

Attachment A

Response-to-Comments Table

Comments from Related Departments

Page No.

COMMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS	2
1. Architectural Services Department, Architectural Branch, Advisory & Statutory Compliance Division, dated 03 September 2026	2
2. Buildings Department, New Buildings Division 1, New Territories East (1) and Licensing Section, dated 03 September 2026	3
3. Civil Engineering and Development Department, Geotechnical Engineering Office, Mainland West Division, Mainland West 6 Section, dated 03 September 2026	5
4. Civil Engineering and Development Department, North Development Office, dated 03 September 2026	5
5. Development Bureau, Works Branch, Works Division 1, Commissioner for Heritage's Office, Antiquities and Monuments Office, Heritage Conservation Unit, Historical Buildings Sub-unit, dated 03 September 2026	5
6. Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland South Division, Mainland South 6(Sai Kung, Sha Tin and Ma On Shan), dated 03 September 2026	8
7. Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Assessment Division, Territory South Group, Ma On Shan, Shatin, Kwai Chung, dated 03 September 2026	9
8. Food and Environmental Hygiene Department, Administration & Development Branch, Planning & Development Section, dated 03 September 2026	12
9. Highways Department, dated 03 September 2026	15
10. Hong Kong Police Force, dated 03 September 2026	15
11. Home Affairs Department, dated 03 September 2026	15
12. Lands Department, Lands Administration Office, District Lands Office, Sha Tin, dated 03 September 2026	15
13. Social Welfare Department, Headquarters, Planning & Development Branch, Project Planning Section (Team 1), dated 03 September 2026	17
14. Transport Department, NT Regional Office, Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division, Shatin Section, dated 03 September 2026	17
15. Water Supplies Department, New Works Branch Construction Division, System Planning Section, dated 03 September 2026	20

COMMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS

No.	Comments	Responses
1.	Architectural Services Department, Architectural Branch, Advisory & Statutory Compliance Division, dated 03 September 2026 Based on the information provided, it is noted that there are no changes to the key development parameters from those in the pre-application submission. From the updated photomontages provided, especially from Figure 1.3 (VP2: Promenade facing the Proposed Development across the River), Figure 1.5 (VP4: Tsang Tai Uk Playground) and Figure 1.6 (VP5: Tsang Tai UK), our previous comment that the proposed development appeared to block a mostly natural and open background such as the sky view or the Needle Hill landmark remains valid. The applicant is suggested to review the building design in order to minimize the visual impact.	Please note that the photomontages aim to illustrate the building envelope in a simplified massing form to demonstrate the Indicative Scheme in support of the Proposed Amendment, which has been revised and formulated by incorporating PlanD’s comments on the proposed massing with building separation during the pre-submission enquiry. It should be emphasised that the proposed building height is the outcome of a carefully balanced planning and design exercise under a “Single Site, Multiple Use” development model. Within a relatively small site area of approximately 5,225m², the Indicative Scheme seeks not only to provide residential development, but also to accommodate a 100-bed Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE), a Parents/Relatives Resource Centre, shop and services uses, and the reprovisioning of the existing religious institution. In addition, the Scheme proposes an at-grade public open space of not less than 1,200m² for public enjoyment and community use. The proposed building height is therefore necessary to support the efficient integration of these multiple public, community and residential functions within a compact urban site, while simultaneously preserving adequate building separation, visual permeability, landscaping opportunities and design quality. The Indicative Scheme represents a balanced response to housing needs, community facility provision and urban design considerations. As shown in Figures 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6 of the submitted VIA Report, it is noted that the Indicative Scheme (+109mPD) exhibit a building height profile generally comparable to that of the surrounding residential developments, including the Riverpark (+149mPD to +155.3mPD), Jat Ming Chuen (+93.7mPD) and The Pavilia Farm (+172.7mPD to +199.8mPD). In this regard, the Indicative

No.	Comments	Responses
		Scheme is considered compatible and well-integrated into the existing built environment and urban context. Whilst the Indicative Scheme would inevitably introduce some degree of change to the existing sky view, the resulting visual impact of the Indicative Scheme are assessed as ranging from negligible to moderate and considered acceptable. With the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, including sensitive building disposition and layout, building separation and setbacks, high-quality architectural design and façade treatment, building articulation, and the incorporation of landscape amenities, the visual impacts can be effectively minimised and further enhanced in visual compatibility with the surrounding context. Further design options, including adjustment of tower footprint, redistribution of unit layouts, reduction of apparent building height and/or incorporation of stepped terraces where practicable, will also be explored in the detailed design stage to better preserve sky view, soften the perceived building massing and profile, and enhance visual compatibility with the surrounding context.
2.	Buildings Department, New Buildings Division 1, New Territories East (1) and Licensing Section, dated 03 September 2026 There is no record of approval by the Building Authority for the structures existing at the application site except new school block and Buildings Department (BD) is not in a position to offer comments on their suitability for the use related to the application. If the existing structures are New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) under the Buildings Ordinance (Application to the New Territories) Ordinance (Cap 121 or the previous Cap 322), District Land Officer/Shan Tin should be in a better position to comment on the captioned application.	Noted. Noted.

No.	Comments	Responses
	The applicant's attention is drawn to the following points: (i) If the existing structures are erected on leased land without approval of the 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. (ii) Before any new building works (including containers/open sheds as temporary buildings) are to be carried out on the application site, the prior approval and consent of the BD should be obtained, otherwise they are Unauthorized Building Works (UBW). An Authorized Person (AP) should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO. (iii) For UBW erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the BD 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. (iv) If the proposed use under application is subject to the issue of a licence, please be reminded that any existing/new structures on the application site intended to be used for such purposes are required to comply with the building safety and other relevant requirements as may be imposed by the licensing authority. (v) In connection with (ii) above, the site shall be provided with and emergency vehicular access in accordance with Regulations 41D of the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R).	Noted. Noted. Should planning approval for the proposed development be obtained, prior approval and consent of the BD will be sought before carrying out the proposed building works. Noted. Noted. Noted. The existing ground-level vehicular route to the northwest of the Application Site around the building podium has been planned to accommodate EVA requirements. While a 5.5m Right of Way is delineated to the northeast of the Application Site connecting the Application Site and a local access road linked to Tai Chung

No.	Comments	Responses
	(vi) Detailed comments under the BO on individual sites for private developments such as permissible plot ratio, site coverage, means of escape, fire resisting construction, emergency vehicular access, private streets and/or access roads, etc. will be formulated at the building plan submission stage.	Kiu Road, the Right of Way can be an alternative access to serve as EVA. Noted.
3.	Civil Engineering and Development Department, Geotechnical Engineering Office, Mainland West Division, Mainland West 6 Section, dated 03 September 2026 It is noted that there are retaining walls forming part of the subway network located outside the western side of the proposed site. Please remind the applicant that the proposed development may potentially affect or be affected by the retaining walls. In this regard, detailed design of the proposed geotechnical works should be submitted to the Buildings Department for approval according to the Buildings Ordinance.	Noted. Detailed design of the proposed geotechnical works would be submitted to the BD for approval during Foundation / Site Formation submission stage to GEO via BD’s centralised processing.
4.	Civil Engineering and Development Department, North Development Office, dated 03 September 2026 No objection to/comment on the application	Noted.
5.	Development Bureau, Works Branch, Works Division 1, Commissioner for Heritage's Office, Antiquities and Monuments Office, Heritage Conservation Unit, Historical Buildings Sub-unit, dated 03 September 2026 This serves as a joint reply of the Commissioner for Heritage Office (CHO) and the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) from the heritage conservation perspectives. While no declared monument, graded historic building, new item for grading assessment, or Government historic site identified by AMO	Noted.

No.	Comments	Responses
	is located within the application site, we are aware that Ng Yuen (at No. 21 Tai Chung Kiu Road), a Grade 3 historic building (the “Graded Building”), is located in the vicinity of the application site (approximately around 42 meters away) and the proposed Right-of-Way shown in Figure 2.2 of the Supporting Planning Statement. For location, grading boundary and historic building appraisal of the Graded Building concerned, please refer to the website of the Antiquities Advisory Board (https://www.aab.gov.hk/en/historic-buildings/search-for-information-on-individual-buildings/index.html). According to the Guidance Notes for section 12A applications under the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131), for applications involving particular uses or developments that may have implications on the environment, drainage, traffic, infrastructure, landscape and topography, etc., technical assessments (such as visual impact assessment) will be required. To facilitate relevant technical assessments, we would like to invite the Applicant to supplement the relevant information in the appropriate section of the Supporting Planning Statement with an assessment of the possible physical and visual impacts of the proposed development on the Graded Building and the proposed protective, mitigation and monitoring measures to avoid any adverse physical impacts.	Noted. The Application Site is located approx. 42m from the Grade 3 historic building, Ng Yuen. Given the separation distance and the absence of any direct encroachment upon the historic building or its immediate grounds, no adverse physical impact on Ng Yuen is anticipated during either the construction or operation phase of the development. Potential indirect impacts arising from construction activities, including vibration, ground settlement, dust and site runoff, are expected to be temporary and can be effectively controlled through the implementation of appropriate construction management measures, for example: • Sufficient establishment of protective buffer zones and hoarding around the development during construction to prevent accidental impact from construction activities; • Adoption of construction methods that minimise vibration and ground disturbance wherever practicable; • Control of excavation and temporary works design to ensure ground movements remain within acceptable limits; • Dust suppression and good site management practices within the project site; • Restriction of heavy construction plant operation in close proximity to the graded building where practicable;

No.	Comments	Responses
		• Immediate implementation of contingency measures should any unusual movement, settlement or signs of distress be detected; • Installation of monitoring points, where necessary, to monitor settlement, tilt, vibration and structural movement during construction within the site; • Regular inspections by qualified building conservation and/or structural professionals throughout the construction period; • Establishment of pre-determined trigger and action levels for settlement and vibration monitoring; • Prompt investigation and implementation of remedial actions should monitoring results approach trigger levels; and • Submission of monitoring records and inspection reports to relevant government departments where required. From a visual perspective, Ng Yuen is currently largely screened by existing vegetation and is not readily visible from most public vantage points (e.g. the cycle track, Shing Mun River Promenade Garden No. 1 and the Shing Mun River promenade) within the surrounding area. As such, the existing visual connection between the graded historic building and the wider public realm is already limited. Furthermore, setback between the proposed podium/building and Ng Yuen helps maintain an adequate visual buffer, preserve visual separation, and retain the ability to appreciate the historic building within its immediate setting. The overall visual impact on the setting of Ng Yuen is therefore considered to be minor and acceptable. In addition, further design refinements will be explored at the detailed design stage, including sensitive building disposition, façade articulation, landscape enhancements and possible reductions in apparent building bulk where practicable, to further minimise visual intrusion and enhance compatibility with the surrounding environment.

No.	Comments	Responses
	If the subject application is approved by the Town Planning Board, AMO will provide further comments from the heritage conservation perspective on the works arising from the proposed development upon receipt of any referrals from the relevant departments under the current internal monitoring mechanism for the protection of the Graded Building. Please keep us posted of any further developments/updates of the subject application. In addition, when any antiquities or supposed antiquities under the Ordinance are discovered in the course of works pursuant to the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53), the applicant is required to inform AMO (Ms. Mandy CHENG, [REDACTED] and email: [REDACTED] and Ms LEE Hiu-wai, [REDACTED] and email: [REDACTED]	The above has been supplemented in Sections 4.1.6-4.1.7 of the revised Supporting Planning Statement (Attachment B) refers). Noted. Noted.
6.	Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland South Division, Mainland South 6(Sai Kung, Sha Tin and Ma On Shan), dated 03 September 2026 DIA - It is noted that the formation level of the whole application site would be raised to around +5.0mPD. Please assess its drainage impacts to the adjoining area surrounding the site and please also review whether runoff from the adjoining area (including but not limited to the eastern side) would flow towards the site and be trapped at the periphery of the site. If affirmative, please advise the proposed improvement measures. - Please consider to take into account the latest development / proposed	Noted. The drainage impacts on the adjoining areas surrounding the Application Site have been assessed and reviewed in Chapter 4 of the revised DIA Report. Peripheral drains have been proposed along the eastern, southern and western boundaries to intercept and divert the runoff. Please refer to Attachment E for the revised DIA Report in this FI submission. Noted. The latest surrounding developments and proposed developments have been taken into account. In particular, the adjacent proposed hotel development under S12A

No.	Comments	Responses
	development in the surrounding area in the assessment. - As mentioned under Table 2.6, it is noted that the adopted total sea levels would be +5.42mPD for the 50-year Return Period Scenario which is higher than the formation level. Please advise any measures would be devise / taken to cater for this design scenario. SIA - It appears that summing up the figures under Table 3.2 do not equal to the total ADWF as stated. Please clarify. - Please beef up how the peak flow of 45.72L/s from FMH4038084 to FMH4038085 was derived.	Planning Application No. Y/ST/62 will collect and discharge runoff via separate drains to different discharge points. Thus, no cumulative drainage impact from surrounding site is anticipated. An existing barrier wall is present along the Shing Mun River Channel with a top level of approximately +5.6mPD, which is higher than the adopted sea level of +5.42mPD. The existing barrier wall will prevent floodwater from the river channel from entering the Application Site under the design scenario. The figures have been revised under Table 3.2. Please refer to Attachment F for the revised SIA Report. The peak flow in the section between FMH4038084 to FMH4038085 comprises the cumulative flow from the Indicative Scheme and upstream catchment, including Garden Villa A, Shing Mun River Promenade Garden No. 1 Public Toilet and Shing Mun River Promenade Garden No. 1 Refreshment Kiosk.
7.	Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Assessment Division, Territory South Group, Ma On Shan, Shatin, Kwai Chung, dated 03 September 2026 Based on the information provided, it is noted that the Applicant proposes to rezone the application site from “Open Space” (“O”) to “Residential (Group A) 11” (“R(A)11”) on the approved Sha Tin OZP No. S/ST/40. According to the indicative scheme provided by the Applicant, the proposed private residential development comprises two 31-storey residential towers atop a podium structure comprising religious institution, social welfare facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE)), shops and services, at a maximum Building Height of not more than 109mPD and a total Plot Ratio of not more than 6.28.	Noted.

No.	Comments	Responses
	The Applicant is reminded to evaluate potential environmental impacts from nearby existing and planned developments, including the proposed hotel development adjacent to the subject site under s.12A application No. Y/ST/62. Further information is therefore required to include the evaluation of these potential environmental impacts into the EA. Technical Comments <u>General</u> Some of the text and pages in the EA and SIA were hidden by symbol “.....”, please rectify such formatting error among the EA and SIA. <i>Appendix E – Environmental Assessment (EA)</i> <u>Noise</u> A proposed hotel development immediately adjacent to the application site was submitted for rezoning from “Open Space” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Hotel Development” under s.12A Application (Ref. No. Y/ST/62) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Please account for potential fixed noise impacts from this proposed hotel development and propose suitable mitigation measures where necessary (e.g. receiver-side noise mitigation measures or liaison with the relevant applicant for at-source mitigation). Section 4.6.1.1 – Please append Transport Department’s endorsement of traffic forecast in the EA. Figure 4.8 – Please indicate the opening side of the semi-enclosures for clarity. Section 4.1 – Please clarify in the EA whether the right-of-way shown in Figure 2.2 of the Supporting Planning Statement is intended solely for emergency vehicular access, such that traffic noise impact assessment for this access is not required. <u>Air Quality</u>	Noted. Evaluation of potential environmental impacts from the adjacent proposed hotel development has been included. Please refer to the Attachment D for the replacement pages of the revised Environmental Assessment Report in this FI submission. Noted and rectified. Please refer to Attachment D for the replacement pages of the revised EA Report and Attachment F for the revised SIA Report. Noted and it is under liaison with the relevant applicant. Noted and it will be supplemented once available. Noted and the figure is updated accordingly. Please be noted that the right-of-way is intended solely for emergency vehicular access at this stage. Therefore, traffic noise impact assessment for this access is not required.

No.	Comments	Responses
	Table 9.5 – The rounding is incorrect, for example, RSP in grid (42,40) should be 50 ug/m³ for 10th highest 24-hour and 20 ug/m³ for annual. Please review the rounding issue. Minor textual comment – Section 9.3.2.1, Line 6 – Please revise “...by PATHv3.0 for Year for 2035.” <u>Land Contamination</u> Section 10.3.1.1 – (i) As commented during the pre-submission stage and with reference to the RtC and desktop review findings, please update Section 10.3.1.1 to provide a clear chronological site history. This should explicitly name Ecclesia Theological Seminary as the historical operator since operations. (ii) As the land use history since 1953 originates from the desktop review rather than observation during site survey, it is suggested to update the section title under Section 10.3 to clearly reflect the data sources of these findings. (iii) As site access was restricted during the February 2025 site survey, please revise the sentence to clarify that the observation that chemicals and dangerous goods (DGs) were ‘not found within the site’ was based on peripheral / external site observations. <u>Waste Management</u> Section 11.2.5.5 – (i) Please amend “Building Department’s” to “Buildings Department’s”. (ii) Please amend “PNAPs” to “PNAP”. (iii) The 300,000 m³ generation threshold applies to a Construction and	According to data extracted from PATHv3.0 for Year 2035 for Level 1 (0-17m) (https://aqia.epd.gov.hk/), RSP in grid (42,40) is 48.82 ug/m³ for 10th highest 24-hour and 19.35 ug/m³ for annual. No rounding issue is observed, and thus, no change is adopted. Noted and revised accordingly. Noted and updated accordingly. Noted. Title of Section 10.3 is updated to “Desktop Review and Site Survey Findings” to reflect the data sources of the findings. Noted and revised the sentence accordingly. Noted and rectified accordingly. Noted and rectified accordingly. Noted. Section 11.2.5.5 has revised to remove sentences that are irrelevant to the Project.

No.	Comments	Responses
	Demolition Material Management Plan (C&DMMP) for submission to the Public Fill Committee (PFC), rather than a Waste Management Plan (WMP) for EPD advice. As the total estimated C&D material generation for this project is 85,500m³, the 300,000 m³ threshold and its associated requirements are non-applicable. Please remove relevant sentences to keep the text project-specific, accurate, and concise. Section 11.4.1.2 – Please update to focus on the ultimate disposal outlets (i.e. landfills) and remove mention of intermediate facilities (such as Refuse Transfer Stations). <u>Water Quality</u> Minor Formatting Comment – The numbering of tables in Section 12 is not in order, please review and update accordingly. Table 12.4, Note [4] “cfu..colony forming unit” - please check if it is relevant. <i>Appendix H – Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA)</i> Section 3.4.1.1 Table 3.3 and Section 3.4.1.2 Table 3.4 – The invert levels of sewer between MH1 and FMH4039860 in Table 3.3 & 3.4 do not tally with Appendix B Table “Hydraulic Assessment on Existing and Proposed Sewerage System After Proposed Development”. Please revise accordingly.	Noted. The first sentence in Section 11.4.1.2 is updated. Noted and updated accordingly. Noted and removed accordingly. The invert levels of the sewer between MH1 and FMH4039860 have been revised to align with Appendix B. Please refer to Attachment F for the revised SIA Report.
8.	Food and Environmental Hygiene Department, Administration & Development Branch, Planning & Development Section, dated 03 September 2026 Our advisory comments are provided as follows: No Food and Environmental Hygiene Department’s (FEHD) facilities should be affected.	Noted.

No.	Comments	Responses
	• Proper licence / permit issued by this Department is required if there is any food business / catering service / activities regulated by the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH) under the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap. 132) and other relevant legislation for the public. In accordance with Section 4 of Food Business Regulation, Cap.132X, the expression ‘food business’ means any trade or business for the purpose of which any person engages in the handling of food or food is sold by means of a vending machine. • Pursuant to section 4 of the Food Business Regulation (Cap. 132X) (FBR), the expression of “food business” does not include any club or any canteen in work place (other than a factory canteen referred to in section 31) for the use exclusively of the persons employed in the work place. As such, a club or a staff canteen is exempted from obtaining food business licence from this department except for permission to sell restricted foods specified in Schedule 2 to the Food Business Regulation. FEHD staff may conduct inspection of the staff canteen / club on regular basis. If the said canteen provided foods to the outsiders with payment, a food business licence is required. • Proper licence issued by this Department is required if related place of entertainment is involved. Any person who desires to keep or use any place of public entertainment for example a theatre and cinema or a place, building, erection or structure, whether temporary or permanent, on one occasion or more, capable of accommodating the public presenting or carrying on public entertainment within Places of Public entertainment (PPE) Ordinance (Cap. 172) and its	Noted. Noted. Noted.

No.	Comments	Responses
	subsidiary legislation, such as a concert, opera, ballet, stage performance or other musical, dramatic or theatrical entertainment, cinematograph or laser projection display, a circus, a lecture or story-telling, an exhibition of any 1 or more of the following, namely, pictures, photographs, books, manuscripts or other documents or other things, a sporting exhibition or contest, a bazaar, a dance part or an amusement ride and mechanical device which is designed for amusement, a Place of Public Entertainment Licence (or Temporary Place of Public Entertainment Licence) should be obtained from FEHD whatever the general public is admitted with or without payment. • A swimming pool licence must be obtained from FEHD for any artificially constructed pool used for swimming or bathing and to which the public have access (whether on payment or otherwise) or which is operated by any club, institution, association or other organization. A swimming pool licence is not required for any swimming pool which serves not more than 20 residential units and to which the public have no access. • There should be no encroachment on the public place and no environmental nuisance should be generated to the surroundings. Its state should not be a nuisance or injurious or dangerous to health and surrounding environment. Also, for any waste generated from such activities/ operation, the applicant should arrange disposal properly at their own expenses. • If provision of cleansing service for new public roads, streets, cycle tracks, footpaths, paved areas etc, is required, FEHD should be separately consulted. Prior consent from FEHD must be obtained and sufficient amount of	Noted. The proposed swimming pool under the Indicative Scheme is for the residential development only and no public access is anticipated. Noted. Noted.

No.	Comments	Responses
	recurrent cost may have to be provided to us. FEHD will NOT provide cleansing service within the site under private grant. If domestic waste collection service of FEHD is required in future, prior comments from this Department on the waste collection plan, including the accessibility and maneuverability of RCV to RCP, should be sought. The refuses collection points of domestic waste and the commercial waste should be clearly separated. The share use of RCP for both domestic and commercial waste is not recommended.	Noted. FEHD will be consulted at detailed design stage.
9.	Highways Department, dated 03 September 2026 no objection to/comment on the application	Noted.
10.	Hong Kong Police Force, dated 03 September 2026 no objection to/comment on the application	Noted.
11.	Home Affairs Department, dated 03 September 2026 no objection to/comment on the application	Noted.
12.	Lands Department, Lands Administration Office, District Lands Office, Sha Tin, dated 03 September 2026 The application site, Sha Tin Town Lot. No. 310 (“the Lot”), is held under New Grant No. 12326 which was granted to the General Council of The Assemblies of God and The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada by way of land exchange on 30.12.1988 for the purpose of a theological college including such ancillary facilities as dormitory, assembly hall, library and classrooms as may be approved. Under the lease conditions, the Lot is subject to, inter alias, maximum gross floor area of 2,902m², maximum site coverage of 25%, building height of not exceeding 13m above the mean formation of the Lot and not	Noted. Please note the lease modification will be proceeded for the proposed development upon the planning approval of this S12A Planning Application.

No.	Comments	Responses
	more than 3 storeys and a “No assignment” restriction. The proposed redevelopment into a residential development with social welfare facilities, religious institution and shop and services is not acceptable under the existing lease. In the event that the subject application under s.12A of the Town Planning Ordinance (“TPO”) is accepted or partially accepted by the Town Planning Board (“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 application(s) 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 land owners may submit request for streamlined processing of land exchange application. Depending on the circumstances of each case, Lands Department (“LandsD”) at its sole and absolute discretion may, upon receipt of such valid request and subject to payment of the administrative fee(s) (including fee payable to the Legal Advisory and Conveyancing Office, if required) by the land owners, commence the streamlined processing of the land exchange application on a without prejudice and non-committal basis while Planning Department is taking forward the relevant OZP amendment. The land owners are reminded that once the accepted or partially accepted proposal is reflected in the OZP and approved under S.9 of the TPO, a formal application for land exchange by land 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	Noted. Noted.

No.	Comments	Responses
	its absolute discretion, including payment of premium and administrative fee(s).	
13.	Social Welfare Department, Headquarters, Planning & Development Branch, Project Planning Section (Team 1), dated 03 September 2026 <i>RCHE</i> Please be informed that we have no objection in principle from service perspectives for the development of the proposed Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE) which is assumed to be private/self-financing nature with no financial implication to the Government in terms of capital and recurrent costs. While our comments given on 2.6.2026 are still valid, we will give comments on the detailed layout plan subject the applicant’s further submission. The applicant is advised to note that provision of light bus parking space and L/UL Bay is not licensing requirements of a RCHE. Instead, one L/UL Bay for the Social Welfare Facilities, one light bus parking space measuring 8.0 metres in length and 3.0 metres in width with minimum headroom of 3.3 metres and one L/UL Bay measuring 11.0 metres in length and 3.5 metres in width with minimum headroom of 4.7 metres are preferable for the operation of the proposed RCHE against the provision of seven light bus parking spaces as proposed. <i>Parents/Relatives Resource Centre (PRC)</i> We agree to the proposed establishment of Parents/Relatives Resource Centre and have no comments from a service perspective at this stage.	Noted. Noted. Noted. The layout was revised to provide one light bus parking space measuring 8.0 metres in length and 3.0 metres in width with minimum headroom of 3.3 metres and one L/UL Bay measuring 11.0 metres in length and 3.5 metres in width with minimum headroom of 4.7 metres for the operation of the proposed RCHE. Please refer to Attachment H for the Replacement Pages of Revised Indicative Layout Plans for the Indicative Scheme at the Application Site. Please also refer to Attachment C for the updated Tables 5.1 and 5.2 of the revised TIA Report for details. Noted.
14.	Transport Department, NT Regional Office, Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division, Shatin Section, dated 03 September 2026	

No.	Comments	Responses
	I refer to your submission regarding the captioned s.12A planning application. Appended below departmental comments received for your consideration please. Please note that comments below are based on information available. Further comments may be provided upon receipt of further submissions. We have following comments on the application: 1. Section 4.2.5 – The construction of T4 has commenced in 2024. Please update the 2nd sentence of this section accordingly. 2. Section 4.2.5 and 4.5 – Please elaborate how the potential traffic implication of Trunk Road T4 are considered in the assessment given that a growth rate approach is adopted. 3. Section 4.4.4 and the response to comments on the pre-submission material – It is noted that additional traffic due to the development is distributed to the road network with reference to the survey data. While the O-D pattern for Hong Kong Bible Research and Education Centre (the current use) could be very different from that of a residential development and RCHE (the proposed use), please explain why adopting the survey data for estimating the trip distribution is considered appropriate.	Noted. The wordings in the revised TIA Report (Attachment C) refers) is revised accordingly. Noted. Further elaboration is provided accordingly. Please refer to Section 4.2.5 and 4.5 of the revised TIA Report for details. Please be clarified that the development traffic is distributed with reference to the traffic pattern of the existing road network, not the existing building. Taking the generation traffic as an example, as the section of Lion Rock Tunnel Road fronting the Site is separated by central divider, the generation traffic can only leave via the junction of Lion Rock Tunnel Road / Tai Chung Kiu Road / Che Kung Miu Road. The generation traffic can only turn left, go straight ahead and turn right, the generation traffic is therefore splitted based on the surveyed traffic flows at these 3 movements. The existing AM peak hour flows are extracted below for easy reference. Turn left: 202 Go straight: 105 Turn right: 147 The generation traffic of the proposed development would be: Turn left: $39 \times 202 / (202+105+147) = 17$ Go straight: $39 \times 105 / (202+105+147) = 9$

No.	Comments	Responses
	4. Table 4.7 – Please explain why the spare capacity of J2 would increase significantly with the additional traffic from the proposed development during AM peak. 5. Table 4.7 – J3 is proposed to be modified under Planning Application No. Y/ST62. Please advise if the updated junction layout has been considered in the assessment. 6. Section 4.8 – Please provide a plan showing the possible pedestrian paths into and out of the development, and hence advise the LOS of the footpath along the abovementioned pedestrian paths. Existing pedestrian flow should also be considered in the assessment. 7. Table 5.1 – Please add a footnote to explain the rationale of providing the respectively number of parking spaces / loading and unloading bay for Research and Education Centre and RCHE. 8. Figure 5.1 – Please clarify if the XYZ shown on the drawing are proposed or existing access points. 9. Table 4.11: Please advise the rationale in estimating the adjusted split for the proposed development. 10. Table 4.12: Please review the modal split of each mode of transport for the proposed development as it is different from that in Table 4.11. 11. Table 4.12: Please advise the rationale in calculating the estimated peak hour passenger demand.	Turn right: $39 \times 147 / (202+105+147) = 13$ The calculations are reviewed and updated accordingly. Please refer to Table 4.7 of the revised TIA Report for details. Please note that the junction layout has not been considered in the submitted TIA report as Application No. Y/ST/62 is not yet approved. Nevertheless, this potential junction modification is calculated for sensitivity test. Please refer to Table 4.7 of the revised TIA report for details. Please refer to Figure 4.4 for information. A footnote is provided in Table 5.1 of the revised TIA Report. The XYZ shown in Figure 5.1 is the proposed access point. Please note that the split is adjusted for conservative assessment purpose, private transport modes are excluded and distributed among public transport modes. Please refer to Table 4.11 of the revised TIA Report for details. Noted. Table 4.12 is reviewed and updated accordingly. The passenger demand induced by the proposed development of different transport modes is

No.	Comments	Responses
	12. Table 4.11 and 4.12: Please include public light bus in the assessment. 13. Section 4.9: Our previous comment on the provision of the OC rates of the nearby bus and GMB routes still valid. The assessment in Section 4.9 was based on the 2021 Population Census which may underestimate the existing demand for the public transport service. Please advise the OC rates of the nearby bus and GMB routes to ascertain there are sufficient capacity to cater for the additional passenger demand arising from the proposed residential development. 14. Section 4.9 and Table 4.3 – Please advise if the nearby planned / committed development listed on Table 4.3 has been considered in the Public Transport Services Review.	estimated by adopting the adjusted split in Table 4.11. Please refer to Section 4.9.3 and Table 4.12 of the revised TIA Report for details. Noted. Please refer to Tables 4.11 and 4.12 of the revised TIA Report for details. Please note that proposing new public transport services is the most conservative approach irrespective of the existing occupancy. In fact, the induced passenger demand by the proposed development may be accommodated by the existing services. Please note that 2021 Population Census is the latest source in the public domain which can reflect the locational characteristics of the Site precisely. The review should be updated upon release of new Population Census. Please be clarified that the public transport service review only focus on the impact of the proposed development. The nearby planned / committed development listed on Table 4.3 has not been considered.
15.	Water Supplies Department, New Works Branch Construction Division, System Planning Section, dated 03 September 2026 The Appendix I – Water Supply Impact Assessment (WSIA) as stated in the Supporting Planning Statement (July 2026) seems outstanding in the documents. Please review.	Noted. Please refer to Attachment G for the Water Supply Impact Assessment.

(Last updated 24 September 2026)