

# Appendix A

## Responses-to-Comments Table

Application for Amendment of Plan Under Section 12A of the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131) to Rezone the Application Site from “Green Belt” and Area Shown as “Road” to “Residential (Group C)3” for Proposed Residential Development at Various Lots in D.D. 210 and Adjoining Government Land, Pak Wai, Sai Kung

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

**Comments from Related Departments**

**Page No.**

<b>COMMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS</b> .....	2
1. Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Assessment Division, Assessment and Noise Group, Noise Assessment & Exposure Information(2), dated 10 October 2025 .....	2
2. Environmental Protection Department, Water Quality Management Division, Water Quality Management Group, Water Quality Impact Assessment and Marine Refuse Management, dated 10 October 2025 .....	3
3. Environmental Protection Department, Water Quality Management Division, Water Quality Management Group, Specific Waste Management and Land Contamination Assessment, dated 10 October 2025 .....	7
4. Planning Department, District Planning Branch, New Territories District Planning Division, Sai Kung & Islands District Planning Office, dated 10 October 2025 .....	8
5. Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Landscape Unit, dated 10 October 2025 .....	9
6. Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 10 October 2025 .....	12

**COMMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS**

No.	Comments	Responses
1.	<p><b>Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Assessment Division, Assessment and Noise Group, Noise Assessment &amp; Exposure Information(2), dated 10 October 2025</b></p> <p><i>Comments on Environmental Assessment</i></p> <p><u>Noise:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is noted that the site layout and positions of NSRs are completely different from the pre-application submission (e.g. there are two residential blocks previously but now there are four blocks). As such, please submit noise models for our checking of road traffic noise results.</li> <li>2. S.4.6.2: Please indicate the endorsement of the methodology of traffic projection for Year 2046 from TD has been included in Appendix 4-2.</li> <li>3. S.4.5.6: Please confirm if there would be any chillers or cooling towers associated with air-conditioning system of the clubhouse.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted. The model files and calculation spreadsheets have been submitted to EPD fore review on 31 October 2025.</p> <p>Noted. Section 4.6.2 has been revised to indicate the endorsement from TD regarding the traffic forecast. Please refer to the revised Section 4.6.2 of the Revised Environmental Assessment (EA) (<b>Appendix B</b> of this Further Information refers).</p> <p>Chiller and ventilation fan shall be provided for the clubhouse. Please refer to the revised Section 4.5.6 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>However, since the project is still in early stage with no detailed information of the fixed plants, maximum allowable sound power levels for nearby representative receivers were calculated to facilitate future design. Please refer to Appendix 4-1 &amp; Figure 4-1.</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>4. Please clarify if the "fence wall" proposed at the southern site boundary is a solid wall. This very tall wall (8.5m above ground) should be considered as noise mitigation measures to mitigate road traffic noise from Hiram's Highway rather than as a given in the base case scenario.</p> <p>5. Table 4-1: Please amend the heading of “Horizontal Distance from Building Facades” as “Horizontal Distance from Nearest Site Boundary to NSRs”</p> <p>6. App.4-2: Please include road speed of the road links in the tables</p>	<p>Sections 4.6.3, 4.6.4, 4.6.7, Figures 4-2a, 4-3 have been revised to clarify the adoption of solid fence wall.</p> <p>The following scenarios have been updated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Base Scenario with solid fence wall (5m above ground)</li> <li>• Mitigated Scenario with taller solid fence wall (8.5m above ground)</li> </ul> <p>The fence wall proposed in Base Scenario is 3m taller than the nearby pedestrian walkway as the ground level of the nearby pedestrian walkway is higher. Therefore, the provision of fence wall in Base Scenario is for privacy and safety reason.</p> <p>On the other hand, the taller fence wall is proposed in Mitigated Scenario to protect the NSR from adverse traffic noise.</p> <p>Sections 4.6.3 to 4.6.8, 4.7.3, Tables 4-6, 4-7, Figures 4-2a, 4-3, Appendices 4-3, 4-4 have been revised accordingly under the Revised EA.</p> <p>Noted. The heading of Table 4-4 has been revised as “Horizontal Distance from Nearest Site Boundary to NSRs”. Please refer to Table 4-4 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Appendix 4-2 under the Revised EA has been revised to include the road speed of the road link.</p>
2.	<p><b>Environmental Protection Department, Water Quality Management Division, Water Quality Management Group, Water Quality Impact Assessment and Marine Refuse Management, dated 10 October 2025</b></p> <p>7. S5.1.2 – The applicant should consult their Authorized Persons at detailed design stage to make sure they will be able to meet the WPCO licence discharge conditions.</p> <p>8. S5.3.5, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence – Suggest to revise the following sentence: <b><u>The treated effluent Sewage</u></b> generated from the Proposed Development will be discharged to the existing watercourse after treated by the on-site sewage treatment plant, that will be</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to Section 5.3.5 of the Revised Environmental Assessment (EA) (<b>Appendix B</b> of this Further Information refers).</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>addressed in separated reports (Sewerage Impact Assessment).</p> <p>9. S5.4.1 – As the site is at immediate adjacency to a stream, pls. pay special attention to the construction of perimeter channels to intercept surface runoff in construction phase as stipulated in section 2 of ProPECC PN 2/24. Such channels should be built firmly anchoring to the ground such that it can capture surface runoff efficiently without leaking outside the works site.</p> <p>10. S5.4.3 –</p> <p>a. Pls. revise as following: Adequate portable chemical toilets will be provided to cater for the sewage generated from the construction workforce. Any effluent discharge from the construction site should comply with the standards stipulated in the TM-DSS <b><u>under WPCO</u></b>.</p> <p>b. Pls. clarify if the sewage of the portable toilets will be collected for disposal instead of discharging. If so, pls. revise the last sentence and supplement disposal arrangement.</p> <p>11. S5.5.2, last sentence &amp; S8.1.12, last sentence – Pls. consider revising as following: All <b><u>discharges water should be discharged through the public drainage and sewerage system that</u></b> will be addressed in separated reports (Drainage Impact Assessment and Sewerage Impact Assessment).</p> <p><u>Air quality</u></p> <p>12. Section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 – Please remove the line break between these two sections.</p> <p>13. Table 3-2 –</p> <p>a. Please align numbering of Notes with other tables across the chapter for consistency.</p>	<p>Noted. Recommended mitigation measures in ProPECC PN2/24 will be strictly followed to prevent construction surface runoff from getting into the nearby stream and leaking outside the works site.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to Section 5.4.3 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>The sewage from chemical toilet shall be handled by licensed contractor. Last sentence of Section 5.4.3 has been revised as “A licensed contractor shall be employed to collect, dispose of, and provide maintenance for the chemical toilets.”. Please refer to Section 5.4.3 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to Section 5.5.2 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>The line break between Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 has been removed. Please refer to Section 2.1.1 of the Revised EA (<b>Appendix B</b> of this Further Information refers).</p> <p>The numbering of Notes has been revised as Arabic Numerals. Table 3-2 to Table 3-5 of</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>b. Please add “Number of exceedances allowed per calendar year” in the last column header.</p> <p>14. Section 3.2.5 – Please revise to “0.001%” in the last line.</p> <p>15. Table 3-3 – Please check if annual FSP and 8-hour (10th max) ozone in 2023 exceeded AQO.</p> <p>16. Table 3-3 to 3-5, Note [ii] –</p> <p>a. Please state the version of the SAMP.</p> <p>b. Please provide a figure showing 500m assessment area, with overlay of PATH grid.</p> <p>17. Section 3.3.4 to Table 3-5 – Please include all PATH grids of 500m assessment area.</p> <p>18. Table 3-5 – Please check the label for the last column which should be L3 instead of L1.</p> <p>19. Table 3-6 and Figure 3-1 –</p> <p>a. Please review if there is any representative ASRs between ASR-05 and the project site.</p>	<p>the Revised EA have been updated accordingly.</p> <p>Noted. Last column header has been revised as “Number of exceedances allowed per calendar year”. Please refer to Table 3-2 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Noted. Section 3.2.5 has been revised as “...0.001%.”. Please refer to Section 3.2.5 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Annual FSP and 8-hour (10th max) ozone in Year 2023 are considered as exceedance.</p> <p>Table 3-3 has been updated to Year 2020 to 2024. Section 3.3.2 have been updated accordingly. Please refer to Table 3-3 and Section 3.3.2 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Note [2] of Tables 3-3 to 3-5 has been updated in the Revised EA to state the version of SAMP (v2.1).</p> <p>Figure 3-1 has been supplemented to indicate the PATH grid and 500m assessment area. Please refer to Figure 3-1 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Table 3-4 has been updated to include the background air quality of all PATH grid within 500m assessment area at L1.</p> <p>Please refer to the revised Sections 3.3.4 to 3.3.7 and Table 3-4 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>The label in last column of Table 3-5 has been revised as “L3 (35-55m)”. Please refer to Table 3-5 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Only temporary structures are identified between ASR-05 and Application Site. No air sensitive use is anticipated in the temporary structures and therefore, no representative ASR is being assigned.</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>b. Please identify representative ASRs at the east of Hing Keng Shek Road and north of Hiram’s Highway.</p> <p>20. Figure 3-2 – Please indicate PASR-01 to PASR-06 in the figure.</p> <p>21. Section 3.5 –</p> <p>a. Please provide more information including but not limited to: the size of the demolition, site formation or/and excavation area, amount of excavated materials to be handled, number of dump trucks and mechanical equipment to be used per time over the work site.</p> <p>b. Please supplement if there are any concurrent projects within 500m assessment area. If affirmative, please discuss cumulative constructional air quality impact.</p> <p>22. Section 3.6.1 – Please provide the separation distance between the STP and the nearest ASR of the proposed development. Please estimate the scale of the STP.</p> <p>23. Section 3.6.2 – Please indicate the location of carpark and carpark exhaust in a figure.</p> <p>24. Section 3.6.4 – While it is noted that the road type of Hing Keng Shek Road would be classified as rural road (RR), considering the traffic flow of the Hing King Shek Road and the associated potential road traffic</p>	<p>Additional representative ASRs (ASR-06, ASR-07) at the area at the Hing Keng Shek Road and north of Hiram’s Highway are identified. Table 3-6 and Figure 3-2 of the Revised EA have been updated accordingly.</p> <p>Figure 3-3 has been updated to include the ID of the planned ASR. Please refer to Figure 3-3 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Section 3.5.2 and Table 3-8 have been supplemented and revised in the Revised EA to discuss the size of the construction works, maximum number of dump truck per day and the number of concurrent PME.</p> <p>Sections 3.5.3 to 3.5.6 and Table 3-9 have been supplemented to include the planned development and discuss the cumulative construction air quality impact. Please refer to the Sections 3.5.3 to 3.5.6 and Table 3-9 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Section 3.6.1 and Figure 3-3 have been revised to include the separation distance and scale and indicate the separation distance respectively. Please refer to the revised Section 3.6.1 and Figure 3-3 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>The location of carpark is supplemented in Appendix 2-1 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Please note the proposed development is still in early stage, the location of the carpark exhaust will be subject to detailed design stage. However, the carpark exhaust will be designed in accordance with ProPEDD PN2/96 and in a way that will not cause nuisance to occupants in the building or of neighbouring buildings, as stated in Section 3.6.2.</p> <p>Buffer distance of 10m for “District Distributor” has been adopted for the Hing Keng Shek Road.</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>impact air quality impact of RR could be comparable to district distributor (DD)/local distributor (LD), please review and confirm whether at least 10m buffer distance from the Hing Keng Shek Road to the nearest ASR/ air sensitive uses within the proposed development could be allowed as conservative approach. Otherwise, further justification on adopting the buffer distance of less than 10m shall be further supplemented to demonstrate the proposed development would not be subjected to potential adverse air quality impact.</p> <p>25. Section 3.6.6 – Please provide the dates of the site survey. Please state clearly that there is no chimney emission from the proposed development. Please be reminded that it should be the responsibility of the applicant and their consultant to ensure the validity of the chimney data by their own site surveys. Should the information of industrial chimneys be subsequently found to be incorrect, the assessment result as presented in the planning application would be invalidated.</p> <p>26. Please highlight all the changes/amendments in the next submission for review.</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 3.6.4 and Figure 3-5 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Section 3.6.6 has been updated in the Revised EA to clearly state that no chimney will be proposed in the proposed development.</p> <p>The date of site survey is also supplemented in Section 3.6.6.</p> <p>Noted. All changes are highlighted in yellow for ease of review and checking.</p>
3.	<p><b>Environmental Protection Department, Water Quality Management Division, Water Quality Management Group, Specific Waste Management and Land Contamination Assessment, dated 10 October 2025</b></p> <p><u>Land Contamination</u></p> <p>27. Please supplement the size of the area used for vehicle repairing activities.</p> <p>28. Please describe any use of concerned chemicals and their storage conditions observed during site visit.</p> <p>29. Please confirm whether there are any records of spillage/accidents/CWP</p>	<p>The total area of the two suspected vehicle repairing sites is approximately 1,610m<sup>2</sup>. Section 7.2.1 of the Revised EA has been supplemented accordingly.</p> <p>Cleaning solvent and lubrication oil are used but they are stored on well-paved storage on-site.</p> <p>EPD has confirmed no chemical waste producer or spillage/leakage incidents was</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>registrations from relevant government departments.</p> <p>30. Please provide the site walkover checklist recorded during the site visit.</p> <p>31. 7.3.1 &amp; 7.4.1 It is stated that the need for further studies shall be determined at a later stage. Please clarify whether this implies that the site is still in operation and that a further site re-appraisal will be conducted prior to the commencement of construction works.</p>	<p>recorded at the site, while response from FSD remains pending.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 7.3.1, Table 7-1 and Appendix 7-2 of the Revised EA.</p> <p>Please refer to Appendix 7-3 of the Revised EA for the site walkover checklist.</p> <p>The ends of Section 7.4.1 and 7.5.1 are supplemented with “However, as the site remains operational, a further site re-appraisal will be conducted prior to the commencement of construction works.” Please refer to Section 7.4.1 and 7.5.1 of the Revised EA.</p>
4.	<p><b>Planning Department, District Planning Branch, New Territories District Planning Division, Sai Kung &amp; Islands District Planning Office, dated 10 October 2025</b></p> <p>1. Regarding the Landscape Master Plan submitted by the applicants, please further supplement the rationale/objective of the proposed landscape design.</p> <p>2. A 2m-wide footpath is proposed along the eastern boundary for public use, please clarify the construction, future management and maintenance responsibilities.</p> <p>3. Also, please advise the maintenance and management responsibilities of the existing footbridge outside the application site connecting Hiram’s Highway and the proposed 2m-wide footpath.</p> <p>4. The section of Hing Keng Shek Road is proposed to be widened to 6.0m, 2-lane carriageway and to be connected to a proposed short vehicular bridge which are both outside the application site. Please clarify the construction, future management and maintenance responsibilities for both the widened road and the vehicular bridge.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to the Revised Landscape Master Plan (LMP) with Tree Survey Report (<b>Appendix C</b> of this Further Information refers) for the elaboration of the rationale/objective of the proposed landscape design.</p> <p>The applicant would be willing to take up the construction, future management and maintenance of the proposed 2m-wide public footpath along the eastern boundary.</p> <p>For the footbridge outside the Site boundary, the project proponent will clarify the future management and maintenance responsibility with the Lands Department during the lease modification stage.</p> <p>The proposed improvement works are discussed in Section 5.1.1 of the Revised Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and the project proponent would be responsible for the construction of the improvement works.</p> <p>For the future management and maintenance responsibility, the project proponent will take up the road section within the Site boundary. For the road section outside the Site boundary, the project proponent will clarify the future management and</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>5. I refer to the para 2.3.2 and Figure 2.3 of the Consolidated SPS, please clarify if there is existing vehicle repairing workshop at the Site.</p>	<p>maintenance responsibility with the Lands Department during the lease modification stage.</p> <p>Noted. Please be clarified that there is no existing vehicle repairing workshop at the Application Site. Please refer to the Replacement Pages of the Revised Supporting Planning Statement (<b>Appendix D</b> refers) and Replacement Page of the Application Form (<b>Appendix E</b> refers).</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design &amp; Landscape Section, Landscape Unit, dated 10 October 2025</b></p> <p>1. With reference to page.11 of the s.12A application form, “no tree felling” and “no landscape impact” are stated. However, according to para. 4.5.2 of the Supporting Planning Statement, it is noted that “A total of 116 existing trees are proposed to be felled...” Please clarify. Moreover, the applicant is advised to carefully review and verify the accuracy and consistency of the information provided</p> <p>2. <u>Appendix B (Landscape Plan with Tree Survey Report)</u></p> <p>(a) <u>LMP-01 (Landscape Master Plan)</u> - The proposed pedestrian and vehicular entrance/exist should be indicated on the relevant drawing(s).</p> <p>(b) <u>SS-01 (Section A-A’)</u></p> <p>I. The setting out and demarcation line of the proposed landscape treatment for the sectional drawing should be provided.</p>	<p>Please note that while a total of 103 trees is proposed to be felled under the Revised Landscape Master Plan and Tree Survey (<b>Appendix C</b> refers), the tree compensation ratio of over 1:1 would be achieved with 103 compensation trees and 12 new trees, ensuring that no negative impacts on tree felling would be anticipated.</p> <p>In addition, various landscape design elements have been proposed for the Application Site, which is currently occupied by temporary structures and a commercial horticulture workshop. With the proposed landscape design as demonstrated in the revised LMP with Tree Survey Report, no negative landscape impacts would be anticipated.</p> <p>Noted. The proposed pedestrian and vehicular entrances/exits have been indicated on the LMP-01 of the Revised LMP with Tree Survey Report.</p> <p>Noted. Please be advised that the demarcation line of the landscape treatment for the sectional drawing SS-01 has been moved to the top of the section in the</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>II. It is noted that “...a 2m tall fence wall will be installed along other sections of the site boundary. The fence wall will be constructed mainly by perforated mesh with planting area underneath...” (para. 4.5.1 of Supporting Planning Statement refers). However, according to drawing no. SS-01, the proposed footpath is connected with the fence wall. Please ensure that adequate space is provided to allow for the healthy growth of the plant of the proposed feature fence wall.</p> <p>3. <u>Appendix I (Tree survey and treatment plan) of Appendix B</u></p> <p>(a) <u>TS-01 (Tree survey and treatment plan)</u></p> <p>I. Discrepancy in the Tree ID is observed between this drawing and tree survey schedule.</p> <p>II. It is observed that some existing trees (e.g. 2, 9, 55, 114, 115, 213, 215, 216, 217, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 228, 230, 232, etc.) are outside the application site which have no conflict with the proposed development. The applicant should provide justification for the proposed treatment of the trees listed above.</p> <p>III. It is observed that some existing trees (e.g. 103 and 104) are within the site but no conflict with the proposed development. Please review.</p> <p>4. <u>Appendix II (Tree survey schedule) of Appendix B</u></p> <p>(a) It appears that the DBH measurement in the tree survey schedule may have been rounded up and in 10mm interval. The applicant is reminded to and cross-check for accurately reflect the respective size of the surveyed trees as far as practicable.</p>	<p>Revised LMP with Tree Survey Report for your easy reference.</p> <p>Noted. The location of the fence wall has been moved to the planting area that separates the public footpath and the residential development. Please refer to Para. 4.5.1 of the Revised Supporting Planning Statement (<b>Appendix D</b> refers) and Para. 1.2 and Drawing SS-01 of the Revised LMP with Tree Survey Report (<b>Appendix C</b> refers).</p> <p>Noted. Tree ID between Plans and assessment schedule revised are updated and tallied in the Revised LMP with Tree Survey Report.</p> <p>Noted. The justification for the proposed treatment of the existing trees outside the application site that would be felled has been included in Appendix II (Tree Survey Schedule) of the Revised LMP with Tree Survey Report under the column “Additional Remarks”.</p> <p>Please be advised that the mentioned trees are very close to the proposed building footprints at the Application Site. Hence, they are proposed to be felled.</p> <p>Noted. The DBH has been revised in Appendix II (Tree Survey Schedule) of the Revised LMP with Tree Survey Report.</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>(b) The applicant is advised to provide a column to show the location (within/outside application site) of the existing trees for reference.</p> <p>(c) The applicant is advised to provide a column to provide the justification of the proposed tree treatment for the existing trees.</p> <p>(d) According to the column of “<i>Suitability for Transplanting</i>” under the tree survey schedule, all tree(s) have been rated “low” for suitability for transplanting. However, it is observed that some trees <i>species</i> (e.g. <i>Livistona</i>, <i>Roystonea</i> etc.) are suitable for transplant and in fair conditions and without any defect. The applicant shall critically review the rating of suitability for transplanting trees including but not limited to T20, T97 -T103 and T113.</p> <p>(e) According to the column of “<i>Department to provide expert advice to Lands</i>” under the tree survey schedule, all tree(s) have been stated “Lot owner” for provide expert advice. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Noted. The trees outside the Application Site have been indicated in the existing “Additional Remarks” column under Appendix II (Tree Survey Schedule) of the Revised LMP with Tree Survey Report.</p> <p>Noted. The justification of the proposed tree treatment for the existing trees is included in the existing Additional Remarks column under Appendix II (Tree Survey Schedule) of the Revised LMP with Tree Survey Report.</p> <p>Noted. The reasons of the rating have been supplemented in the “Remarks” column under “Suitability for transplanting” in Appendix II (Tree survey schedule) of the Revised LMP with Tree Survey Report.</p> <p>Noted. The “Department to provide expert advice to Lands” column in Appendix II (Tree survey schedule) of the Revised LMP with Tree Survey Report has been changed into “LandsD” for providing expert advice.</p>
	<p><u>Advisory Comment</u></p>	
	<p>5. The applicant is reminded that approval of the planning application under Town Planning Ordinance does not imply approval of tree preservation/removal scheme under lease. Thus, the applicant should seek comments and approval from the relevant authority on the tree works concerned and/or compensatory/replacement planting proposal, where appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>6. Please be reminded that the approval of the Planning Application does not imply approval of the site coverage of greenery requirements under BD’s PNAP APP-152 and/or under lease. The site coverage of greening calculation should be submitted separately to BD for approval.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
6.	<p><b>Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design &amp; Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 10 October 2025</b></p> <p><u>Visual Impact Assessment</u></p> <p>1. Para. 4.1: it is stated in this paragraph that <i>‘the Assessment Area is defined by approximately three times of overall maximum BH of the subject development’ and thus ‘a radius of 40 m from the Application Site boundary defines the Assessment Area, within which key public viewing points are selected.’</i> However, it is noted that none of the selected viewpoints fall within the Assessment Area shown in Figure 1. According to the TPB PG-NO. 41, Initial Assessment Area Boundary could be defined by three times of the height of proposed building, but it may not necessarily be the actual assessment area. The actual assessment area, i.e. the visual envelope, should be determined having regard to the size of the proposed development, the distance of the development and its potential visibility from the selected viewing points, and the actual site and surrounding topographical conditions. The visual envelope is expected to cover the fields of views from all sensitive viewers in direct sight of the proposed development. The applicant may consider revising the assessment area boundary.</p> <p>2. Para. 4.4 to 4.9: According to TPB PG No. 41, visual sensitivity should take into account factors including the activity of the viewers, distance of each VP from the Site, the duration over which the development remains visible, and the public perception of value attached to the views, etc. Discussions of some of these factors for some VPs are missing. It is also suggested that analysis on how the sensitivity of each VPs is so reached with reference to these factors should be beefed up.</p> <p>3. Section 5:</p>	<p>Please note that the location of the VP3 was previously misplaced and has been rectified in Figure 1 of the Revised Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) (<b>Appendix F</b> refers). It is located about 40m from the Application Site, falling within the Assessment Area. Hence, there would be one selected viewpoint within the Assessment Area.</p> <p>Please also be noted that the visual envelope has been taken into consideration, with five other VPs selected outside 40m from the Application Site boundary in all directions to assess the visual impacts of the indicative scheme at the Application Site.</p> <p>Noted. Para. 4.4 to 4.9 of the Revised VIA have been updated to include the analysis on the sensitivity of each VPs.</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>(a) While noting that the Site and the proposed development are not visible at VP2 and VP5, Consultant may wish to add a brief discussion on visual composition, visual obstruction, effects on public viewers, and effects on visual resources for these two VPs.</p> <p>(b) Besides, for these two VPs, according to TPB PG No. 41, if the visual effect is screened or filtered by other distracting visual elements within the Assessment Area, the visual impact may be described as ‘negligible’, instead of stating that ‘there will not be any impact’.</p> <p>(c) There is no concluding paragraph(s) on the assessment findings of the potential visual impact for all the VPs except VP1. The concluding paragraph(s) should briefly conclude the findings on the visual impact with reference to the discussion on visual composition, visual obstruction, effects on public viewers, and effects on visual resources for each VP.</p> <p>4. It is mentioned in various sections of the VIA that there is stepped building height design for mitigating the potential visual impact. However, it is noted that among the four residential buildings, three of them are in same building height of 4 storeys above a one-storey basement while one of them is in three storeys above a one-storey basement. In this regard, the applicant may wish to elaborate on how the stepped building height design be formulated and the effectiveness of such building height profile in mitigating the visual impact. Besides, planting of trees is also mentioned as a mitigation measure, but without specific details. The applicant may wish to supplement.</p>	<p>Noted. The discussions about VP2 and VP5 have been elaborated. Please refer to Para. 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 5.6.2 and 5.6.3 in the Revised VIA.</p> <p>Noted and revised accordingly. Please refer to Para. 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 5.6.2 and 5.6.3 in the Revised VIA.</p> <p>Noted. A concluding paragraph has been supplemented for all the VPs in the Revised VIA.</p> <p>Noted. The current building design would create visual variation and reduce the visual bulk of the proposed blocks, with proposed plantings along the site boundary that allows the development at the Application Site to blend in with the surrounding natural setting. Please refer to the discussions throughout the Revised VIA.</p>

(Last updated 30 October 2025)