 6.3.18</p> <p>The information about the BAW will be stated in the Sales Brochure and Deed of Mutual Covenant to let the future occupants be well aware of its intended purpose. Please supplement.</p> <p>3. Table 6</p> <p>Based on the photo provided by consultant, there are clearly mobile crane is found together with the lorry. Please review and update.</p> <p>4. Section 6.4.13</p> <p>Please supplement the full details, including the date, time, personnel, equipment, calibration record, weather, field operations and site location plan, shall be included for completeness and easy future reference.</p> <p><u>Waste Management and Land Contamination Perspective</u></p> <p>5. Response-to-Comment (16) - Section 8.4.2</p> <p>Please clarify whether a Contamination Assessment Plan (CAP) has been separately submitted to EPD for approval. If affirmative, please append the relevant submission for</p>	<p>Noted. TD’s endorsement on traffic forecast data will be supplemented once available.</p> <p>Noted. Information has been supplemented in Sections 6.3.17, 6.3.18 and 6.3.19 of Annex C – Revised Environmental Assessment</p> <p>Noted. Table 6-7 and Appendix 6.7 of Annex C have been revised to account for the fixed plant noise identified.</p> <p>Noted. Background noise measurement and details have been supplemented in Appendix 6.7 of Annex C.</p> <p>Noted. Information has been supplemented in Section 8.2.4 suggesting that CAP will be prepared for EPD approval before site investigation before commencement of project</p>

<p>further vetting. If not, please update the wording to avoid confusion.</p>	<p>development. Please refer to Annex C for details.</p>
<p>6. Response-to-Comment (19) – Table 8-1</p> <p>Discrepancies have been spotted in the occupation period between Table 8-1 (i.e., occupied as an open storage area since 1990) and Appendix 8-4 (i.e., occupied as an open storage area since 1982). The Consultant is advised to carefully review the content and ensure the information is consistent throughout the submission.</p> <p>7. Response-to-Comment (19) – Table 8-2</p> <p>(a) The Consultant shall incorporate the distance between the off-site contamination sources and the Project boundary and further elaborate on the site condition and any physical separation (e.g., concrete paving or roads) from the Site.</p> <p>(b) Inconsistencies in the description for OLC-2 have been spotted between Table 8-1 and Table 8-2. Please clarify whether it shall be referred to the east or northeast of the Project Site.</p> <p>(c) Please clarify whether the open storage area at the west of the Project Site has been occupied since 2000 (i.e., Table 8-1 and Para. 8.4.7) or 2009 (Table 8- 2).</p>	<p>Noted. Appendix 8.4 of Annex C has been revised. The land has been occupied since 1982, and was used as open storage from 1990.</p> <p>Noted. Figure 8.1a has been revised and Table 8-1 has been to show the distance between the off-site sources and the Project Boundary. Please refer to Annex C for details.</p> <p>Noted. Table 8-1 of Annex C has been revised. Please be noted that “East” was revised as “Northeast”.</p> <p>Please be clarified that the comment is referring to OLC 3. Table 8-1 of Annex C has been revised. The southeast of the site has been occupied since 2000.</p>
<p>8. Response-to-Comment (20) – Appendix 8-1</p> <p>The previous comment has not been duly addressed. There are still slight displacements with the location of the site boundary on some of the aerial photos. Please carefully review and align the boundary on each aerial photo as appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. The sites boundaries have been revised in the aerial photos. Please refer to Appendix 8-1 of Annex C for details.</p>
<p>9. Response-to-Comment (22) – Section 8.4.5 to 8.4.7</p> <p>Since the three identified potential off-site contamination sources have already occupied the current locations for quite a period of time, please clarify whether site interviews were conducted during the site walkover to better understand their business and operation nature</p>	<p>Site interviews were conducted during the site walkover to better understand their business and operation nature and evaluate land contamination potential from off-site sources. Please refer to Sections 8.4.5 to 8.4.7 of Annex C for details.</p>

<p>and evaluate land contamination potential from off-site sources.</p>	
<p>10. Response-to-Comment (23) – Table 8-3 and Appendix 8-3</p>	
<p>(a) According to Appendix 8-3, correspondence with the Planning Department dated 25 May 2023 has been attached to this submission. Nevertheless, there is no such record tabulated in Table 8-3. Please review and incorporate the relevant information to avoid confusion.</p>	<p>Noted. Table 8-3 of Annex C has been updated.</p>
<p>(b) The Consultant is advised to supplement the latest enquiry letter to PlanD for clarity.</p>	<p>Noted. Enquiry letter to PlanD has been supplemented in Appendix 8-3 of Annex C.</p>
<p>(c) It is understood that a new request has been made to PlanD, and their response is currently underway. We will reserve our comment on the conclusion of the land contamination chapter.</p>	<p>Noted. Enquiry letter to PlanD and corresponding responses have been supplemented in Appendix 8-3. Information has also been updated in Section 8.7.2 and Table 8-3. Please refer to Annex C for details.</p>
<p>11. Response-to-Comment (27) – Section 8.6.4</p>	
<p>According to the locational plan on Appendix 8.5, stained surfaces were identified at the edge of the machinery storage area (i.e., Photo 43 and 46), please review and update the description to avoid confusion.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 8.6.4 of Annex C has been revised as “No stains or distressed vegetation observed on the ground in the storage area. Stains were observed along the corridor between the construction material and machinery storage area (Photo 43,46), where the respective ground is paved in good condition. Stains were also spotted at the edge of building material storage area (Photo 39) where the ground is unpaved.”</p>
<p>12. Response-to-Comment (27) – Section 8.6.5</p>	
<p>According to the locational plan in Appendix 8.5, the area for machinery maintenance / chemical oil drums storage areas is physically separated into two parts. Please review and update the wording for clarity.</p>	<p>Noted. Sections 8.6.5 and 8.6.6 of Annex C have been updated.</p>
<p>13. Response-to-Comment (27) – Section 8.7.2</p>	
<p>Please clarify the meaning of the “relevant illegal land contamination case”, as mentioned in the second sentence.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 8.7.2 of Annex C has been revised.</p>
<p>14. Response-to-Comment (33) – Section 8.7.8</p>	

<p>Per Figure 8.5a of Appendix 8-5, stained surfaces were identified at the edges of building material storage area (i.e., Photos 39) and machinery storage areas (i.e., Photos 43 and 46). Please review the conclusion on the locations of hotspots outlined in Section 8.7.8 and update as appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 8.6.4 of Annex C has been updated.</p>
<p>15. Response-to-Comment (33) – Section 8.7.9</p> <p>In addition to the entire machinery maintenance area, please clarify whether the identified hotspots shall be included in the site investigation works in the subsequent stages.</p>	<p>Noted. Sections 8.7.7 and 8.8.8 of Annex C have been revised.</p>
<p>16. Section 8.8.2</p> <p>In the second sentence, please clarify whether stained surfaces were identified within the machinery storage or maintenance areas.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 8.8.2 of Annex C has been updated.</p>
<p>17. Response-to-Comment (35) – Section 9.1.5</p> <p>(a) The previous comment has not been duly addressed. Since Cap.354C and Cap.354N are already covered in Section 9.1.3 and Section 9.1.4, please remove the duplicates to avoid confusion.</p> <p>(b) The previous comment has not been duly addressed. As the revised version of Monitoring Solid Waste in Hong Kong – Waste Statistics 2022 was issued in December 2023, please quote the most updated reference as appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.1.5 of Annex C has been revised.</p> <p>Noted. Section 9.1.5 of Annex C has been revised.</p>
<p>18. Response-to-Comment (36) – Section 9.3.1</p> <p>(a) The 4th sentence is confusing. Please review whether non-inert C&D materials are suitable as filling materials on-site or for other beneficial off-site uses at PFRFs.</p> <p>(b) Please be advised that timber and woody materials are only part of the non-inert C&D materials to be generated during the construction works. The Consultant shall review whether further segregation and recycling shall be adopted prior to landfill disposal.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.3.2 of Annex C has been revised.</p> <p>Noted. Section 9.3.2 of Annex C has been revised.</p>

<p>(c) In addition to estimating the daily truck trip for the disposal of non-inert C&D materials, please also provide a preliminary estimation of the transportation arrangement for inert C&D materials.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.3.1 of Annex C has been revised.</p>
<p>19. Response-to-Comment (39) – Section 9.3.11</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.3.12 of Annex C has been revised.</p>
<p>The amount of chemical waste to be generated shall be quantified in the Waste Management Plan (WMP) as part of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) to be prepared by the Contractor.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.3.12 of Annex C has been revised.</p>
<p>20. Response-to-Comment (39) – Section 9.3.13</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.3.14 of Annex C has been revised.</p>
<p>Please consider referring to the generation rate (i.e., 0.65 kg/person/day) adopted in approved Environmental Impact Assessment Reports instead of 0.59kg/person/day from “Monitoring of Solid Waste in Hong Kong—Waste Statistics for 2022”. The Consultant shall update the estimation and the relevant figures in Section 9.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.3.14 of Annex C has been revised.</p>
<p>21. Section 9.3.15</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.3.16 of Annex C has been revised.</p>
<p>The sentence is incomplete, please carefully review and update it as appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.3.16 of Annex C has been revised.</p>
<p>22. Table 9-1</p>	<p>Noted. Table 9-1 of Annex C has been revised for further elaboration. The calculation on the quantity of non-inert C&D materials made reference to the Waste Index in Section 3.2 of A Guide for Managing and Minimizing Building and Demolition Waste published by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University in May 2001.</p>
<p>(a) Please further elaborate on the estimation of the quantity of non-inert C&D materials based on the GFA of the sites.</p>	<p>Noted. Table 9-1 of Annex C has been revised for further elaboration. The calculation on the quantity of non-inert C&D materials made reference to the Waste Index in Section 3.2 of A Guide for Managing and Minimizing Building and Demolition Waste published by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University in May 2001.</p>
<p>(b) Please adopt the generation rate (i.e., 0.65 kg/person/day) adopted in approved Environmental Impact Assessment Reports instead of 0.59kg/person/day from “Monitoring of Solid Waste in Hong Kong – Waste Statistics for 2022”.</p>	<p>Noted. The quantity of general refuse has been revised in Table 9-1 of Annex C.</p>
<p>23. Response-to-Comment (44) and (46) – Section 9.5.1</p>	<p></p>

<p>The description of chemical wastes is confusing, please carefully review the first sentence and update it as appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.5.1 of Annex C has been revised.</p>
<p>24. Response-to-Comment (45) – Section 9.5.2</p> <p>In addition to the disposal outlet of segregated food waste, please elaborate on the collection arrangement for food waste generated during the operational phase.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.5.2 of Annex C has been revised.</p>
<p><u>Water Quality Perspective</u></p>	
<p>25. Response-to-Comment Item 53(a)</p> <p>There is nearby public sewer, please clarify the reason of not connecting to public sewer for handling and disposal of sewage generated from the proposed development. <i>[not yet addressed in last round of comment]</i></p>	<p>Please be clarified that the nearby public sewer along Ping Che Road is rising main – discharging to rising main is not proposed.</p>
<p>26. Section 7.6.3 to 7.6.5</p> <p>(a) Paragraphs regarding STP should be considered as mitigation measure during operation phase. Please amend as appropriate.</p> <p>(b) Please illustrate disposal pathway, emergency/contingency measures (e.g. emergency bypass) of proposed STP in appropriate paragraph(s). <i>[not yet addressed in last round of comment]</i></p>	<p>Noted. Sections 7.6.3 to 7.6.5 of Annex C have been placed under the section titled “Mitigation Measures during Operation Phase”.</p> <p>Noted. The detail design of the proposed STP is not yet available at this stage. The requested information will be supplemented in the revised SIA report for approval at the detail design stage. Nevertheless, emergency/contingency measures of the proposed STP have been supplemented in Section 7.6.7 – 7.6.8 of Annex C.</p>
<p>27. Section 7.6.4 and Table 7-3</p> <p>Please amend typo “Deep bay” to “Deep Bay”.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 7.6.5 and Table 7.3 of Annex C have been updated.</p>
<p>28. Section 7.6.6</p> <p>Please include ProPECC PN1/23 as one of the mitigation measures during operation phase.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 7.6.9 of Annex C has been updated.</p>
<p>29. Figure 7.1</p> <p>Please indicate the ID of water sensitive receiver (WSR) to show the WSRs clearly.</p>	<p>Noted. Figure 7.1 of Annex C has been updated.</p>

Sewerage Impact Assessment Report	
<p>30. Section 4.2 and Table 4-2</p> <p>(a) Please check the calculation for “Total ADWF” - 2083.0 m³/day. Given the addition of 6m³/day sewage generation from swimming pool, please clarify should the calculation be 2074.6m³/day + 6m³/day = 2080.6m³/day.</p> <p>(b) Please check the calculation for “Contributing Population”.</p>	<p>The unit flow factor and average sewage discharge for generation from residential – Day Care Centre for the Elderly are updated to 0.19 m³/person/day and 11.3 m³/ day in Table 4-2. As such, the total ADWF is to be 2077 m³/day + 6 m³/day. Please refer to section 4.2 and table 4-2 of Annex A for details.</p> <p>Noted. The contributing population has been revised to ADWF/ 0.27 (excluding swimming pool backwash), i.e. 2,077/0.27 = 7,693. Please refer to Table 4-2 and Appendix B of Annex A for details.</p>
<p>31. Section 4.4.5 and Table 4-4</p> <p>(a) Please check the calculation of Average ADWF for “Sewage (Residents)” and “Sewage (Staff)” and Total ADWF. Please amend relevant data / info / appendix accordingly.</p> <p>(b) Please clarify the contribution of sewage generated from swimming pool.</p>	<p>Noted. The “Sewage (Staff)” has revised as 394.6 m³/day (backwash from swimming pool excluded). Relevant table, main text and appendix are revised accordingly. Please refer to Section 4.4.4 and Table 4-4 of Annex A for details.</p> <p>The contribution of sewage generated from swimming pool is the backwash which is 6m³/day. A column has been added in Table 4-4 of Annex A.</p>
<p>32. Section 4.4.7</p> <p>Please amend typo “As is good practice for STP...” to “As for good practice for STP...”.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 4.4.6 of Annex A has been revised.</p>
<p>33. Section 4.5.2 and Table 4-6</p> <p>Population for residents and staff (i.e. 6114+839=6953) does not align with that in Table 4-2 (i.e. 7693) and in Appendix C (i.e. 6334+839=7173). Please review and amend as appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. Population for residents has been revised as 6334 in Table 4-6 to tally with Appendix C. Please refer to Annex A for details.</p>
<p>34. Section 4.6 and Table 4-7</p> <p>(a) Please check the calculation for “Sewerage Flow Rate”. Please amend relevant data / info / appendix accordingly.</p>	<p>Noted. The calculation of “Sewerage Flow Rate” is to be 2083.96 m³/day, which are consistent with calculation of Appendix C.</p> <p>Please refer to Table 4-7 and Appendix C of Annex A for details.</p>

<p>(b) Please review the whole report and amend based on the changes made.</p>	<p>Noted. The comments are addressed and reflected accordingly in Annex A.</p>
<p>35. Table 4-1</p> <p>The category of the Residents of the Elderly Day Care Centre should be domestic: institutional and special class. Please update.</p>	<p>Noted. Information has been updated in Table 4-1 of Annex A.</p>
<p>36. Table 4-2</p>	
<p>(a) The UFF of residential from the Elderly Day Care Centre should be 0.19 m³/person/day. Please revise and update the calculation.</p>	<p>Noted. Information has been updated in Table 4-2 and Appendix B of Annex A.</p>
<p>(b) Please provide the details calculation and reference of the peak flow from the swimming pool backflow.</p>	<p>The design of swimming pool would be available in detailed design stage. Meanwhile, please refer to the assumptions with reference for detail calculation for swimming pool backflow is given in Appendix B of Annex A.</p>
<p>(c) Please verify the peaking factor and peak flow for the proposed development according to the GESF and update the calculation accordingly.</p>	<p>Noted. The peaking factor has been revised as 3 according to Section 3.3 of EPD’s Guidelines for the Design of Small Sewerage Treatment Plant. Please refer to Table 4-2 and Appendix B of Annex A.</p>
<p>37. Section 4.4.2 and Appendix C</p> <p>It is noted that equalization tank should be used in the STP. Please state the size of the equalization tank to ensure it fulfils the Guidelines for the Design of Small Sewage Treatment Plants.</p>	<p>Noted. The minimum size of equalisation tank of 519.75m³ has been stated in Section 4.4.4 and Appendix C of Annex A.</p>
<p>38. Section 4.4.4</p> <p>The meaning of this paragraph is similar to Section 4.4.2, please check and delete if applicable.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 4.4.2 has deleted accordingly.</p>
<p>39. Section 4.4.5</p> <p>The design peak flow of the on-site STP should be 6249 m³/day not 2083 m³/day. Please update.</p>	<p>Noted. The design peak flow of the on-site STP has been revised as 6237 m³/day. Please refer to Section 4.4.4 of Annex A.</p>
<p>40. Table 4-4</p> <p>Please use “Peaking factor/peak flow factor” instead of “ADWF factor”. Please update.</p>	<p>Noted. Information has been updated in Table 4-4 of Annex A.</p>
<p>41. Table 4-6</p>	

	<p>The population of the residents is inconsistent with the data in Appendix C. Please verify and update.</p>	<p>Noted. The population of the residents has revised as 6334. Please refer to Table 4-6 of Annex A for details.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Lands Department, District Lands Office, North, dated 23 February 2024</p>	
	<p>It is noted that the Applicant's R-to-C submitted on 19.12.2023 are solely related to comments given by WSD and thus not related to this office. And our comments to the Applicant's R-to-C submitted on 14.12.2023 are provided below: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As no amendment is proposed in response to our previous memo, our comments stated in my memo dated 8.12.2023 remain valid. • The R-to-C confirmed that "the Child Care Centre and Day Care Centre for the Elderly will be privately-owned and to be operated by the owner of the Proposed Development". As advised you in para. 4(iv) of my previous memo, unless the facilities are required by Government and monitored by the relevant B/Ds, the requirements for G/IC facilities (and the PTT) would not be imposed in the lease conditions. • As the R-to-C deferred the management and maintenance responsibilities of the access road to later stage, your attention is particularly drawn to para. 4(v) of my previous memo. However, the Applicant has not advised, in particular, comments of TD and HyD in respect of the nearby village access arrangement. Without in-principle agreement from B/Ds, the proposed access road may not be able to realise and re-zoning becomes premature. • The Applicant responded in item (vii) on page 12 that the "residual" part of Lot 796 in D.D. 77 (which would be "isolated" from the major part of the private development by the proposed access road) would remain under private land ownership and could serve as a works area / amenity area for future access road. Unless TD and HyD agree to the arrangement, this R-to-C did not address to the issue raised in para. 4(vii) of my previous memo. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The submission was circulated to TD and HyD and comments to the access road have not been received. The Applicant would address such comments when available.</p> <p>Noted. The submission was circulated to TD and HyD and relevant comments have not been received. The Applicant would address such comments when available.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the "Replacement Pages of Updated Supporting Planning Statement", the amendments are related to design details of the access road and visual mitigation measures which are outside the purview of this office. For the statement under para. 4.5.1, i.e. "Compensatory planting will also be cultivated at appropriate locations", the appropriate locations should refer to the private lots of the proposed composite development. 	Noted.
6.	Leisure and Cultural Services Department, North District Leisure Services Office, dated 16 January 2024	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the project consultant has addressed our previous comments, we have no specific comment at this stage 	Noted.
7.	Leisure and Cultural Services Department, New Territories North Tree Team, dated 16 January 2024	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCSD reserves the right to provide further comments until the coming Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal is provided LCSD would not take up the future maintenance of vegetation until all concerns are fully addressed 	Noted. Noted.
8.	Planning Department, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Landscape Unit dated 5 January 2024	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant is advised to revise/adjust the current design layout to maximize the planting areas for more tree plantings within the Site. 	<p>The current design layout has been maximised to fulfil the quantity requirement for 1:1 tree compensation. The area of greenery coverage has also been maximized with in consideration of the building layout, ground level and podium level. For example, sufficient tree planting has been incorporated along the site boundary to create a lush and verdant environment. Greenery has also been incorporated into various outdoor amenity areas, such as pavilion, sports ground, landscape terrace, water play area, courtyard, and tree walk located on ground and podium levels.</p> <p>To further enhance the quality of the landscape proposal, ornamental tree and shrubs planting have been proposed to provide shade and create an attractive visual appeal to the site, while softening the built form and maximising</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This office maintains previous view of “the proposed rezoning for high density mixed use development will bring significant change to the existing rural landscape character of “AGR” zone” from the landscape planning perspective. 	<p>the greenery. Selective planting of species have been proposed to serve a number of landscape features, such as screening undesirable views, providing pedestrian with shades, and augmenting the aesthetics.</p> <p>As explained in FI submission dated 14 December 2023, the proposed amendment is considered compatible with the changing planning circumstances and is compatible with the existing surrounding environment.</p> <p>Although the Application Site is partly within “AGR” and “OS” zones, the site is largely paved and currently used as open storage. Minor portion of vegetation is observed in area zoned “AGR” but intermixed with temporary structures. Also, the Application Site is surrounded by other brownfield operations.</p> <p>Apart from the existing condition, the proposed amendment also complements the changing planning circumstances. As promulgated in multiple Government studies and policy documents, including the NTN Study in 2017, Northern Metropolis Development Strategy (NMDS) in 2021 and Northern Metropolis Action Agenda as announced in Chief Executive’s Policy Address 2023, the positioning and planning intention of the NTN New Town are emphasized to be developed into a base for emerging industries to complement I&T industry in San Tin Technopole and collaborate with the development of Luohu District in Shenzhen. Ping Che area, with its strategic location at the centre of the NTN New Town, is anticipated to be the main driver for supporting the anticipated growth of NTN New Town.</p> <p>With clear direction and agenda set by the Government, the Application Site and its vicinity are intended and suitable to become the centre of the future NTN New Town featuring a variety of land uses and maximum development intensity. The proposed mixed use development at the Application Site, embedded with multiple landscape enhancement measures in the Indicative Scheme, such as landscaping on podium and on ground level and vibrant green elements at the building façade, is considered fully compatible with and will serve as a first-mover in response to the changing planning</p>
--	--	--

		circumstances of the surrounding Ping Che area while contribute to the enhancement of the overall built environmental quality.
9.	Planning Department, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 16 January 2024	
	<p>Having reviewed the FI1, please note that our previous comments in paras. 1 to 4 via email dated 5.12.2023 are still valid. Some of our previous specific comments dated 5.12.2023 are not fully addressed (which are recapped below) and there are some further comments/observations on the updated SPS, VIA and AVA.</p> <p>1. As for the VIA and AVA submissions, it is advised that the applicant should compare the existing provisions (OZP compliant scheme) with the full proposal to provide a picture of how the complete proposed development would impact the existing surrounding environment, while the ‘planned Ping Che/Ta Kwu Ling NDA’, which is not incorporated into the OZP, could be taken as additional information.</p> <p>Appendix A – Replacement Pages of Updated SPS</p> <p>2. For the sake of clarity, please provide a figure indicating all visual and air ventilation mitigation measures (e.g. building separations, setbacks etc.) with dimensions.</p> <p>3. Paras. 4.4.11 and 4.4.12 - According to Sections 5.2 and 5.3 of the AVA, building setback should be added to these two paragraphs.</p> <p>4. Para. 9.8.8 in Figure 5.3b – According to paras. 4.4.10 to 4.4.12, building separation is a design measure to mitigate both visual and air ventilation impacts.</p> <p>Appendix C – Replacement Pages of Updated VIA</p> <p>5. The applicant should compare the existing provisions (OZP Compliant Scheme) to provide a picture of how the proposed</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to the responses in the following.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to the information revised in Para. 4.4.10 to 4.4.13 of Annex D – Replacement Pages of Revised Supporting Planning Statement. Please also refer to Annex E for a supplementary drawing showing the visual and air ventilation mitigation measures as appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. Information have been revised in Para. 4.4.10 to 4.4.13 and 6.8.2 of Annex D.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to the discussion regarding building separation as a both visual and wind enhancement feature in Para. 4.4.10 to 4.4.13 and 6.8.2 of Annex D.</p> <p>Noted. The assessment has been revised with to compare the OZP Compliant Scheme with OZP Compliant Scheme with Indicative</p>

<p>development would impact the existing surrounding environment. Please critically review and revise the VIA (including photomontages and analysis, etc.) accordingly to include a proper OZP Compliant Scheme (as the Baseline Scheme) for comparison with the Proposed Scheme on the impact on the existing surrounding environment (and other planned/committed developments, if any, to be confirmed with DPO). In this connection, we could only provide general comments on the VIA at this juncture and shall provide further comments (especially to the evaluation) upon receipt of the revised VIA.</p>	<p>Scheme to demonstrate the visual impact of the Indicative Scheme to the existing OZP compliant condition. In order to portray a more realistic and accurate scenario in the future, the assessments have also included the evaluation with consideration of Ta Kwu Ling Potential Development Area (TKLPDA) of the NTN Development.</p> <p>Please refer to revised photomontages (Figures 3 – 7), Para. 1.1.4, 1.1.5, Sections 3.2, 4.2, 5 and 6 of Annex F – Revised Visual Impact Assessment for the revised assessment methodology and the corresponding assessment.</p>
<p>6. There are observations of the photomontages:</p> <p>(a) Figure 3 (VP1) – It seems that the proposed development should be located eastward (i.e. closer to the middle of the view) and appear to be smaller in scale, in which the roof of T1, T3 and T5 would be visible from this VP.</p> <p>(b) Figure 4 (VP2) – It seems that the proposed development should appear to be smaller in scale, in which the upper portion of T5/T6, T3/T4 and T2 would be visible from this VP.</p> <p>(c) Figure 5 (VP3) – It seems that the proposed development should be located northeastward (in which T1 is located at the middle of the view).</p> <p>(d) Figure 7 (VP5) – It seems that the proposed development should be located northwestward.</p>	<p>Noted. Figure 3 (VP1) has been revised in Annex F.</p> <p>Noted. Figure 4 (VP2) has been revised in Annex F.</p> <p>Noted. Figure 5 (VP3) has been revised in Annex F.</p> <p>Noted. Figure 7 (VP5) has been revised in Annex F.</p>
<p>7. The consultant is reminded to revise the relevant section(s) in the SPS accordingly.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to the revised discussion in Para. 4.4.10 and 6.8.2 of Annex D.</p>
<p>Appendix E – Replacement pages of AVA-EE</p>	
<p>8. The applicant should compare the existing provisions (OZP Compliant Scheme) to provide a picture of how the proposed development would impact the existing surrounding environment. Please critically review and revise the AVA (including figures and analysis, etc.) accordingly to include a proper OZP Compliant Scheme</p>	<p>Noted. The assessment has been revised with to compare the OZP Compliant Scheme with Indicative Scheme to demonstrate the air ventilation impact of the Indicative Scheme to the existing OZP compliant condition. In order to portray a more realistic and accurate scenario in the future, the assessments have also included the</p>

<p>(as the Baseline Scheme) for comparison with the Proposed Scheme on the impact on the existing surrounding environment (and planned/committed developments, if any, to be confirmed with DPO). In this connection, we could only provide general comments on the AVA at this juncture and shall provide further comments (especially to the evaluation) upon receipt of the revised AVA.</p> <p>9 . Table 3-1 – According to para. 3.1.8, the wind data from the HKO Ta Kwu Ling Weather Station is also adopted in this AVA-EE. However, its annual N wind and summer SSW wind are not included in the summary of Table 3-1 nor the analysis in this AVA-EE, which instead covers the annual and summer winds of the RAMS wind data.</p> <p>10 . Para. 4.2.6 and Figure 4-3 – The Ping Che New Village is located to the north of the Site instead of the downwind area of ESE and SE.</p> <p>11 . Para. 4.2.7 – It is anticipated that Ping Che Road would facilitate the SE/SSE winds instead of E/ESE winds.</p> <p>12 . Figure 4-3 – The ENE is one of annual (i.e. not summer) prevailing winds while the SSE is one of the summer (i.e. not annual) prevailing winds.</p> <p>13 . Para. 5.3.2 and Figure 5-5 – Please indicate the degree of change in direction of the air path.</p> <p>14 . Para 5.3.4 and Figure 5-6 – Please review and indicate the widths of the building separations (measuring from that perpendicular to the prevailing wind directions). According to the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, the minimum width of the air corridor along its path between buildings shall not be less than 15m.</p>	<p>evaluation with consideration of TKLPDA of the NTN Development.</p> <p>Please refer to Sections 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, Figures 4-5, 4-6, 5-1 and 5-2 – 5.5 of Annex G – Revised Air Ventilation Assessment – Expert Evaluation (AVA-EE) for the revised assessment methodology and the corresponding assessment.</p> <p>Noted. The dominant wind flow has been revised. The NNE, ENE, E, ESE, SE, SSE and S wind have been evaluated. Please refer to Section 3 and Tables 3-1 and 3-2 of Annex G. Section 4.2 of Annex G has also been revised accordingly with the updated wind data.</p> <p>Noted. Para. 4.2.7 has been revised in Annex G.</p> <p>Noted. Para. 4.2.8 has been revised in Annex G.</p> <p>Noted. Figure 4-4 has been revised in Annex G.</p> <p>Noted. The wind path of NNE wind will experience a change in direction when passing through the Public Transport Terminus (PTT) from NNE to N direction. The wind flow will then merge with the NNE wind again after the diversion. There will be no change in direction in other wind flow. Please refer to the updated wind path as shown in Figure 5.2b of Annex G.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to the building separation shown in Figure 6-5 and corresponding discussion in Para. 6.1.5 and 6.1.6 of Annex G. The building separations ranged from 18m to 30m.</p>
--	--

<p>15 .Paras. 5.3.6, 5.3.7 and Figure 5-7 – The text and figure are not consistent. Besides, the consultant claims that the proposed terraced podium would facilitate the SE and ESE winds, but it seems that these winds would be blocked by Tower 2. Figure 5-7 is also misleading as the 3 steps of terrace are ascending in NNE/SSW direction and the wind from the SSW direction would be blocked by T3/T4.</p>	<p>Noted. The corresponding sections and figures have been removed in the revised AVA-EE. Please refer to Annex G for the revised assessment.</p>
<p>16 .Figure 5.9 – Please clarify if any of the prevailing winds could skim over the low-rise clubhouse (5m in BH) and reach the downwind area after reattachment.</p>	<p>Noted. The evaluations of wind flow have discussed in Sections 5.3 – 5.6 and Figures 5-3 – 5-6 of Annex G. The NNE, ESE, SE, SSE and S wind will skim over the clubhouse.</p>
<p>17 .Para. 5.3.14 and Figure 5-11 – Please indicate the widths of the setbacks measured from the site boundary to building structure. Please review if the setbacks from the southern/southeastern/southwestern and northern boundary could facilitate E, ESE, ENE, SE and SSE winds.</p>	<p>Noted. The building setback from northeast, northern and southern sides of the Application Site have been supplemented and evaluated in Para. 6.1.10 and 6.1.11 of Annex G. It could facilitate the E, ESE, ENE, SE and SSE wind.</p>
<p>18 .Section 6.1 and Figure 6-2 Annual Prevailing Winds – E and ESE Wind (Proposed Scheme) – The ESE wind flows in Figure 6-2 are not consistent with those in Figure 6-6. Please rectify.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to the evaluations of E wind supplemented in Section 5.4 and ESE wind supplemented in Section 5.5 of Annex G.</p>
<p>19 .Section 6.2 & Figure 6-4 Annual Prevailing Wind - ENE Wind (Proposed Scheme) – It is noted that wind flows are drawn to be passing through the buildings separations of which the widths may be less than 15m and involve change of direction. Please specify the widths of the relevant setbacks/building separation (measuring from that perpendicular to the prevailing wind directions) and indicate the degree of change in direction of the air path. According to the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, the minimum width of the air corridor along its path between buildings shall not be less than 15m.</p>	<p>Noted. Evaluations of ENE wind has been supplemented in Section 5.4; the widths of the relevant building separation have been supplemented Figure 6-5 and corresponding discussion in Para. 6.1.5 and 6.1.6; and discussions on relevant building setbacks have been supplemented in Para. 6.1.10 and 6.1.11 of Annex G.</p>
<p>20 .Section 6.3 and Figure 6-6 (Summer Prevailing Wind – E, ESE, SE and SSE) – For the sake of clarity, the consultant should discuss E/ESE winds and SE/SSE winds separately. As E/ESE winds are also annual prevailing winds, the consultant may</p>	<p>Noted. Evaluation of E wind has been supplemented in Section 5.4; ESE/SE wind has been evaluated in Section 5.5; and SSE wind has been evaluated in Section 5.6 of Annex G.</p>

	<p>consider to refer to both annual and summer prevailing winds in Section 6.1.</p> <p>21 .The consultant is reminded to revise the relevant section(s) in the SPS accordingly.</p> <p>22 .Comments from the Landscape Unit, if any, will be provided under separate cover.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to the revised discussion in Para. 4.4.11 – 4.4.13 and 6.8.2 of Annex G.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
10.	Social Welfare Department, dated 10 January 2024	
	<p>According to the Further Information (FI)1 : -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed CCC will be privately owned and to be operated by the owner of the Proposed Development. • The proposed DE will be privately owned and to be operated by the owner of the Proposed Development • From licensing perspective, please take note that all child care centres, irrespective of its funding sources, must be registered in compliance with the requirements under the Child Care Services Ordinance (Chapter 243), the Child Care Services Regulations (Chapter 243A) and the latest version of the Operation Manual for Pre-primary Institutions. Moreover, the prospective operator should ensure that there is no objection from the Town Planning Board and the premises proposed for use should also be in compliance with the fire safety, structural safety, as well as all other relevant statutory requirements on a child care centre. • Child care centres (including residential child care centres and special child care centres) are registered and monitored by Child Care Centres Advisory Inspectorate of the SWD. On the other hand, child care centres providing kindergarten education to children aged 3-6 in the same premises are registered and monitored by the Joint Office for Kindergartens and Child Care Centres of the Education Bureau (EDB). Regarding application procedures for registration of kindergarten-cum-child care centres, 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>detailed information can be found at EDB Website via the following hyperlink:</p> <p>https://www.edb.gov.hk/en/edu-system/preprimary-kindergarten/application-for-registration-of-child-care-centre-in-kindergarten/index.html</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from above, we have no further comment from welfare point of view 	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>Transport Department, NT Regional Office, Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division, North Section, dated 3 January 2024</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given that the scale of this proposed development is large, the assessment area presented in the TIA is considered not sufficient. The applicant shall justify the area of influence (AOI) conducted in the study or revised AOI appropriately. • The applicant should further advise and substantiate the traffic generation from and attraction to the site and the traffic impact to the nearby road links and junctions, also the reasons on mean trip rates from TPDM were adopted; • The applicant shall illustrate on layout plans and justify the adequacy of the parking spaces and loading/unloading spaces so provided by relating to the number of vehicles visiting the subject site; • The applicant should advise the width of the vehicular access leading to the site; • The applicant shall demonstrate the satisfactory maneuvering of the vehicles entering and exiting the subject site, maneuvering within the subject site and into/out of the parking and loading/unloading spaces, preferably using the swept path analysis; 	<p>Noted. The AOI has been reviewed and updated accordingly. Please refer to Chapter 3 and Figure 3.1 of the Annex H – Revised Traffic Impact Assessment for details.</p> <p>Please note that the traffic generation from and attraction to the site and the traffic impact to the nearby road links and junctions have been reviewed and updated. In view of the remoteness of the area, upper limit trip rates from TPDM are adopted.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 4 and 6 of Annex H for details.</p> <p>Noted. Please note that internal transport facilities will be provided to meet the high-end requirement of HKPSG. Please refer to Appendix C of Annex H for the car park layout plan.</p> <p>Please be advised that the width of the vehicular accesses would be 7.5m. Please refer to Appendix C of the Annex H for the car park layout plan.</p> <p>Noted. Swept path analysis is conducted to demonstrate sufficient spaces are provided for the maneuvering of vehicles entering and exiting the subject site, maneuvering within the subject site and into/out of the parking and loading/unloading spaces.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Especially on J4, are there any traffic improvement measures proposed by the applicant? 	<p>Please refer to Section 5.3 and Appendix C of Annex H for the details of swept paths analysis.</p> <p>Please note that there are improvement measures at J4 and details have been discussed in Section 4.6 of Annex H.</p>
12.	<p>Transport Department, NT Regional Office, Transport Operations (NT) Division, Sai Kung & North Section, dated 3 January 2024</p>	
	<p>The applicant needs to submit the Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment for their application for the proposed development with significant upsurge of public transport services demand, especially the over 2,200 flats residential development and the commercial tower with retail, office, hotel and G/IC facilities. They are required to take into account of the public transport service demand in the nearby developments including new Ping Che Transitional Housing with population intake of about 1000 in Q1 2024 in their transport impact assessment.</p>	<p>Taking into consideration the future planning at Ping Che area and the relatively large area of the Application Site, a public transport terminus (PTT) is proposed at the northern part of the Application Site along Ping Che Road. The PTT will comprise of a double width bus bay and a GMB bay. The ingress point is located at the upgraded access road and the egress point is located at Ping Che Road to provide better circulations within the PTT. Please refer to the PPT layout in Annex H for details.</p> <p>The proposed development under this planning application will be completed in 2032. Upon reaching this completion year, the operational status of the Ping Che Transitional Housing, with its estimated date of completion in Q2 2024 and an operation period of 5 years, remains a matter of uncertainty to the proposed development.</p>
13.	<p>Water Supplies Department, New Works Branch, Construction Division, System Planning Section, dated 2 April 2024</p>	
	<p>Comments on the revised WSIA</p> <p>Annex D - WSIA</p> <p>(a) Table 3.1</p> <p>The fresh water unit demand of 0.104m³/h/d is not correct. Please refer to WSD’s DI 1309 and use an appropriate fresh water unit demand. i.e. for R2 Residential development, the ceiling value of the fresh water unit demand is 0.3m³/h/d. Please also add the daily demand for service</p>	<p>Noted. Table 3.1 has been revised. The fresh water unit demand of domestic plus service trade has been revised to 0.34m³/h/d.</p> <p>The water demand calculation and hydraulic calculation in Section 4, Section 5, Section 6, Appendix B and Appendix C have also revised.</p>

<p>trade of 0.04m³/h/d to your domestic type development.</p> <p>(b) Table 3.1 and Appendix C</p> <p>For domestic type development, please use flushing water demand of 0.104m³/h/d instead of 0.07m³/h/d.</p> <p>(c) Figure 5.1 and Appendix C</p> <p>The existing DN900 at Ping Che Road is a raw water main which is not suitable of use. Please consider connecting to the existing DN300 fresh water main at Ping Che Road.</p> <p>(d) Figure 5.1</p> <p>Only one supply main connecting to your site for both fresh water use and for flushing is not acceptable. Please provide fresh water main and flushing water main connecting to the proposed site.</p>	<p>Please refer to Annex I – Revised Water Supply Impact Assessment for details.</p> <p>Noted. Table 3.1 has been revised. The flushing water demand of domestic has been revised to 0.104m³/h/d.</p> <p>The water demand calculation and hydraulic calculation in Section 4, Section 5, Section 6, Appendix B and Appendix C have also revised.</p> <p>Please refer to Annex I for details.</p> <p>Noted, Section 2.3.2, Section 5.1.1 to 5.1.3, Figure 5.1 and Appendix C of Annex I have been revised. The proposed water supply are connected to DN300 fresh water main.</p> <p>Noted, Section 5.1.2, 5.1.3 and Figure 5.1 of Annex I have been revised. A DN200 fresh water supply and a DN100 flush water supply is proposed, branch of from the existing DN300 fresh water main.</p>
---	--

(Last Update: 13 April 2024)